United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2014 No. 129

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have stepped away from a Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health to come to the floor. The purpose of that hearing is once again to attack the Affordable Care Act, criticisms of CMS, and to lay the foundation for the Republican goal of repealing the Act entirely.

I have frankly lost track of the number of attempts to repeal the bill. Fifty? Sixty? You know, it really doesn't matter. The Affordable Care Act is here to stay and will be throughout the tenure of President Obama.

Despite some difficulties in its implementation, the President is justly proud of the health care reform as a signal accomplishment of his administration. Many of the problems that we are facing in the implementation of the act have been as a result of Republican intransigence.

Remember, despite the fact that the legislation embodies most of what had been bipartisan principles—indeed, those strongly advocated by Republicans over the last 20 years or more—there was unrelenting opposition.

Republicans in the Senate refused to cooperate and refused to legislate, denying the 60-vote threshold necessary to move the bill forward. As a result, the bill was adopted through a process called reconciliation, where you just melded the two bills together.

The result was not a bill that anybody would have designed, but it easily could have been made better, should our Republican friends have chosen. Instead, they have continued this unyielding assault.

Even without their assistance, the results are pretty remarkable. We have the lowest rate of medical inflation in years. The Congressional Budget Office has consistently now been lowering the long-term cost estimates for Medicare.

This is probably the most powerful evidence yet that we are getting runaway health care costs under control, which was and remains the greatest single threat to the fiscal stability of our country.

We have been doing much more than merely controlling costs. There are more than 8 million people with marketplace insurance, and about three-quarters of them receive tax credits to help reduce the cost. Six million low-income people have been enrolled in Medicaid. Another 6 million children have been able to stay on their parents' health plans.

129 million—Americans, I daresay that includes most of us in Congress—can no longer be denied care because of preexisting medical conditions.

As I said, there is lots that can be done to improve the system. Today, I had a chance to address the Case Management Society of America about one of them. Congressman PETRI of Wisconsin and I have introduced a transitional care benefit that would greatly reduce the chance of hospital readmissions that are not just costly, but they represent a failure to deliver health care to our citizens and reduce the stress and strain on families with loved ones who have left the hospital. This could save billions of dollars and frankly doesn't remotely depend on whether or not you support ObamaCare.

Another great example is legislation that Dr. PHIL ROE of Tennessee and I have introduced, dealing with the Federal Government finally placing a value on the conversation with patients and their families for conditions surrounding the end of life.

There is value-based insurance, which I am cosponsoring with Representative BLACK of Tennessee. Representative ROSKAM of Illinois has the PRIME Act to deal with Medicare fraud. Representative GERLACH of Pennsylvania for several years has had legislation for a secure access card.

The list of opportunities is long and represents an extraordinary chance to build on reform, not just a futile effort at undermining it.

Someday, the American public is going to insist that we grow up and do our jobs, and there would be no better place to start than in building on the promise of health care reform not just to save money, but to improve the lives of Americans of all ages.

The hypocrisy here is breathtaking: refuse to legislate and then attack it for its faults; starve the IRS and CMS

Printed on recycled paper.

of resources to properly administer the law and then complain that the IRS and CMS are not properly administering it.

The American public has a right to expect better from the people's House. Someday, they will get it.

INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, although criminal forfeiture laws have been an important tool and a useful tool for law enforcement, civil asset forfeiture has been used too many times to seize, forfeit, and indeed profit off the property of Americans without even charging them with crimes—innocent until proven guilty.

The activity can be a boon for police budgets, as the Federal asset forfeiture fund exceeded $2 billion in 2013 and equitable sharing agreements between the Department of Justice and local police departments accounted for over $600 million.

While policing certainly is a vital element of an effective society, let's also be mindful of the fact that our Constitution emphasizes individual rights above all. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 5212, the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act, to limit the scope, the power, and the reach of the government to abuse their forfeiture powers in violation of individual rights guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

I urge all my colleagues to support this needed reform effort and to again assure our citizens of their civil liberties and the opportunity to defend innocence or prove guilt.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, my press secretary has kept me pretty busy the last few days, talking about the President's decision to delay executive action on immigration, in two languages. I made it clear that from a political standpoint, in the short run and the long run, I think the President should have taken action before election day in order to be more transparent with the American people about the policy we all know is coming.

It makes the job harder for me to generate enthusiasm among Americans to vote at all, let alone enthusiasm for voting for Democrats when there are members of my own party asking the President to hold his pen and his phone in abeyance until after the voters vote.

From a policy standpoint, every week we delay is bad for our country. From a humanitarian perspective, deporting the parents of U.S. citizens is not in our national interest. Making it impossible for spouses of legal immigrants and citizens of the United States to pick up the visas that have already been issued to them is not in our national interest.

Keeping the fear of deportation hovering over immigrant communities, like Pilsen and Little Village in my district in Chicago, has a damaging impact on the fabric of our community. It dampens the economy along commercial thoroughfares, like 26th Street, a key engine of the Chicago economy and tax base.

Perhaps more important to those living outside of immigrant communities is to know that when the President acts, he will announce a tough but fair solution for millions of immigrants who do not have visas or any way of getting visas, but who have lived and worked here peacefully for years, even decades.

It would work something like this: if they come forward, if they submit their fingerprints at their own expense to the FBI, and if they pass a rigorous criminal background check and meet other requirements, we will issue them a biometric identification card that says that they are not a priority for deportation.

Not only do we get them in the system and on the books, but now they are in a program that needs to be renewed periodically with strict rules. This creates a huge incentive not to violate the rules of the program or the rules of our society.

I know the President has heard all of these arguments, and I don't think I will convince him to change his mind again and move forward with key improvements to our deportation policies before November 4, but let us be clear, I think he has already made two important decisions.

Number one, there is no longer any question that the President of the United States has the legal authority to act on immigration and deportations under current law. Even Republicans who have hired the best lawyers at taxpayers' expense to prepare their lawsuits against the President agreed and didn't include immigration in their farfetched list of Presidential ''overreaches.''

This is settled law, and despite the shouts of talk radio and a few on the Republican side, there is no real serious debate about the rock-solid legal ground from which the President can act and has already acted.

Secondly, I know the President has decided going big, going broad, going generous, and going quickly after the election is the right decision because he and Secretary Jeh Johnson have to set enforcement priorities about which people they will deport first and which people they will deport last based on national security and economic interests of this country.

He will act up to the limits of current law, and believe me, I can hear the cries from the other side, ''He can't act because we, Republicans, may try to do something on immigration in the lame-duck. The President can't act because we, Republicans, are going to put the bipartisan coalition back together again in the new 114th Congress, and we will get reform passed in both Houses; or, you know, we were just kidding when we said all that stuff about immigration after our defeat on election day in 2012.''

They will say, ''This time, we really mean it because 2016 and the electoral college are staring us in the face''—but no, I know the President and the Democrats will not fall for that again.

I don't see the President saying he will act if you don't act, as we have been saying for 2 years. This time, I see the President acting first, acting broadly, and acting generously, laying out a broad array of executive actions to mitigate the damage that is being done to our country by congressional inaction on immigration reform.

If the Republicans are so inclined, they can take legislative action. It is what we have been begging them to do for two decades on this issue. We may even work with you if you are serious about it, but it will no longer be accepted as a delaying tactic for action by the executive branch of government. It will be a response to Presidential action.

I think the President will have the courage to act, and then it is Congress' chance to act.

THE RETIREMENT OF BILL SCHWERI

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend of southern and eastern Kentucky, Mr. Bill Schweri, upon his retirement as the director of Federal Relations at the University of Kentucky.

During his 42 years at the university, Bill has been a champion for progress in education, health care, and energy research across the State. Behind the scenes of Kentucky's highly esteemed flagship university, Bill has been a driving force, seeking out partnerships, programs, and funding to help the most distressed region of the Commonwealth. I am certain there is not a single resource that Bill hasn't researched for the benefit of southern and eastern Kentucky.

No one knows the value and power of creating and sustaining longtime partnerships like Bill. If the University of Kentucky needed a partner to improve education or access to health care, Bill ensured the connection was secured with his genuine, kind, and humble approach.

Most leaders seek recognition or credit for their own efforts, but that has never been the case with Bill Schweri. His work has led to exponential growth of UK's research enterprise and jump-started new research initiatives that have enabled the university to be successful in competing for Federal grants and contracts.

This riveting scientific research on cancer, fossil energy, transportation, and agriculture is blazing new trails in every aspect of our everyday life in our country, to say nothing of how our State is better off for it.

□ 1015

He has fought for legislation that is important to UK and student financial aid. Bill has been a leader in the Science Coalition and actively involved in the Council on Governmental Affairs and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. Over the years, he has deservedly gained the utmost respect of his peers in Federal relations.

As he departs his post, Mr. Speaker, at the University of Kentucky, it is my intention to ensure Bill Schweri receives the recognition that is due him for his tireless efforts on behalf of students and families all across Kentucky, and specifically living in Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District. We hope he knows he always has the thanks of a grateful Big Blue Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me as we honor my friend Bill Schweri as we bid him a joy-filled retirement.

POTABLE WATER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just last month, hundreds of thousands of residents in Toledo, Ohio, were left without access to potable water and faced an extended drinking water ban, after unsafe toxin levels, likely caused by a Lake Erie algal bloom, were found at a city water treatment plant. In January, Charleston, West Virginia, residents faced a similar ban on their drinking water after a chemical spill.

George Bernard Shaw once said:

> Success does not consist in never making mistakes, but in never making the same one a second time.

One would think, after two new incidents that left hundreds of thousands of Americans without access to clean drinking water, this body would jump into action to prevent this from ever happening again. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the House hasn't only refused to act, yesterday we actually voted to prevent the administration from acting.

Again and again my colleagues continue to introduce bills and riders that would endanger our drinking water while ignoring basic scientific principles in the process. Today more than 117 million Americans get their drinking water from systems that rely on rivers, streams, and wetlands which, at this very moment, are not clearly protected under the Clean Water Act. Let me say that again: 117 million Americans are getting their drinking water from bodies of water that may not be protected from pollution or destruction.

American families deserve clarity, and that is exactly what the administration is trying to provide with their proposed Clean Water Act rule; and, unbelievably enough, that is exactly what the House voted to prevent yesterday.

For years we relied on the Clean Water Act to protect the Nation's waters. For my constituents back home in Chicago, that meant everything from the wetlands on the shores of Lake Michigan to the inland streams that flow across the Great Lakes region. But two Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 changed all that, leaving us with a confusing, time-consuming, and frustrating process for determining which of the Nation's waters are now protected under Federal law and which are not.

It is imperative that we close what has become a harmful loophole, and that is what the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers are trying to do with their proposed rule clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act.

Let's be clear: The EPA and the Corps of Engineers are acting within the authority granted them by Congress under the Clean Water Act to legally clarify the statute's jurisdiction. This clarity is desperately needed, especially in the Great Lakes Basin. Half the streams in the Greats Lakes States lack clear water protection simply because they do not all flow all year.

This lack of protection has taken its toll, slowing permitting decisions for responsible development and reducing protections for drinking water supplies and critical habitats. The EPA and Army Corps' proposed rule would restore Clean Water Act protections to wetlands and tributary streams because the science clearly shows that these water bodies are connected.

Before proposing its rule, the EPA analyzed more than 1,000 peer-reviewed scientific articles, and the findings are irrefutable. Tributary streams and wetlands are clearly connected to downstream waters. Pollution is carried down the river, polluting bigger and bigger waterways.

Healthy wetlands improve water quality by filtering polluted runoff from farm fields and city streets that otherwise would flow into rivers, streams, and great water bodies across the country. Wetlands and tributaries provide vital habitat to wildlife, waterfowl and fish, reduce flooding, and replenish groundwater supplies.

We cannot protect and restore the Great Lakes and our drinking water supplies without first protecting and restoring the wetlands and upstream waters that feed into them. Congress passed the Clean Water Act with the intention of protecting our waterways, and that is what it did for almost 30 years. Now this administration is trying to bring back these protections this House has undermined.

Let's not make the same mistake twice. Let's let the experts do their job.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS ON 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO VETERANS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay special tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also known as the VFW, on the 100th anniversary of its organization in September 1914. The Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was also organized in 1914.

Over the past century, members of the VFW have worked tirelessly to ensure that veterans receive the respect, honor, and support they deserve. The VFW was formed when the American Veterans of Foreign Service and the National Society of the Army of the Philippines merged during a conference at the former Schenley Hotel, which is now the William Pitt Union at the University of Pittsburgh.

A Pennsylvania Historic Society marker that sits between the Soldiers and Sailors Hall and the William Pitt Union commemorating the occasion reads:

> The Veterans of Foreign Wars organized September 14–17, 1914, at the former Schenley Hotel near here. Veterans who had served in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and China were among its founders.

Since its founding, the VFW has done tremendous work to serve veterans and family members. The organization played a central role in the creation of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the GI Bill. In addition, the VFW helped spearhead the creation of the Vietnam War, Korean War, World War II, and Women in Military Service Memorials.

It continues this legacy of service by helping veterans and their family members secure VA benefits, including disability claims and pensions. The VFW continues to play an important role as Iraq and Afghanistan veterans return home and adjust to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join us in recognizing and expressing sincere gratitude for the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the important work they have done and continue to do to stand with those who have stood for us.

SOCORRO, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, as we continue our journey through the 23rd District of Texas, I would like to highlight the historic city of Socorro, in El Paso County. It is located in the center of El Paso's Mission Valley, a valley named for three historic missions founded by Spanish priests, soldiers, and colonists.

Socorro is also home to the Socorro High School Bulldogs. They are known for many things, but particularly they are known for their prowess in baseball. Socorro High is a former State

champion in baseball. In a State as big as Texas, that is a pretty impressive feat.

The roots of Socorro began to take shape in 1680 when Governor Antonio de Otermin and Father Francisco de Ayeta led the Spanish and Piro Indian refugees who were fleeing the New Mexico Pueblo Indian revolt to the El Paso area. Two years later, they built a mission, Nuestra Senora de la Limpia Concepcion del Socorro, the second-oldest mission in Texas. Unfortunately, this first mission was swept away by a flood on the Rio Grande in 1744 and a second mission was built.

Today it may be hard to imagine, but the Rio Grande in those days was a wild river, much different from the dry riverbed or placid stream of today. And a powerful flood also washed away the second mission in 1829.

In 1843, the main part of the present Socorro mission was completed, and at that time, Socorro had a population of about 100 people. The city of Socorro is one of those cities in Texas that has seen several flags flown over it. Founded by the Spanish, it became a part of Mexico from 1821 to 1848, and as a result of the U.S.-Mexican war, Socorro became part of Texas.

The area around El Paso can be arid and harsh, but the secret to Socorro's longevity has been its acequias, a well-designed system of irrigation canals still in existence today. These acequias provided water for crops and vineyards.

The development of Socorro suffered a setback in 1881 when the railroads laid their track all the way to El Paso but they bypassed Socorro. This shifted the development and the political power into the city of El Paso itself. And yet the determined city of Socorro continued to grow, and it diversified and developed various industries. Its resolute citizens were determined to stay in the area.

Later on, unscrupulous developers started to build homes and residential subdivisions there that didn't have paved streets or water or sewer, but Socorro residents again rose up against these builders of these colonias to make sure that their city survived and prospered. And today, the city of Socorro is home to some 32,000 people, making it the 95th largest city in Texas.

The city of Socorro is El Paso County's second largest municipality, and there is a lot of history in Socorro, a lot of places to go and see. If you have got a young kid, a young child, you will want to hang out where the community gathers, and that is at Bulldog Championship Park, which includes a splash park, an amphitheater, walking trails, and a pond.

There is also the Socorro Entertainment Center, known as Speaking Rock, operated by the Tiguas, a Pueblo tribe located in the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo. The Entertainment Center welcomes recording artists like B.B. King and the Gipsy Kings, Everclear and Korn, just to name a few.

Socorro is served by the Socorro Independent School District, with one high school, three middle schools, and five elementaries.

I invite people visiting the 23rd to stop by Socorro, enjoy Texas culture. It is an infusion of Southwest history and Southwest traditions.

SUPPORT THE EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, later today, the House will consider the Employee Health Care Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

As I traveled West Virginia during the August recess, I heard from small business owners and workers across the State that their health insurance premiums are increasing. I also heard that their deductibles are increasing quite rapidly.

Given that the Obama administration's own Centers for Medicare & Medicaid studies found that 11 million small business employees will see their premiums increase due to ObamaCare, it was sad, but not surprising, that businesses in West Virginia and around the country are feeling the pinch of this law's misguided policies.

Yesterday a report issued by the American Action Forum found that the Affordable Care Act regulations are reducing small businesses' pay by $22.6 billion annually, and the rising premiums spurred by the law have cost our Nation's economy more than 350,000 jobs.

In my State of West Virginia, more than half of our private sector workers are employed by small businesses. Making sure that health insurance on the small group market is affordable is important to both the family budgets and to make sure those small businesses can continue to grow and provide jobs.

We saw last fall the tremendous problems and uncertainty that occurred when roughly 5 million Americans who purchased insurance on the individual market received cancelation notices, but recent testimony at the House Energy and Commerce Committee has indicated that millions more workers who have employer-sponsored plans could get similar notices starting as early as this year.

If a worker is forced to change health insurance policies, their new plan might not include their doctor or their community hospital. This is another example of overreaching government that is taking away the freedom of individuals and businesses to make the health care decisions that best fit their unique circumstances.

The bill the House will consider today is very simple. If a plan was offered on the group health insurance market in 2013, that plan can continue to be offered for the next 5 years. Any worker covered by one of these plans will not be fined under the individual mandate. The Employer Health Care Protection Act keeps the President's promise that people who like their insurance, health insurance, can keep it.

□ 1030

It also provides more affordable alternatives for small businesses whose health care costs are soaring. This bill is a commonsense step forward.

There is still much more work that needs to be done. We need to go back to the drawing board and enact true health care reform. We should build on the good ideas, like helping those with preexisting conditions and allowing children to remain on parents' benefits until the age of 26. These are good things.

We should get rid of bad ideas like the job-killing employer mandate, the individual mandate, and regulations that have cost many Americans the insurance plan and the doctor that they choose. We should enact meaningful medical liability reform, we should help spur association health plans, and allow insurance to be sold across State lines to broaden competition in the individual insurance market.

We need to come together to fix our broken health care system. But today, the least we can do is keep the promise that the President made to the American people and allow current plans to continue to be available. I ask my colleagues to support the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

THE WISDOM OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the effective action and wise caution shown by the President of the United States with regard to ISIS. We were all disgusted by the beheading of American journalists and alarmed by ISIS' early military successes.

Those who oversimplify the Middle East focus exclusively on the evils of ISIS and demand its immediate destruction without sufficient examination of the costs and the effects. The President recognizes that the situation calls for action but that its complexity also calls for caution. He has ordered over 150 airstrikes, which have punished ISIS, killing hundreds of its fighters and securing military victories at Mosul Dam, protecting the Yazidi minority, protecting our Kurdish allies, and protecting the Shiite Turkmen, four important military victories. And, just as importantly, we have pushed back ISIS and prevented its further expansion in Iraq.

Yet, the simpleminded argue that all of our problems in the Middle East would disappear if only we had a President with a different personality. Or

they assume that ISIS can be destroyed immediately without any American boots on the ground. The ground forces necessary to destroy ISIS immediately, that deployment would involve hundreds, if not thousands, of American casualties. Even if we had a victory over ISIS that was swift, our forces would be the ones on the ground. We would then be viewed as responsible for providing security, which would require a prolonged presence.

Now, some fantasize that Turkey or Saudi Arabia or somebody else—just not us—will be willing to deploy ground forces and suffer major casualties. Well, keep in mind that Turkey and Saudi Arabia weren't willing to suffer any casualties to destroy Saddam Hussein in our final war against him, and that these two Sunni nations hate some of the enemies of ISIS as much they hate ISIS. If there are going to be troops on the ground, they will not just magically appear from others in the region.

The greatest flaw in the simple thinking is to focus exclusively on whom we want to destroy without asking who will be empowered by such destruction. Who are the enemies of ISIS that ISIS is fighting today? Who would step into the vacuum if ISIS were rapidly destroyed? Four entities: the al-Nusra front, ISIS' chief rival in Syria. The al-Nusra front, of course, is part of al Qaeda. Second, Assad, who has killed over 191,000 of his own people. Third, the extremist Shiite militias and perhaps former Prime Minister Maliki. These are forces that killed hundreds of Americans last decade. And fourth, Hezbollah and its patron Iran, who killed hundreds of Americans in Lebanon in 1983 and also killed hundreds of Americans in Iraq last decade.

Now, there is constant discussion that ISIS might have the ability to conduct operations outside the Middle East, perhaps against us. Hezbollah and Iran have killed hundreds of people in actions in Asia, South America, Africa, and Europe. So let us be clear: those who will take power if ISIS is swept aside are nearly as evil as ISIS. Let us applaud a President who has taken decisive action, acted with caution, achieved significant military victories, and done it all without a single American casualty.

Finally, there is the issue of Congress. What is our role? Some think that our role is to dodge tough votes, leave town next week, and stay away until Veterans Day, all without voting on what America is doing in the Middle East. Unfortunately, we ought to do our job. The War Powers Act allows the President to act for 60 or 90 days. After that, if Congress refuses to act, the President either has to violate the Constitution or summon Congress back and hope that we do our job. We ought to pass a resolution authorizing air operations for a significant period of time while not expanding the President's limited rights to deploy ground forces.

We ask our pilots to do their job. We in Congress should do ours. Let's consider a War Powers Act resolution. Let's take the tough vote.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Violence Against Women Act.

Our Nation has certainly come a long way in advancing the rights of women. In fact, just a few weeks ago, our country celebrated Women's Equality Day, a day commemorating the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, granting women the right to vote. Women, united together against incredible odds, have fought for the right to participate in our democratic process. And, now, 94 year later, our fight for our dignity continues in our own homes—the war being waged against domestic violence. The Violence Against Women Act embodies that fight against women being brutalized by those who claim to love us. The Violence Against Women Act provides the resources for women to access police protection, legal services, and social services.

The passage and reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act was a victory for our entire country—a victory for Native American women who had been raped and brutalized on tribal lands with impunity, a victory for LGBTQ victims whose agony was ignored because of their gender identity, a victory for young women in college whose institutions were derelict in their response to ''boys just being boys,'' and a victory for children whose emotional wounds had scabbed over with no healing balm.

We can take comfort knowing that the Violence Against Women Act is making a true difference in the lives of countless women across the country. It has helped reduce domestic violence by shifting the way our culture responds to it. For instance, our Services-Training-Officers-Prosecutors, or STOP, grant program provides vital funding to local communities, giving them the tools they need to strengthen the States' criminal justice system response for victims.

And the Violence Against Women Act isn't just socially responsible, it is fiscally responsible, as well. In its first 6 years alone, the Violence Against Women Act saved taxpayers at least $12.6 billion in net averted social costs. A recent study found that civil protection orders saved one State, Kentucky, on average $85 million in a single year.

The road to this victory wasn't traveled alone. As I look around, I see many of those who stood with me in the face of partisan opposition and obstruction. I see the faces of friends and champions like Representative DONNA EDWARDS, Representative TOM COLE, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, Representative JOHN CONYERS, and Leader NANCY PELOSI. But I don't want to just talk about Members of this body but talk about those who walk outside these Halls, champions like President Obama, Vice President JOE BIDEN, President and Secretary Clinton, Kim Gandy from the National Network to End Domestic Violence, and all those Native American tribes who showed up to stand for the reauthorization.

As I stand here remembering those who have walked with us, I am reminded of my very own home district of Milwaukee. Our community will, once again, host the annual Brides Walk sponsored by the UMOS Latina Resource Center. This walk commemorates a Dominican American woman who was brutally murdered by her jealous ex-boyfriend in New Jersey on her wedding day. This beautiful bride was shot dead in her wedding dress. This event, the Brides Walk, was inspired by a staunch advocate for women's rights, Josie Ashton, who raised awareness about domestic violence by walking from New Jersey to Florida wearing her own wedding dress and spending the night sleeping at shelters from New Jersey to Florida to elucidate the problems and challenges of domestic violence, and remind us that sometimes so-called love can turn to abuse.

This event, the Brides Walk in Milwaukee, will be celebrated by women donning wedding gowns and walking through the streets of Milwaukee speaking against domestic violence. They will be accompanied by brave men who walk by their sides. And so I urge people in Milwaukee to join the March Against Domestic Violence in Milwaukee and to use social media to bring attention to this pressing issue.

THE DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we only have 24 legislative days left in the 113th Congress, yet the Republican majority has failed to pass any meaningful legislation. The last 2 years have been wasted with partisan rhetoric and legislative initiatives that amount to nothing more than talking points. House Republicans have made this the least productive Congress in recent memory.

They have waged a sustained war against low-income citizens by blocking commonsense legislation that would raise the minimum wage and restore emergency unemployment insurance. They continue to oppose efforts to ensure women receive equal pay for equal work. For the first time in the history of our Nation, they are pursuing a frivolous lawsuit against the President at taxpayer expense, and I continue to fume about that lawsuit.

Republicans seem proud that this prestigious body has been labeled the Do-Nothing Congress.

For the past 2 years, Democrats have repeatedly called on the Republicans to tackle a pro-jobs, pro-middle class agenda. Democrats have consistently put forth proposals that would grow jobs, provide workers with a living wage, and fix our broken immigration system. Instead of working with Democrats to bring about the change supported by the majority of Americans, Republicans have refused to act.

Instead, the Republican majority has spent the 113th Congress appealing to the fringes of the Republican Party. They wasted hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars trying to defend the Defense of Marriage Act. They held hearing after hearing after hearing to pursue conspiracy theories about Benghazi at the expense of our Nation's delicate work in a volatile region. And for the first time in the history of our Republic, the Republicans voted to sue the President of the United States for delaying a health care mandate that they themselves have long opposed.

□ 1045

My Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, routinely walk away from key discussions and negotiations, failing to lead, but worse, failing the American people. They have, however, succeeded in making this Republican-controlled House one of the least productive and most divided in our Nation's history.

In the Senate where 60 votes are needed to pass any bill, Republicans have also been successful in blocking important proposals that have the overwhelming support of the American people. As a result, Americans' confidence in Congress has fallen to less than 10 percent.

The American people desperately need their elected representatives to come together to advance policies that benefit our citizens. The American people don't care about Republicans or Democrats. They care about us working to improve their lives, but Republicans insist on driving us further apart.

Instead of doing the work we were elected to do, House Republicans have scheduled another 5-week break beginning in October. I guess obstruction must really be exhausting to all of them.

There is so much work that remains to be done. I pray my Republican colleagues hear me. Now is the time to work the will of the American people. That is what we were sent here to do.

I urge the majority to end this Congress on a high note. Cancel the 5-week break. I am serious. Cancel the 5-week break. I can handle it if you can handle it.

Let's raise the minimum wage, reform our immigration system, and ensure equal pay for equal work. It is what the American people expect and deserve.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the urgent need for 24 States to expand Medicaid for the 5.7 million Americans who fall into the Medicaid gap.

Among those excluded are 435,000 cashiers, 341,000 cooks, and 253,000 nurses' aides. These hardworking Americans should not have to choose between groceries and medicine or between rent and a doctor's visit.

On behalf of all Alabamians, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my colleagues, Representatives BUTTERFIELD and JOHNSON, for heading up the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, of which I am a proud member.

It is painfully unsettling that the 24 States not expanding Medicaid are the very States where the concentration of those living in poverty and without health care is the most acute. The 24 States that have rejected Medicaid expansion are home to over half of the Nation's population, but 68 percent of the poor, uninsured, Blacks, and single mothers. These constituents have the highest burden of illness and costs to our entire health care system.

The 235,000 Alabamians and 5.7 million Americans who fall in the coverage gap are our most vulnerable citizens. About 60 percent of the Nation's uninsured working poor live in these 24 States.

These individuals pay their taxes, they work hard, and they contribute to our community. Our government should support them in return. To not expand Medicaid for these hardworking Americans is reckless disregard for their dramatic needs and their important work that they do in our community.

Expanding Medicaid is not only a moral imperative, but an economic imperative as well. There is not a State in the country that will benefit from its refusal to accept Federal dollars provided to them to expand their Medicaid program.

Alabamians need jobs, and they need health care. Without raising a cent in taxes, my Governor and State leaders can achieve both job creation and health care coverage by expanding Medicaid.

The facts are clear. There is not an economic development investment in Alabama's history that would provide the State with 35,000 new jobs like Medicaid expansion would. Our State leaders cannot be honest with their constituents in arguing that they are interested in economic development while turning down $375 million a quarter.

In the State of Alabama, the income ceiling for Medicaid in its current form for a family of three is $3,560 annually. That is less than $10 a day for a family of three. This is the lowest Medicaid income ceiling in the country. So families that earn a mere $15 a day are left behind when it comes to being able to afford access to affordable health care.

While I understand the political realities in which we operate and in which my Governor operates, I do not understand the shameful neglect of our most vulnerable constituents, our rural hospitals, and our fragile economy that is presented in our State's refusal to accept Medicaid expansion.

Our most sacred responsibility to serve our constituents shall not be examined and instituted through such a dangerous partisan lens. With each day that my State of Alabama delays expansion, more of our constituents are unable to work due to unrelated health conditions.

Americans who are both impoverished and sick should not have to wait one more day while our State leaders play political football with this urgent issue.

This is why I am so proud to stand with my colleagues in the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus today in sending a clear message to our State leaders that enough is enough. We need to expand Medicaid now for every State in the Union.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Cliff Lea, First Baptist Church of Leesburg, Leesburg, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Living Lord, it is an honor to come and open our hearts before You today. We acknowledge Your greatness and power over us and all things. Thank You for salvation.

It is with our deepest gratitude that we thank You for the privilege of being called Americans. With humility, let us realize the responsibility this privilege entails. Let Your presence in us be the light that causes this Nation to shine bright in the world.

Grant Your favor, wisdom, and protection to our troops here and abroad. Place within our leaders and Representatives, here in the House and the Senate, a desire to make God-honoring decisions. May our President be guided by Your truth. In our differences, let us see You first.

Please give each of us in this place and every citizen of this Nation a contrite heart and willingness to follow Your way.

In Christ's name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS 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 PRO TEMPORE

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

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S SPEECH ON ISIS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Islamic State, or ISIS, has been doing what terrorists have done for millennia: decimating villages, persecuting religious minorities, and massacring the innocent, including the brutal public beheadings of two American journalists.

For the past month, as lawmakers and leaders around the country have called for President Obama to outline a plan to respond to this enemy, the President has been vacationing, golfing, and fundraising for partisan allies.

The President initially admitted that he doesn't have a strategy for dealing with ISIS, a brutal group he once compared to a jayvee team. He then indicated his goal was reducing ISIS to a manageable problem.

This won't do.

Tonight, the President addresses the Nation. I hope he uses the opportunity to make a change. I hope he uses his speech to provide a clear strategy. I hope he provides long overdue leadership on this issue. The American people and the world are waiting.

PASSING OF TOM McCORMICK

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mourn the passing and recognize the life of Tom McCormick: loving husband, father, marine, man of great faith, and dedicated public servant to the city of Dublin, California.

Following graduation from high school, he joined the U.S. Marines and served honorably in the Korean war, where he received a Purple Heart.

Tom loved Dublin deeply, serving 17 years as an elected representative for the Dublin-San Ramon Services District, where he pushed, and was one of the first in the State to push, for water recycling systems. We can also thank Tom for his role in helping to create and establish the Dublin Heritage Park.

Tom also had a big heart. In 1975, he and his wife, Claudia, took in some of the last South Vietnamese refugees.

Tom will be missed.

I send my condolences to his wife, Claudia, of 42 years, who also served as a Dublin City Council member; his sons, Marshall and Thomas; and stepchildren, Melinda, Desiree, and Kathy.

HARVEST HOPE ADDRESSES PRESIDENT'S JOB POLICIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last month's jobs report revealed the worst numbers of the year. Millions of Americans are continuing to drop out of the workforce, destroying opportunity. A clear symbol of the President's failure is that 14 million more people are forced to depend on food stamps than when the President took office.

The State's recent article explains families are hurting as a result of the President's failed job policies.

Harvest Hope Food Bank is serving an unexpected increase of needy families. CEO Denise Holland says: ''Every morning when we open up, the lines are waiting for us all the way to the road. The people who are suffering from hunger have not seen an improvement in their financial condition yet.''

House Republicans have passed over 40 job-creation solutions which are blocked in the Senate. The President should change course so we can, together, work for job opportunities.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President's actions should be based on remembering September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

My sympathy to Mayor Rita Crapps and the families of Batesburg-Leesville.

HONORING JOE SCHNEIDER

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, today I want to tell the story of a constituent of mine whose life has exemplified the American Dream.

Joe Schneider was born in Kernei, Yugoslavia, in 1929. While his father was off fighting in World War II, Joe led his displaced family on a journey throughout Eastern Europe. As refugees, the war years were extremely challenging, and he eventually lost a leg at the age of 15.

His family was given the opportunity to leave Austria and arrived in the U.S. as immigrants in 1951. Without speaking a word of English, he set out to start working as a tailor. He finally lived his dream when he founded Joe's Tailor Shop at 50. For more than 25 years, his small family business created employment and provided for more than 20 families. As a resident of Hanover Park, Illinois, Joe was known for his commitment to his community.

In 1953, Joe met Katharina Schaeffer, who was also an immigrant from Kernei. They had three children and three grandchildren together. The family was blessed to be able to celebrate Joe and Katharina's 60th wedding anniversary in February.

Unfortunately, Joe passed away recently, but his American Dream and love for his country and his family will live on forever. I send my condolences to his family and especially to Herman, his son, who continues that tradition of the American Dream and is leading manufacturing in our district, adding to the strength of this Nation.

RUSSIA

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin lives in an alternate reality, one where the state is still all-powerful and can control reality for its citizens.

In the 1930s, Stalin could make people disappear by sending them to the gulags and then erasing any mention of them in state archives. By controlling all information, he could pretend that black was white and up was down.

Today, in Russia, Putin wants to pretend that the Ukrainian insurgency is homegrown, that Russian soldiers on the other side of the border are lost or just volunteers. He wants to pretend that Kiev is controlled by Nazis. His state-owned media dutifully reports these fictions as fact.

The Soviet Union hasn't existed in more than 20 years. It collapsed out of weakness, and Russia remains weak and wholly dependent on energy exports today. Putin can pretend all he wants, but the reality is that he does not have the power of the secretary general or the czars. Let's not let him turn his dreams into reality by abandoning our friends and NATO allies. We must stand up for their freedom and support them more vigorously.

BOKO HARAM

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I stand today with my colleagues in remembering the more than 200 girls who were abducted from their school on April 14, 2014. It is hard to imagine the fear, pain and the anguish they have suffered at the hands of the monsters who kidnapped them.

As a father, I understand what these girls' families are feeling. I have not forgotten these girls, and I will continue to work with my colleagues for their safe return and for the elimination of the terrorist group Boko Haram.

The world and mainstream media have mostly moved on from the events in Nigeria, but amid all the horrors that regularly compete for the world's attention, this one should not be forgotten. Among these missing girls are future lawyers, doctors, and teachers, women who could some day lead their country.

I call for my colleagues not to forget these girls and come together to combat Boko Haram, al Qaeda, and ISIL.

COLORADO FLOODS

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observation of the 1-year anniversary of the horrific floods that hit the State of Colorado 1 year ago.

Starting on September 11, floods ravaged communities and wiped away homes, schools, and businesses. The widespread damage was unlike anything I have seen in my lifetime in Colorado.

As the flooding was happening and in the immediate aftermath, I joined neighbors and leaders to survey many of the damaged areas. We worked together to make sure that we provided the much-needed relief.

In west Longmont, I saw railroad tracks ripped and tangled. I saw vehicles lying upside down and garages filled with mud. I also saw people working in the spirit of community, striving to recover, helping each other.

I couldn't possibly name all of the heroes involved in the flood response and recovery, but I would like to recognize a few:

St. Vrain and Left Hand Water Conservancy District Director Sean Cronin has provided invaluable resources to water districts and ditch companies to help them provide water to communities for agriculture;

John Zadel and Stan Linker of the Central Weld County Water District worked to get water systems for small communities like Frederick and Firestone back in operation;

Local fire districts like Mountain View, Hygiene, Johnstown, and others were on the front lines of flood response.

In the year since the disaster, we have made tremendous progress, but there is a lot more work to be done. Communities in Weld, Morgan, and Logan continue their work today.

With the great resilience of the people of this State, I have no doubt we will come back stronger than ever and continue working together for the good of our great State.

SECOND DISTRICT MANUFACTURING TOUR

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this August work period, I had the pleasure of meeting with businesses and workers across my district as part of my Second District Manufacturing Tour. I was fortunate to witness firsthand the creation of products made in Illinois and had the privilege of hearing from workers about what Congress could be doing to support America's workforce.

The Second District and our Nation is made better by the presence of manufacturers like Smedberg Machine Corporation. They build the parts used in locks and bridges, products we rely on every day.

The future of our economy is made brighter by members of the Kankakee County Chamber of Commerce, whom I met with to discuss economic development, jump-starting the middle class, and the future of American business.

Speaking of America's future, I must acknowledge our national champion, Jackie Robinson West Little League team from the great State of Illinois. They are a shining example of how far hard work and teamwork can get you and what happens when you have the opportunity to pick up a ball, a pen, a book, or a skill.

As we return to business, I urge my colleagues to follow the example of these Little League and business heroes because hard work, teamwork, and innovation make us all better.

Lastly, I salute the heroes of 9/11.

STRATEGY TO DEFEAT ISIS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this summer America has witnessed the horrific actions of ISIS as it marched into Iraq as part of its mission to create an Islamic state.

As a 29-year Air Force veteran, I know trouble when I see it, and so do the American people. ISIS is a direct threat to America and our democratic way of life. Congress and the American people want, need, and deserve a clearly defined strategy from our President to defeat ISIS—not a strategy to degrade or contain or manage, but a strategy to defeat ISIS.

Tomorrow Americans remember the 13th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. As we remember all those we lost that day, let us also remember the hard lessons those attacks taught us: that we must always be vigilant in protecting the American way of life and all that we hold dear.

□ 1215

THE FCC AND THE NFL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in my western New York community, there is no shortage of pride for our Buffalo Bills. This was apparent yesterday when it was announced Terry and Kim Pegula will be the new team owners. The Pegulas have time and again shown their commitment to western New York through their ownership of the Buffalo Sabres, financing of the new HarborCenter development on Buffalo's Inner Harbor, and now as owners of the Bills, keeping the team in western New York where it belongs.

This is excellent news for the team's future. Still more good news came for football fans yesterday when FCC Chairman Wheeler announced plans to consider repeal of the sports blackout rules at their next meeting.

Commissioner Ajit Pai was recently in Buffalo advocating for the same, and it appears now that momentum is building to return the game to the fans who support their teams and end blackouts once and for all.

The Federal Government certainly should not support such outdated and unfair practices, and I am hopeful that the FCC will end the backing of NFL blackout rules on September 30.

OVERREGULATION

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, over the last few decades, the Federal Government has regulated activities of the American people in increasingly minute detail. It was the Founders' desire to protect our individual liberty by having a government which was energetic in its ability to perform the duties entrusted in it but limited in its scope, a concept incompatible with the current degree of overregulation.

The result is diminished job opportunities and higher costs for the average American. When jobs are lost, when new businesses never open, it is the low-skilled, the young, new worker and those already suffering from chronic unemployment who are harmed the most.

The story of America is the story of someone starting out with nothing and achieving the American Dream. The secret to our success has always been our free and dynamic society that enables everyone to fulfill their unique human potential. It is time for Congress to decide whether it values paperwork or

people. Don't regulate the American Dream out of existence.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, about 5 months ago, we were shocked and disturbed by the news that 200 schoolgirls were kidnapped from their beds in Nigeria by the militant terrorist group Boko Haram. The #bringbackourgirls raised awareness around the world of the plight of these innocent victims.

Boko Haram continues to terrorize families across Nigeria, attacking villages, gunning down civilians, and burning churches. Kidnappings and beheadings have become commonplace. Boko Haram has been responsible for the deaths of more than 900 men, women, and children in the last 3 months. The people of Nigeria are living in a state of fear, and I can't imagine what the kidnapped girls are facing in the months of captivity.

We will not rest until every girl is home and safe.

HONORING LYNNE MOFENSON, M.D.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Lynne Mofenson, M.D., who is retiring after 26 years of service to the Federal Government and is currently the chief of the Maternal and Pediatric Infectious Disease Branch at the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.

Now, I have a full list of Dr. Mofenson's accomplishments and her prestigious and wonderful resume for the RECORD, but just a couple of points:

Dr. Mofenson received the 2012 Federal Employee of the Year Award from the Partnership for Public Service. The award is one of nine Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals bestowed on public servants who make high-impact contributions to the health, safety, and well-being of Americans. She was recognized for playing a pivotal role in preventing the AIDS epidemic among U.S. children through an effective means of preventing pregnant women from passing HIV on to their infants, and for dedicating her career to conducting research on HIV, which has influenced and informed national HIV policy.

Dr. Mofenson has continued to work with her colleagues in this country and around the globe to reduce mother-to-child HIV transmission and to improve the treatments for children with HIV infection. Please join me in honoring the lifelong work of this extraordinary scientist.

BOKO HARAM MUST BE STOPPED

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in June, I joined colleagues on a trip to Nigeria. The focus of the journey was the kidnapping of 270 innocent young girls at the hands of Boko Haram terrorists. It has now been 5 months since they were taken from school and from their families off to unimaginable circumstances.

Since then, Boko Haram has only become more brutal and more vicious, continuing its rampage in Nigerian villages killing, torturing, kidnapping, raping, burning, and announcing the creation of an Islamic state in northeast Nigeria.

Their reign of terror has been overshadowed on the world stage by events elsewhere. Overshadowed but not forgotten, Boko Haram must be stopped, and the girls must be brought home.

RECOGNIZING ARNOLD PALMER ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 85TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a true American treasure and one of my constituents who still spends his summer months in his native Youngstown, Pennsylvania, Arnold Palmer.

Today, Arnold celebrates his 85th birthday, and he continues to serve as an inspiration to me and the millions who make up ''Arnie's Army.''

Arnold rose from humble beginnings and has achieved remarkable things in his life. Taught the game of golf at the age of 3 by his father, Deacon, who was the golf pro at Latrobe Country Club, Arnold made a name for himself in the amateur ranks. His promising collegiate career was cut short when he enlisted in the Coast Guard in honor of a friend who died. After he fulfilled his military service, Arnold returned to Wake Forest and won the U.S. Amateur Championship in 1954.

Arnold's achievements on the golf course are nothing short of legendary: seven-time major champion; 1960 and 1962 PGA Player of the Year; and 92 overall professional victories.

Perhaps Arnold's most enduring legacy, however, lies in his decades of philanthropic work. Over the years, he has raised millions of dollars for the Latrobe-area hospital for charitable care. He helped to build a 30,000-square-foot cancer center and sponsored construction of a nature preserve for all of Westmoreland County to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call Arnold Palmer a son of western Pennsylvania, as well as my friend, and I ask that all Members wish him a very happy birthday.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while the world and mainstream media focuses on other world events, the Boko Haram terrorists continue to bomb, pillage, rape, and behead innocent men, women, and even children in Nigeria. Yesterday, I met with some of the girls who bravely escaped from their captors.

As the girls relived their nightmare, the trauma of this experience was visible on their faces. I reassured them that Congress has not forgotten them and that I will be reintroducing legislation to help safely return their friends and family members and to eradicate Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited Nigeria, a young woman, Abuja, told me that Boko Haram beheaded her husband and put his head on the bed next to her as they raped her.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram is using kidnapped girls as suicide bombers. Boko Haram is beheading men, women, and children—let me repeat—and children. They must be stopped.

Tweet today: #bringbackourgirls and #joinrepwilson.

Tweet, tweet, tweet, tweet. Tweet all day, tweet all night, tweet all week, and tweet all month. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

THE EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT

(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, when the President was trying to sell ObamaCare to the people of Montana, we were promised that if we like our health insurance, we can keep it. But millions of Americans, including 38,000 Montanans, were forced out of their health care plans, and President Obama's promise was named the Lie of the Year by PolitiFact.

The promise he made to Montanans should be honored.

The Employee Health Care Protection Act, H.R. 3522, will protect the health care plans of 50 million Americans who get coverage through their employer and provide relief for workers who could see their out-of-pocket costs increase due to ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3522 and help ensure that no more Montanans see their health care costs rise or are forced out of plans that they like and that they chose.

EXPAND MEDICAID NOW

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are finally increasing access to health coverage for millions of Americans, those who need it the most are left without.

Nearly every day, I hear from constituents in my State of Maine who are suffering because they are caught in a political battle over the expansion of Medicaid. These people are our friends and neighbors, and many of them have chronic conditions, injuries, or mental illnesses that prevent them from working. But because they live in States that have chosen not to expand the program, they have been left without any affordable options.

Instead, people are putting off getting health care until their needs are critical. Hospitals and health centers end up picking up the tab, and our economy continues to be strained.

In Maine, almost 70,000 people are struggling without health care because Medicaid hasn't been expanded. I call on Governors across the country, including my own, to think about these people rather than politics when they make decisions about health care in their States and expand Medicaid now.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD LISTEN TO THE VOTERS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President should listen to the voters and not grant amnesty to illegal immigrants by executive order. A recent survey by the polling company found that three-quarters of voters want the President to work with Congress to change immigration policies, not act on his own.

This overwhelming opposition to unilateral executive action is bipartisan—93 percent of Republicans, 81 percent of Independents, and 56 percent of Democrats want the President to follow the legislative process.

Voters also support immigration policies that put American workers first. Supermajorities from all demographic groups say that Americans who need work should have the opportunity to do the jobs now held by illegal immigrants. They believe that government has a responsibility to protect American workers from competition with illegal workers.

The President should listen to the voters and put the interests of Americans first.

SAFE CLIMATE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to urge this Do-Nothing Congress to acknowledge the dangers and the reality of climate change.

This week we got startling news that once again is falling on deaf ears here in the House of Representatives. The World Meteorological Organization announced that atmospheric carbon levels reached a record high in 2013. And the Audubon Society found that nearly half of all bird species in North America—but, unfortunately, not including the ostrich—are at risk of severe population decline due to climate change. But despite the clear and present danger to the species, the ostrich-like Members of this body have their heads buried in the sand of denial.

We can no longer ignore the science. The time to act is now. I support the President's decision to reduce carbon emissions, and I urge my Republican colleagues to take their heads out of the sand so that together we can address this global threat.

□ 1230

TAYLORVILLE 175TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I have the honor to stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to wish my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois, in my home county of Christian County, a happy 175th anniversary.

I was only 7 years old when my parents moved our family to Taylorville, where my mom and dad were opening their very first restaurant. While my family has called Taylorville home for 37 years, I can say what made Taylorville and Christian County a great place to live when we first moved there still makes it a great place to live now.

My parents wouldn't have been able to achieve the American Dream without the support of friends and neighbors in Taylorville and Christian County, and without a doubt, I would not be standing here today if it weren't for the help and friendship of so many people throughout my years in Taylorville and Christian County.

As Taylorville and Christian County prepare to celebrate their 175th anniversary, it is an honor for me to be able to stand here today and offer my congratulations and best wishes.

GETTING BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, Congress is back in Washington, and it is time to get to work on the priorities of the American people, but I rise today with serious concerns about the Republican agenda, which has failed to tackle important issues that would grow the economy and strengthen the middle class, such as raising the minimum wage, making education more affordable, and guaranteeing women equal pay for equal work.

Instead of ignoring the challenges facing hardworking Americans, we should be investing in their future and, in so doing, in the future of our great country.

We have a plan that will get the middle class back to work called the Middle Class Jumpstart. This legislative action plan will raise the minimum wage, guarantee women equal pay for equal work, make education more affordable, and invest in rebuilding our country and reinvigorating American manufacturing.

In order to move our country forward and build ladders of opportunity, we have to invest in our greatest asset, hardworking middle class families, and we have to take action now.

HONORING BEAVER COUNTY'S VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America.

I join Beaver County residents and all western Pennsylvanians in thanking them for their service to our Nation, as well as their efforts to bring The Wall that Heals, a traveling Vietnam Memorial, to Beaver County for the second time.

The Wall that Heals is a half-scale replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C. It travels across the country and provides greater access to the memorial for those who may not be able to visit it in our Nation's capital.

At more than 600 members strong, the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America is the largest chapter in Pennsylvania and the third largest chapter in the Nation. Thanks to their efforts, The Wall that Heals will be in Quay Square in Darlington from September 24 through September 28.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the service of all Vietnam veterans and thanking the members of the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America, Chapter 862, for their hard work in once again bringing The Wall that Heals to Beaver County.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we must pass a long-term reauthorization for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The Ex-Im Bank provides small and large U.S. businesses more job-creating opportunities to sell their products

internationally. By providing loans and financing, the Ex-Im Bank has helped U.S. businesses compete in international markets that has generated over $266 billion in export value.

Since 2007, businesses in California's 16th District in the San Joaquin Valley, which I represent, has helped finance tens of millions of dollars of loans' worth of exports that have created jobs in the Valley. The Export-Import Bank supports American jobs and helps level a playing field in the face of fierce competition that we experience from countries in Asia and around the world.

Rather than kick this can down the road, we must pass a long-term reauthorization for the Export-Import Bank. This issue has never been a partisan issue and nor should it be so today. We ought to be doing our jobs and working together.

TAX EXTENDERS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, for the last month, I have traveled up and down the 25th District of Texas talking with my constituents about their biggest concerns.

They are fed up with Washington's out-of-touch economic policies that are hurting their families and their businesses. Business owners and individuals need certainty when it comes to their money and their taxes. That is why we need to quickly pass a tax extenders bill so business owners can stop playing defense and focus on what they do best, creating jobs.

Since Texas doesn't have a State income tax, Texans need to know if they can continue deducting their sales tax from their Federal income taxes. Business owners need to know if they can continue taking risks and innovating with the R&D credit. Companies need to know that they are not the target of tax bias by extending the bonus depreciation credit permanently.

Ensuring these incentives is just the first step for true comprehensive tax reform, but these are good, sound policies that my constituents want and that our economy needs. Let's give America the certainty they deserve and pass the tax extenders.

And remember the 9/11 victims. In God we trust.

LET'S ADDRESS THE ONGOING CRISIS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support my colleague and good friend, FREDERICA WILSON, in her effort that she has undertaken to #bringbackourgirls, addressing the horror of Boko Haram having extracted these girls from their lives, but we also, in addition to that responsibility, have an exacting responsibility with reference to ongoing circumstances that the President will address tonight.

On August 14, nearly a month ago, I wrote to the President asking him to be mindful of a letter that I include in my remarks to Speaker BOEHNER. What I wrote to Speaker BOEHNER was:

> I respectfully call upon you to bring Congress back into session, so that we can meet our constitutional responsibility to address the ongoing crisis in Iraq. As you know, the situation there is becoming increasingly more complex and continues to defy easy resolution.
>
> There is no doubt that the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, ISIS, will continue to terrorize the people of Iraq, leading to an increase in tens of thousands of Iraqi Christian, Yazidi, and other refugees who have been driven from their homes.

We must ask Congress: exercise our constitutional responsibility.

SUICIDE PREVENTION DAY

(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, I rise today to recognize Suicide Prevention Day, which is recognized on September 10. Suicide is a tragedy that touches more of us than most might realize. It is also a great challenge for our military.

In addition to an alarming suicide rate, half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting, according to recent Army studies, and a large percentage had never been deployed in a combat role.

Today, as we draw attention to the issues and prevention strategies that might save just one life or more, I am proud to say the House in May passed bipartisan legislation that would improve the military's approach to suicide detection and prevention.

While currently the Department of Defense does a thorough physical assessment for military recruits, no similar mental health evaluation is performed.

H.R. 4305, the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act, will bring mental health to parity with physical health through the enforcement of a mental health assessment for incoming military recruits.

On Suicide Prevention Day, I am calling on the Senate to pass this important legislation. Our servicemembers deserve as much.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT IN DEFENDING OUR NATION

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today in Emancipation Hall, the United States Congress and the United States Government honored the fallen heroes of 9/11 with a Congressional Gold Medal ceremony—three gold medals: one to the individuals who died in Shanksville, Pennsylvania; one to the folks who died at the Pentagon; and another to those who died at the World Trade Center. Their names are all in this memorial book, nearly 3,000 innocent victims of radical Islam.

Radical Islam and al Qaeda continues to stay in ISIS. The President will address the Nation tonight about the dangers ISIS presents to the world, to democracy, and to the United States.

I plan to support the President in his request for us to join him militarily, economically, and in other measures to see that ISIS does not hit our homeland, attack democracy, and create a caliphate that will be dangerous to freedom-loving people all over the world.

I attended the National 9/11 Memorial Museum 2 weeks ago. It is stirring. It made me think of the heroes, the firemen, the policemen, the first responders, and the people on that airplane, but it also made me think of the hate of al Qaeda and ISIS.

We must respond. We are America. God bless America.

WE MUST BE EVER VIGILANT IN DEFENDING OUR NATION

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, recent insecurity throughout the world is a reminder that we must be ever vigilant in defending our Nation against those who wish to attack us and destroy our American values.

Tomorrow is the 13th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, and once again, we pause to remember the innocent lives lost at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the heroes on Flight 93 in Pennsylvania.

We also pay tribute to the brave men and women who answered the call of duty and have courageously joined the Armed Forces to serve our Nation and fight the global war on terror.

September 11, 2001, changed our great Nation. It awakened us to the ever-present threat by those who wish to attack our country and our citizens, but it also stiffened our resolve and unified our Nation. Immediately after the horrific attacks, we came together as a nation, American spirit running high, and we emerged determined and stronger than ever before.

As we combat today's threats, our American spirit is enduring, and our leadership in the world is the strongest tool we have against terror.

God bless America.

DON'T DENY LGBT VETERANS FEDERAL VA BENEFITS THEY HAVE EARNED

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Republican members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, with one notable exception, voted to deny LGBT veterans the Federal VA benefits they have earned if they happen to live in a State that does not recognize marriage equality.

The Defense Department provides for LGBT soldiers and their families, regardless of where they live, but not the VA. While they are wearing a uniform, they and their families are covered, but once they take it off and become a veteran, too bad. If they live in Florida or Texas or Nevada, too bad.

It doesn't matter that they fought to defend this country, not a particular State. It doesn't matter that the VA and the VSOs support giving them benefits. It doesn't matter how brave they were, how much they sacrificed, or how long and honorably they served, too bad. They get nothing, according to the Republicans.

This is unfair and unjust, and they should be ashamed for lacking the courage to do the right thing by our Nation's heroes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 10, 2014 at 9:22 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1934.
That the Senate passed S. 898.
That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 539.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3522, EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 717 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 717

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-56, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 717 provides for consideration of H.R. 3522, the Employer Health Care Protection Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, equally divided between the majority and minority. One clarifying amendment has been included to clarify that group health plans for the upcoming year can be covered under 2013 plans. The minority is afforded the customary opportunity to offer one motion to recommit, should they so choose. This is a fair rule to allow us to give some relief to Americans who want to keep their health insurance plan but are being told that, because of the Affordable Care Act, they may not.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the President has quickly forgotten some of the promises he made to the American people about this law. In a June 2009 speech before the American Medical Association, President Obama, addressing the house of delegates, said:

> We will keep this promise to the American people. If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what.

In March of 2010, the President said:

> Your employer, it's estimated, will see premiums fall by as much as 3,000 percent, which means they could give you a raise.

It is obvious that both statements were not only nonoperational, they were completely false. Individuals and businesses have experienced or will face in the future the loss of current health insurance if it does not comply with Affordable Care Act coverage requirements. The Affordable Care Act is, quite simply, a job killer. Employers are reducing hours and limiting pay increases just to keep up with the demands of the law.

Just a few weeks ago, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported that over half of employers are changing insurance in response to the Affordable Care Act. These changes aren't being done for the benefit of the employees. All across the country, employees have lost doctors, seen premiums rise, seen hours cut, or had their coverage dropped. This will continue as long as the Affordable Care Act continues with the benefit mandates, burdensome taxes, and unreasonable regulation. In fact, employees are paying more in out-of-pocket costs than ever before. Premiums have skyrocketed under the Affordable Care Act, but access to doctors has narrowed.

Today, H.R. 3522 offers a solution to this problem. This bill would allow employer-sponsored plans that were available at any point in 2013 to continue to be offered. This bill would also help protect both employers offering these plans and their employees enrolled in them from the Affordable Care Act's costly taxes and penalties.

The President recognizes that there are serious flaws in his signature health care law, a law that he championed and, in fact, was written at the White House. Since the law was passed, the President has signed seven bills into law that repealed parts of the Affordable Care Act, bills that passed both the House and the Senate, went to the President for his signature, and he signed them.

In addition to these statutory changes, there have been attempts to fix this broken law through a series of unilateral executive orders and regulations. Can we really expect the same administration that wrote this disastrous law to now fix it?

Last year, the President unilaterally decided to delay the employer mandate. Even the administration doesn't believe that businesses and their employees can handle the burdens imposed by the Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 3522 is offering the American people a legal solution to get out from under the crushing demands of the health care law. The law would grandfather in employer plans that existed before the law went into effect. With the passage of this bill before us today, no employee would have to lose their coverage or have their out-of-pocket costs soar because of the Affordable Care Act.

It is clear that H.R. 3522 offers the only feasible lifeline to millions of employees who want to keep their health care plan. It is Congress' job to protect the American people. I urge men and women on both sides of the dais to pass this law so that Americans will have the opportunity to keep their plans and their doctors and reduce their out-of-pocket costs.

To be clear, this bill before us today, if signed into law, will not fix the Affordable Care Act. No piece of legislation, short of a full-fledged repeal, could ever achieve that. The bill we are voting on today serves to stop the hemorrhaging that is occurring as a consequence of this ill-conceived government takeover of the American health care industry. As a physician, I know that sometimes it is important to just stop the hemorrhage if you are going to save the patient. That is what the House of Representatives will do today. I hope all colleagues from both sides of the dais will support this.

I encourage everyone to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill and stand with millions of Americans who are losing their employer health care coverage and access to their doctors, despite what has been promised to them repeatedly by this disastrous law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am hearing quotes given about what people promised when and what is happening now, and yet under this very rule that we are considering, I fail to see how it is consistent with promises that our current Speaker has made.

On January 5, 2011, our current Speaker, promised:

> You will always have the right to a robust debate and open process that allows you to represent your constituents, to make your case, offer alternatives, and to be heard. Furthermore, to my friends in the minority, I offer a commitment: openness.

And yet how ironic is it that this very rule is the 75th closed rule of the 113th Congress?

Now, what does a closed rule mean? A closed rule means that even if Democrats or Republicans have great ideas about how to improve or amend a bill, they are not even allowed to be discussed or voted upon on the floor of the House.

A closed rule means the only say that I or my friends get as Members of Congress is to say ''yes'' or ''no.'' We don't get to improve upon the idea. We don't get to make it work better for our country. We don't get to offer changes that will reduce costs to taxpayers or improve the efficiency of the bill.

We had a commitment from this current Speaker to have an open process, and yet here we have before us the 75th closed rule. This is the diamond jubilee of closed rules that we are celebrating here on the floor of the House today with this 75th closed rule that doesn't allow my Democratic or Republican colleagues to bring forth simple, commonsense ideas to improve the bill before us and make it work for our country.

In addition to the diamond jubilee of closed rules, we also have the 53rd attempted repeal of ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act. Now, we get that. Our friends on the other side want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We have heard that. This is the 53rd time we have heard that.

Whenever our colleagues on the other side are serious about rolling up their sleeves and working in a bipartisan way to improve the Affordable Care Act, to make it work better for our country, to increase competition, to reduce costs, we are happy to have that discussion.

I myself am the sponsor of several bills to change the Affordable Care Act, as are many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but instead of having that discussion, we are having the 53rd vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act under the 75th closed rule of the current Congress. I think the American people are learning no longer to be surprised by these kinds of maneuvers. We wonder why the approval of rating Congress is at a record low of 12 percent.

There was a commitment from our Speaker to allow us to represent our constituents, to allow us to make our case, to allow us to offer alternatives. We are going to do that under the previous question. We are going to do that under the motion to recommit. But in terms of actually being able to amend this bill, the process has been closed, not only from my fellow Democrats, but from the many fine Republicans who have ideas to make this bill better and make health care more affordable.

This Congress deserves better, and I know that we can do better.

I know that under this rule, my colleague, Mr. BURGESS, managed to have his amendment included. They use a self-executed amendment in the rule. That means that by passing this rule there is a special amendment that actually becomes part of the bill. We don't even have the opportunity to debate the merits of that amendment, whatever they are, but any other ideas from Democrats or Republicans are closed down for the 75th time. They are not even able to bring them forward.

My colleagues have a lot of ideas for improving the Affordable Care Act. I am the sponsor of a number of bills. Rather than bringing forth the 53rd repeal of the Affordable Care Act, let's move forward. The country is ready to go. Let's make sure that Americans that have used the health care marketplace to enroll in affordable, high-quality health care are able to continue doing so. Let's make sure we improve the Affordable Care Act rather than end it.

Instead of rolling back protections that benefit millions of Americans, let's get back to work on the issues that matter, like reducing costs in health care, like fixing our broken immigration, like raising the minimum wage and making sure that we can get our economy going with an infrastructure investment.

For instance, on immigration reform alone, this body's failure to act continues to cost taxpayers money every day. There is a bill that passed the Senate with more than a two-thirds majority. That is not easy to do over there. If that bill were simply allowed to come to a vote in the open process that the Speaker promised and allow us to vote for our constituents, I think it would pass.

We have a bipartisan bill in the House called H.R. 15. It is a version of the Senate bill. We can bring that bill forward under a rule. Let's do it. It will pass tomorrow and address our broken immigration system and save taxpayers over $200 billion over 10 years, create hundreds of thousands of jobs for Americans, secure our borders, and make sure that the rule of law in our country is restored. The longer we put that off, the worse that issue becomes and the harder it will be to address.

Again, while this bill is an anniversary of sorts—the diamond jubilee of closed bills and the 53rd attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act—it doesn't offer anything new to the American people, and it doesn't allow Democrats or Republicans who have thoughtful ideas for improving the Affordable Care Act to bring them forward at all to be discussed on their merits or voted on here in this body.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Again, Mr. POLIS, I think, very powerfully stated how this majority once again is denying a free and open amendment process, or even a limited amendment process, with this totalitarian version of debate.

I also want to speak in opposition to the underlying bill. We heard a lot about skyrocketing premiums. I come from a State where a Governor actually embraced the Affordable Care Act. What we saw just a few days ago, with the new premiums that are released for 2015, was reported on by Kaiser Family Foundation, which is the gold standard for health care reporting in this country, is that the State of Connecticut is actually going to see a 4 percent reduction in the plans sold through the Affordable Care Act exchange. My friend from Colorado is one of the real lucky States. They are looking at a 15 percent reduction in terms of their silver plans that are sold through the exchange.

Again, this chart which we have prepared for today shows that, rather than skyrocketing premiums, what we are seeing in State after State after State in terms of premiums for next year is that there are either reductions or very modest increases.

The bill that we are going to be voting on later today would actually damage the progress that is being made in a lot of these States because it basically expands plans that protect discriminating against people with preexisting conditions, which was, sadly,

what the insurance market looked like before the Affordable Care Act was passed. It, again, allows cherry-picking plans that picked healthier populations as opposed to what we are seeing with the plans that have been implemented and now are high-functioning.

□ 1300

256,000 people enrolled through the exchange in the State of Connecticut last year, far shattering all the projections that HHS had set forth, because we had a high-functioning Web site—kudos to Governor Malloy—but also because people voted with their feet; that when they actually got the facts and had a chance to look at the coverage that was being offered and the price that it was going to cost, they, again, shattered all the projections. And we are poised to move forward again next year.

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

Mr. POLIS. I am happy to yield an additional 45 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. In the small group market, what we are seeing is that since the enrollment ended for the individual market, the shop exchange, as the small market is called, tripled in terms of small businesses in the State of Connecticut that enrolled, with protections so that people with preexisting conditions, who are born with diabetes, or arthritis, are not going to be shut out of the market, which these old plans that the Cassidy bill seeks to enshrine and enlarge did under the provisions of that legislation.

We, as Mr. POLIS said, need to roll up our sleeves and talk about ways that we can improve the law. This is a huge, terrible step backwards, which, for all these States which are seeing rate reductions for 2015, would be lost.

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

Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting recitation.

I wanted to draw my colleagues' attention to Bloomberg View and an article by Megan McArdle from September 9 of 2014, just a couple of paragraphs in the article that prices—talking about reissue rates—that prices are not being based on claims data. She points out, and I am quoting here: ''Companies began setting these rates just a few months ago after open enrollment closed, and because so many people bought in the last few weeks, they had no meaningful idea of what their expenses would be, that is, the insurance companies.''

And, further quoting: ''The companies that are coming in are looking to gain market share, not make a profit.''

Continuing to quote: ''The other reason we cannot learn much from these data right now is that for the next year, insurers are operating under the expectation of large subsidies from the Obama administration via the various reinsurance provisions in ObamaCare. These provisions expire in 2016.''

Continuing to quote: ''Right now, it is just not very risky to write a policy that loses money because your losses are capped. Starting in 2017, all that changes. Insurers are going to need to price policies with the expectation of making money and the fear of losing it.''

Mr. Speaker, what Megan McArdle is saying is, right now you don't really know much about the renewal rates on insurance policies because there is distortion in the market because of the reinsurance provisions in the Affordable Care Act.

But I will share this with you. I bought insurance in the Texas Federal fallback exchange. I bought a bronze plan on Blue Cross/Blue Shield. It is the most expensive insurance I have ever had in my life. Trying to plan and trying to budget for next year, I can't because here we sit, September 10, and I do not know what the renewal rates are going to be. And in all likelihood I will not know until around election day, with very little time to plan.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up two pieces of legislation. The first is the Stop Corporate Inversions Act of 2014, and the second is a constitutional amendment to address the issues surrounding Citizens United.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

I rise to urge the defeat of the motion on ordering the previous question on this rule.

Most Americans would be outraged to see the 113th Congress, on track to be the most unproductive Congress in this Nation's history, return from a 5-week recess, only to waste more time. Yet, that is what is happening today with the GOP's 53rd attack on the Affordable Care Act.

We could be doing so much more. We could stand up against special interests and advance the American people's priorities.

We could raise the minimum wage to prevent big corporations from paying workers starvation wages.

We could stand up to the gun lobby and pass background checks to stop criminals from buying guns online.

We could stand up to companies that use fancy corporate inversions to skirt their responsibility to pay taxes towards American infrastructure, American schools, and American research.

Yet, these priorities will just as surely go ignored this 113th Congress as they did in the 112th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that we are not dealing with the people's business today. Since the 2010 Supreme Court decision in Citizens United, Congress has become mired in dysfunction. The people's House is now paralyzed by the threat of attacks from corporations and a handful of billionaires with their Super PACs and their secret front groups.

When Members spend more time fundraising and dodging Super PAC attack ads than working on bipartisan solutions and championing their constituents' priorities, our democracy is dysfunctional. And that dysfunction is a form of corruption. It is money from the left and the right, and it is only getting worse.

This year, the Supreme Court ruled 5–4 in McCutcheon that the wealthy have a right to hold more influence over elected officials than actual voters. This idea threatens our entire system of elected self-government, and we have an opportunity to take action today.

I urge my colleagues to do the courageous thing, to do the right thing. Join me to support the Democracy for All Amendment, H.J. Res. 119, to amend our Constitution and overturn these destructive Supreme Court rulings.

In the Senate this week, our colleagues are considering Senator UDALL's companion to my constitutional amendment. And while the Senate has this important debate about money and politics, this House is rehashing tired old attacks on ObamaCare that everyone is sick of.

The Democracy for All Amendment is simple. It says that the American people have a right to pass laws protecting the integrity of our elections by limiting money and politics.

It is time to get money out and voters in and end this ''pay-to-play'' democracy. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion ordering the previous question, to allow consideration of the Democracy for All Amendment to overturn Citizens United, and allow the American people, and not the special interests, to once again set the agenda in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, our Bill of Rights guarantees free speech, but free speech is not free if only the wealthy can afford it.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) certainly convinced me. I hope he convinced you as well that, rather than repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time, let's take this body back from the special interests and return it to the people of this country. And his motion will do that if we defeat the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, to discuss the other proposal if we defeat the previous question, I am proud to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge we defeat the previous question for two reasons, and I want to speak to one of them.

Right now, corporations can move their tax address overseas and avoid or

lower their U.S. taxes. Middle class and other typical families cannot do that at all. They can't simply change their address and lower or eliminate their taxes.

Since the beginning of this year, more than a dozen large corporations have announced their plans for inversion. And yet, they will continue to benefit from being headquartered in our country, taking advantage of everything this country has to offer, whether it is our wealth of educated workers, government funding of basic research, tax credits like R&D, or our robust financial markets.

They will pay less in U.S. taxes, so much that the American tax base is expected to lose $20 billion over the next 10 years if we do nothing to address the issue.

And who will make up this difference? Basically, middle class taxpayers.

The Republican answer? To do nothing, leave town next week, or, some say, to wait for tax reform at some undetermined time.

Republicans are taking the President to court for use of executive authority, his executive authority. At the same time, Republicans in this House fail to use their own authority, failing to do their job.

Addressing this issue cannot wait. This is an immediate problem that requires an immediate legislative solution. Voting ''no'' on the previous question provides all of us an opportunity to do just that and will allow us to bring up legislation to address this problem.

If you vote to move the previous question, essentially you are saying, I rubberstamp this inversion process where corporations essentially move their address and lower or eliminate their taxes. No one should be doing that.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote ''no'' on the previous question as well so we can allow consideration of the Democracy for All constitutional amendment, which would allow us to put some reasonable limits on this outside spending, these huge expenditures of funds by Super PACs and outside groups that are crowding out the voices of everyday citizens.

When I go around my district, when I talk to people, the average person feels like their voice can't be heard. When they go into the political town square to try to make their views known, there is a megaphone being held by these Super PACs and these outside groups that is drowning out the voice of everyday citizens, so that their opinions, their perspective can't be heard.

If you go to a town meeting, usually, the way they organize it is you sign up and everybody gets a chance to talk for 5 minutes. The way the system is headed with these Super PACs, because there are no limits on the amount of speech they can buy, if you go down to the town hall meeting now, in a sense, you get there and you find out that some Super PAC has reserved 59 minutes out of the hour of time for talking on the issues, and everyday citizens only have 1 minute left.

That is why we need some reasonable limits, because the big money is taking over the microphone, and they are not letting anybody else have their opinions heard.

A constitutional amendment, the Democracy for All constitutional amendment—I want to salute my colleague, TED DEUTCH of Florida for leading the effort on this—would put reasonable limits in place so that everybody can have a voice, so that everybody can participate in a pluralistic democratic society where all voices are heard.

I urge that we vote ''no'' on ordering the previous question to allow consideration of this important constitutional amendment to give a voice back to everyday citizens out there in our country.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question and to urge support of the Democracy for All Amendment that we intend to offer if the question is defeated.

The last thing Congress needs is more special interest candidates who don't answer to the American people. The Supreme Court decisions in Citizens United and McCutcheon have opened the floodgates of unlimited spending on campaigns.

Protections against special-interest influence on our elections have steadily eroded, along with public confidence in government. The result is campaigns dominated not by ideas, thoughtful debates, or visions for the future, but by television ads, mostly negative and mostly funded by unaccountable outside groups.

In my State of Kentucky, MITCH MCCONNELL and his special interest allies have spent more than $8 million, running nearly 26,000 TV ads in our Commonwealth. The vast majority are from outside groups attacking Mr. MCCONNELL's opponents. Many bend the truth and intentionally mislead Kentuckians, which is a lot easier to get away with if the attacker isn't accountable to voters.

Under our current political system, these groups are allowed massive influence over our campaigns, much more than any average citizen or group of citizens could ever exert.

It is system riddled with loopholes, lacking meaningful disclosure, and more awash in corporate influence than ever.

□ 1315

In Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL's race is expected to cost $100 million. That would pay the annual salaries of about 2,000 public schoolteachers in our Commonwealth. While Senator MCCONNELL and other supporters of the Citizens United decision call this ''freedom of speech,'' it is actually the freedom to deceive. To be fair, dishonest ads are coming from both sides by both parties. These are ads made possible by Citizens United, and if The Washington Post Fact Checker actually had to present real Pinocchios for all of the dishonest ads made possible by Citizens United, Geppetto would be the busiest man in America.

That is why we need to pass the Democracy for All amendment—to put a stop to this runaway special interest spending on campaigns and to return Congress to the people it was meant to serve.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of defeating the motion on ordering the previous question.

The GOP has put forward H.R. 3522, which would undermine the Affordable Care Act by putting insurance companies back in charge of health care for everyday Americans. That is right. I mean, it is not a surprise, putting corporate special interests ahead of the interests of the American people. Instead, they are now taking the 53rd vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

We could be enacting a commonsense constitutional amendment, as my colleagues have said, that would better serve the people's interests. The Democracy for All constitutional amendment seeks to address the failure of our current political system, where the megaphones of moneyed interests are now drowning out the voices of ordinary Americans.

Since the Supreme Court's decision in 2010 of Citizens United, which struck down the limits on independent campaign spending by corporations, we have actually seen those with deep pockets threaten our democracy, spending unlimited, hidden amounts on our elections, and it gets worse with each passing election.

Two years ago, outside groups, including more than 1,200 so-called Super PACs, spent $970 million on our elections. That is nearly $1 billion in secret, dark money. It is not fair, and the American people know it. $123 million of anonymous cash was also spent. Overall, spending totaled nearly $7 billion.

Earlier this year, another Supreme Court decision struck down decades-old caps on the total amount that any one individual can contribute to Federal

candidates in a 2-year cycle. Now those individuals—and there are only a handful of them across the United States—can contribute unlimited amounts from their own pockets into elections. The result has only increased the role that money plays in American politics.

Recent reports show that undisclosed political spending, better known as ''dark money,'' will, once again, reach record levels in this November's election.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Recently, the Center for Responsive Politics announced that dark money has already exceeded $50 million—seven times the amount that was accrued at this time in the last midterm election.

Justice Breyer wrote in this last Supreme Court decision: ''Where enough money calls the tune, the general public will not be heard.''

We are not being heard, and that is exactly the position that we find ourselves in today because, as the Republican House votes to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time since its enactment, they have given us a choice. The Republicans want us to choose corporate insurance special interests, or we can choose the interests of the American people by passing a constitutional amendment that would restore democracy, government, and our elections back to the people of the United States.

It is time that we pass this constitutional amendment, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and to let us begin to address the interests of the American people.

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

I just want to address the issue of the insurance companies.

They have never enjoyed the type of unprecedented power that they have today until the passage of the Affordable Care Act. The insurance companies—executives from the insurance companies—meet regularly down at the White House with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We are not privy to those discussions. We have no earthly idea what goes on in those meetings, but we do know that insurance companies are enjoying unprecedented profits right now since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Their profits have increased. Their stock prices have increased.

Why is that? It is because of the individual mandate that was included in the Affordable Care Act.

No longer do insurance companies need to be interested in the longitudinal relationships with their insureds. You have got to buy what they are selling. Don't even get me started on their own narrow networks, which can restrict patients' abilities to see a doctor or to go to a hospital, to see who they want, to buy the medications that they need or to be reimbursed for the medications that they need. A lot of that has gone out the window. Talk about people with preexisting conditions. Most of us buy on price. Since we buy the lowest-cost price on the Bronze plan, we find ourselves now confined by narrow networks.

Who is really now prejudiced against a person with a preexisting condition under the current arrangement?

This bill today does not undo the Affordable Care Act, but it provides one more little measure of sanity for patients who wanted to keep their insurance policies before this regime took over.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendously important topic because this Congress, unfortunately, and our government are affected so much by political contributions. Because of Baker v. Carr, ''one man, one vote'' exists, but that one vote is not equal to the voice of corporations or individuals with unlimited amounts of money. The fact is those people, those corporations, have gotten more of a voice than any one person's vote.

Most Members of Congress spend a great deal of time raising money when they should be studying issues, listening to debate, participating in debate, listening to constituents. The amount of money that is in this system and determines who comes into this body is beyond anything the Framers of the Constitution ever imagined. The amendment that we offer would allow the Congress to put limits on the amount of money that can come into the system. It promotes the idea of everybody being equal, of ''one man, one vote'' and our representing people equally. It simply gives Congress the power to set limits.

I don't know why anybody in this Congress would object to giving Congress the power to set limits on corporate spending involving campaigns, which takes away the fundamental aspect of democracy that each person is considered to have a voice and one's perspectives presented on this floor in equal opportunity with those who are the most wealthy. There is nothing that affects this House in a more adverse way than money. This amendment can help this House be more representative of the great democracy that we represent and intend to represent and make it the democracy that it is supposed to be. It simply gives Congress that power.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. I would urge this amendment to be considered and to be voted on in order to uphold the idea that each individual and his position is sacred and equal, that money is taken out of the system in the best possible ways, and that corporations don't continue to have the extraordinary influence they have had on this body.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3522.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

While the title of this legislation and those supporting it claim that it will protect employees, in fact, it will prevent millions of Americans from accessing the consumer protections and important reforms included in the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

H.R. 3522 would permit any health insurance issuer offering coverage in the group market in 2013 to continue to offer that coverage through 2018. These insurance policies would not have to comply with the consumer protections that went into effect in 2014.

This bill is different—and much worse—than the Administration's grandfathering policy. It means that insurance companies would be able to cherry pick, offering low rates for inadequate bare-bones policies for some groups but discriminate against, charge higher prices, or offer weaker coverage for others.

The bill would put insurance companies back in the driver's seat. If this became law, insurers will be able to continue to discriminate against small businesses if they have an older workforce, more women in their workforce, or if any of their employees or their children has pre-existing health conditions. And small businesses will face higher premiums and continue to see their premiums spike year to year if an employee has an accident, develops a chronic health condition, or has a complicated pregnancy.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, businesses have added nearly 10 million jobs and in just the past few months, more than 10 million people who were previously uninsured have gained health insurance coverage. Premiums have risen at historically low levels, and the life of the Medicare trust fund has been extended by 13 years.

We have come far in the effort to stop the worst abuses of the insurance industry and provide Americans with true coverage that protects them from bankruptcy, annual and life-time limits, discrimination, and from being dropped from their plans when they need them the most. Rolling back critical reforms and returning to a broken system is not the answer. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and work together to improve the law for all Americans.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers. We are prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. No, I have no additional speakers. I am prepared to close.

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

Instead of focusing on rolling back protections for the benefits of millions of Americans for the 53rd time, this House should get back to the work of focusing on real problems, like the need to overhaul our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works for our country. Instead of solving immigration problems that are facing our Nation, the House continues to vote on bills that take our country backwards.

Before we left for recess 5 weeks ago, the House voted to deny DREAMers the ability to stay here, and they subjected them to deportation proceedings. This body's continued failure to act on comprehensive immigration reform means that the President must act instead. For more than a year, I have come to the House floor to decry the fact that the House Republicans have failed to move any immigration reform bills to the floor this entire Congress—or any bills to secure our border, any bills to provide provisional work permits, any bills to require workplace authentication. Not a single one has been brought to the floor of the House.

I am deeply disappointed that the President has put off taking action on this bill until after the November elections, but the President will have no alternative if this Congress continues to fail to act. Sadly, over the next 2 months, the current administration will continue to deport tens of thousands of hardworking mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers because of the lack of courage of this body to act and because the President continues to refuse to act with the authority that is already granted to him by the nature of his office.

I am hopeful that the President's failure to act right now means he will go big and bold tomorrow, but the truth is the President can't do it all alone. He needs Congress. If we are serious about securing the border, it will take an appropriation—it will take resources—from this body to secure the border. I am confident the President will do whatever he can with the money and resources he has to do it, but if this body is serious, we need to require the President to secure the border and make sure the President has the resources to do that. I am hopeful the President will use his powers to reform our antiquated visa program, which restricts an employer's ability to hire key talent and only provides an additional incentive for companies to move overseas so that they can hire the people they need.

These are issues that the President can and should address now, not just when it is politically convenient. Unite families, make America more competitive, and challenge Congress to get immigration reform done.

Of course, any relief the President provides would be just a temporary fix. Only this body can find a permanent solution by rewriting our immigration laws to restore the rule of law with regard to the 11 million people who are here illegally, to reform our visa and green card systems going forward, to secure our borders, to ensure workplace enforcement, and to make sure that we can facilitate legal commerce between Mexico and the United States.

But once again, rather than addressing the issue that came up the most of any issue in my 10 town halls—immigration reform—we are faced with the 53rd repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the 75th closed rule—the diamond jubilee of closed rules—that doesn't allow Democrats or Republicans to offer a single amendment to this bill. Amendments that are germane, that improve the Affordable Care Act, that have bipartisan consensus support are not even allowed to be brought forward and are not even discussed for 10 minutes on the floor of this House of Representatives.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. Vote ''no'' on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In 2006, the Democrat manifesto, ''A New Direction for America,'' states:

> Bills should come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.

The fact remains that, when the Democrats took control of the House, they did precisely the opposite.

Throughout the 111th Congress, which was the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI'S time as Speaker and which was the first 2 years of the Obama administration, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule. That is the definition of a closed process. Under Republican control, the House has returned to the consideration of appropriations bills under an open process with 22 open rules.

□ 1330

This year, the House has considered 404 amendments, 189 of which were offered by the Democrats. When you compare the record of the Republican majority and the most recent Democratic majority, any fair analysis will show that the Republicans are running a more open, transparent House of Representatives.

One word on the previous question: defeat of the previous question would not allow any of these proposals that we have heard about today to be considered because they would not be germane to the rule, so I do urge my colleagues to support the previous question.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of a critical bill to protect millions of Americans who are facing the loss of their employer-sponsored health insurance and that they were promised—a promise is a promise—they were promised they could keep.

I certainly thank my colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, for his thoughtful piece of legislation and his work in this effort.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 717 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the joint resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution.

SEC. 3. Immediately upon disposition of H. J. Res. 119, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4679) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports

that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 119 or H.R. 4679.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 276) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 276

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR.

Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12423, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice and in accordance with the procedures of the Commission under that section, reinstate the license and extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of project works to the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

S. 276 requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reinstate the license and extend for 3 years the deadline for commencement of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir. Hydropower is a critical component of our all-of-the-above energy strategy, and this bill will help facilitate the construction of an affordable and reliable source of domestic electricity.

As many people around the country understand, many Members of the House and Senate have very strong differing views with the President and his administration over the direction that we are going on energy in America, particularly the impact that regulations are having on the electric generation system in America.

It looks like it is going to be creating a lot of chaos, but when we have projects like this hydro project at American Falls Reservoir, I think there is unanimous agreement that we need to move forward expeditiously on these types of projects.

This bill has passed the U.S. Senate, and I would urge all Members of the House to support it.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I support the American Falls Reservoir hydropower legislation, introduced by Senators RISCH and CRAPO of Idaho. The bill would authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reinstate the license for a hydroelectric project involving Idaho's American Falls Reservoir, and it gives the project 3 additional years by which to begin construction.

This bill allows FERC to get this project licensed expeditiously while ensuring that the appropriate environmental analyses are completed and considered.

The noncontroversial legislation before us today has passed the Senate by unanimous consent in two consecutive Congresses.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I also urge passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 276.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EPS SERVICE PARTS ACT OF 2014

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5057) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5057

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''EPS Service Parts Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXEMPT SUPPLIES.

Section 325(u) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(u)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) EXEMPT SUPPLIES.—

''(A) FEBRUARY 10, 2014, RULE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An external power supply shall not be subject to the final rule entitled 'Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for External Power Supplies', published at 79 Fed. Reg. 7845 (February 10, 2014), if the external power supply—

''(I) is manufactured during the period beginning on February 10, 2016, and ending on February 10, 2020;

''(II) is marked in accordance with the External Power Supply International Efficiency Marking Protocol, as in effect on February 10, 2016;

''(III) meets, where applicable, the standards under paragraph (3)(A), and has been certified to the Secretary as meeting International Efficiency Level IV or higher of the External Power Supply International Efficiency Marking Protocol, as in effect on February 10, 2016; and

''(IV) is made available by the manufacturer as a service part or a spare part for an end-use product that—

''(aa) constitutes the primary load; and

''(bb) was manufactured before February 10, 2016.

''(ii) REPORTING.—The Secretary may require manufacturers of products exempted pursuant to clause (i) to report annual total units shipped as service and spare parts that fall below International Efficiency Level VI.

''(iii) LIMITATION OF EXEMPTION.—The Secretary may issue a rule, after providing public notice and opportunity for public comment, to limit the applicability of the exemption established under clause (i) if the Secretary determines that the exemption is resulting in a significant reduction of the energy savings that would otherwise result from the final rule described in such clause.

''(B) AMENDED STANDARDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may exempt an external power supply from any amended standard under this subsection if the external power supply—

''(I) is manufactured within four years of the compliance date of the amended standard;

''(II) complies with applicable marking requirements adopted by the Secretary prior to the amendment;

''(III) meets the standards that were in effect prior to the amendment; and

''(IV) is made available by the manufacturer as a service part or a spare part for an end-use product that—

''(aa) constitutes the primary load; and

''(bb) was manufactured before the compliance date of the amended standard.

''(ii) REPORTING.—The Secretary may require manufacturers of a product exempted pursuant to clause (i) to report annual total units shipped as service and spare parts that do not meet the amended standard.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), who is an important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman WHITFIELD for his leadership on the Energy and Power Subcommittee, and I certainly appreciate the work you have done on energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the EPS Service Parts Act of 2014. This bill simply seeks to achieve congressional intent of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 regarding exemptions for certain service parts.

I would like to thank my colleague from New York, Congressman TONKO, for working with me on this legislation, and I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for bringing this bill to the floor.

In the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act, Congress recognized the need for manufacturers to continue to produce and distribute service and spare parts to be used with older out-of-production products that didn't comply with the new energy efficiency regulations produced by the 2007 bill.

The most common forms of EPS products are laptops, desktops, tablets, printers, and network products—products we use every day. Congress anticipated issues surrounding older service parts. The 2007 bill provided that from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2015, the energy standards would not apply to EPS made available as service or spare parts for end use products manufactured before July 1, 2008.

The reason for this legislation is to make a technical correction to provide explicit authority to the Department of Energy to create a similar exemption when the Department of Energy updated their EPS efficiency standards.

The existing language in the 2007 bill, according to DOE, has the opposite effect. It actually prevents DOE from extending this needed exemption in its February 2014 rulemaking on EPS efficiency standards.

The EPS Service Parts Act is in line with the original intent of the 2007 energy bill. It allows for continued production and distribution of replacement EPS for use with equipment manufactured before February 10, 2016, the effective date of the new DOE efficiency standards.

By passing this legislation, the bill will benefit both U.S. consumers and manufacturers. It will allow manufacturers such as Dell or Hewlett-Packard to maintain and distribute supplies of replacement parts for older equipment. It will also allow for warranty and contract compliance by these manufacturers.

Without this legislation, manufacturers would be required to redesign and qualify service on spare EPS parts at significant expense solely to support products that are no longer in production.

Manufacturers would also be forced to destroy existing inventories. Again, they would have to be destroyed—existing inventories—that were intended to support service and spare parts.

Also, in addition to meeting energy efficiency standards, the redesigned EPS parts would also need to be recertified to all the applicable safety, efficiency, and other environmental specifications.

Because of the low volume of services and spare parts, this would be a very costly and job-costing undertaking for manufacturers. Companies have estimated increased costs in the millions of dollars with no corresponding benefit to energy savings or the consumer.

This bill has the support of the Information Technology Industry Council, the Alliance to Save Energy, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, the Consumer Electronics Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The bill saves money and avoids a regulatory overreach not intended by, but accidentally instigated by a previous Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the bill.

Again, thank you to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

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

I rise in support of H.R. 5057, the External Power Supply Service Parts Act of 2014.

I thank my colleague Representative GARDNER and Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their cooperation and support in bringing this measure to the floor.

External power supplies have become regular fixtures in homes and workplaces around the world as we have expanded our use of rechargeable batteries to power the many electronic products we use every day. Because these products are so common, lowering their power consumption translates into substantial energy savings for consumers and savings for businesses.

Earlier this year, the Department of Energy finalized a rule to strengthen the energy efficiency standards for these products. I support that rule.

H.R. 5057 is not intended to undermine the new standard. H.R. 5057 simply creates a short-term targeted exemption to enable a smooth and orderly transition to the new standard for both manufacturers and for the current owners of equipment purchased prior to the adoption of the new standard.

This narrow exemption enables manufacturers to continue to provide service and replacement parts for existing equipment. It allows owners of equipment to keep it functioning for the full intended life of that given product.

The bill ensures the exemption included in this legislation will not result in a significant delay in reaching the new energy efficiency targets for EPS equipment.

The bill provides DOE with the authority to establish a reporting requirement to track the number of parts that are shipped and of those that do not meet the efficiency standard.

If the Department finds that this exemption is undermining the energy savings that are projected under the new efficiency regulations, the Secretary can issue a rule to limit or rescind the exemption.

H.R. 5057 strikes an appropriate balance, I believe, that keeps us moving forward on efficiency goals for external power supplies while providing manufacturers and owners of current products the assurance that service and spare parts will be available.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, Representative GARDNER, for working with me and working with our colleagues on this bill.

I urge all Members to support the legislation, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARDNER for being the cosponsors of this legislation and thank Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. UPTON for working with all of us to bring it to the floor, as well as the staffs on both sides of the aisle.

As both Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARDNER stated, this bill is a technical correction to existing law that will allow external power supply manufacturers to continue to sell service parts compatible with older technology to the benefit of consumers and manufacturers. It is a good piece of legislation.

I would urge all the Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5057, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1504

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 717;

Adoption of House Resolution 717, if ordered;

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2678, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4751, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3522, EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 717) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—196

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

NOT VOTING—8

DesJarlais
Dingell
Latham
Nunnelee
Roskam
Rush
Tierney
Yoho

□ 1534

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. OWENS and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

AYES—233

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
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
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

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

NOT VOTING—11

Bass
DesJarlais
Dingell
Latham
Nunnelee
Rush
Schrader
Tierney
Walz
Waxman
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1542

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes Nos. 490 and 491. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 490—Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 717, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3522—I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 491—Adoption of H. Res. 717, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3522—I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, I, along with other leaders, committee chairs, and ranking members, received a classified briefing from the administration regarding a significant piece of the President's strategy to confront the international terrorist organization known as ISIL.

This piece involves a request for additional authority to be included in the continuing resolution. Tonight the country will hear from the President of the United States as he addresses the Nation on this situation.

Additionally, all Members of the House will receive a classified briefing from the administration tomorrow morning on both the threat and the strategy to confront it.

I think I speak for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that we stand ready to listen and work with the President to confront this growing threat.

Now, given the severity of the situation and the need for all Members to properly evaluate the President's request, the House will postpone consideration of the continuing resolution which was originally scheduled for tomorrow.

However, votes on other measures will still take place tomorrow after the classified briefing, and all Members are encouraged to be in attendance.

LARCENIA J. BULLARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2678) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the ''Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—422

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
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
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
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
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Massie
Rigell

NOT VOTING—7

DesJarlais
Dingell
Latham
Nunnelee
Rush
Tierney
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1551

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO PUBLIC LAW 110–229

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4751) to make technical corrections to Public Law 110–229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—422

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
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
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
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)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais
Dingell
Gallego
Latham
Nunnelee
Perry
Rush
Tierney
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1559

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 493 I was temporarily off the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 717, I call up the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–56, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113–584, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3522

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. IF YOU LIKE YOUR GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN, YOU CAN KEEP IT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including any amendment made by such Act or by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010), a health insurance issuer that has in effect health insurance coverage in the group market on any date during 2013 may after such date offer such coverage for sale through December 31, 2018, in such market outside of an Exchange established under section 1311 or 1321 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18031, 18041). A group health plan shall not be treated as not complying with the requirements of such Act (or the amendments made by such Acts) insofar as it provides health benefits through health insurance coverage that is permitted under the previous sentence.

(b) TREATMENT AS GRANDFATHERED HEALTH PLAN IN SATISFACTION OF MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.—Health insurance coverage described in subsection (a) shall be treated as a grandfathered health plan for purposes of the amendment made by section 1501(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of States with respect to the regulation of health insurance coverage in the group market.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3522.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2014, sponsored by my good friend and colleague and important member of the Health Subcommittee, Dr. BILL CASSIDY of Louisiana.

This bill is a necessary tool for America's workers that will allow for health insurance coverage in the small group market during the 2013 calendar

year to be continued to be offered through calendar year 2018. In other words, if you like your group health insurance plan, you can keep it.

It has been over 4 years since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, and we are still hearing from constituents, small business owners, and employees who are continuing to struggle with the adverse effects of this law.

Here is what Roger from Columbia, Pennsylvania, wrote to me last year:

I am the third generation family owner of a business. We have 32 employees and have been providing health insurance for our employees and their families for over 25 years. This week, we received a renewal notice from our current provider, which is a 40 to 50 percent higher premium than our current contract, with less overall benefit coverage. If we choose to renew early, before the ACA takes effect, our premiums will increase 11.4 percent. Our President told us that the ACA would decrease health insurance costs.

My constituents—businesses, as well as individuals—have bitterly conveyed to me the myriad of concerns they face.

Eastern Lancaster County School District announced it would ''outsource'' about 100 of its support staff workers to private companies to avoid possible penalties under ObamaCare.

In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, the community college decided to cut hours for 400 adjunct faculty and other employees, so it wouldn't have to pay $6 million in ObamaCare-related fees.

From Auntie Anne's franchises, I have been told they have put their growth plans on hold, hiring has been pushed off, and they may no longer be able to afford to provide employee insurance coverage. In 2012, they experienced a 19 percent increase in insurance premiums and a 30 percent increase in 2013.

Here is what Tom and Rosemarie had to say from Lititz, Pennsylvania:

I have been crunching numbers to prepare for ObamaCare, and this is what I face: close my doors December 31, 2014 . . . or . . . pay $40,000 a year to insure my employees or ''pay'' a fine of $2,000 per employee per year over the first 30, at the price of $166 per month per employee over the first 30. So now, the 10 that have insurance, as well as my husband and I, will no longer be insured because the penalty is more affordable than to cover . . . this is ridiculous. I am outraged.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than this. We can enact patient-centered free market reforms, where private insurers engage in robust competition and create the same kind of market-based inducements to reduce prices and improve services that occurs in most other parts of the American economy.

We can start by enacting H.R. 3522. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. American workers who like their health care plan should be able to keep it, just like President Obama and the supporters of the Affordable Care Act promised.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I am writing concerning H.R. 3522, the ''Employee Health Care Protection Act,'' which is scheduled for floor consideration today.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code requires individuals to maintain minimum essential coverage or pay a penalty. Section 2(b) of H.R. 3522, both as reported out of your Committee and Rules Committee Print 113–56, modifies which health care plans would meet the requirement of minimum essential coverage. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3522, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3522, the ''Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2013.'' As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on Ways and Means' Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 3522, and I agree that your decision does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 3522 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than another political attack on the Affordable Care Act. In fact, I think this bill serves as House Republicans' 53rd vote to repeal or undermine the health care law.

If enacted, this bill would allow insurance companies to discriminate against small businesses if they have an older workforce, more women in their workforce, or if any of their employees or their children have preexisting health conditions. The impact is taking away from millions of workers key protections and puts insurance companies back in charge of their health care.

Even worse, I believe, it gives insurance companies the best of both worlds: millions of new customers through the ACA, but the ability to continue to cherry-pick employers with young, healthy workforces.

In fact, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the bill would have serious adverse effects on premiums, causing them to rise substantially for many small firms, and the CBO agrees. This bill causes serious harm.

Republicans are claiming that this is just another effort to help people keep the coverage they have, but let's be clear, if your insurance starts covering your child to the age of 26, you are not losing your old coverage, your coverage is simply getting better.

If your insurance starts covering preventive services like annual physicals and vaccinations and cancer screenings for free, that is not losing your old coverage, that is your coverage getting better. There is no evidence employers are dropping coverage en masse.

So Republicans are left to claim people are losing their coverage when their coverage is actually getting better. This is again the Republicans misleading the public.

Mr. Speaker, when the ACA passed, employers and health insurers had the option to grandfather their coverage. They could keep that coverage the same, and it would not have to comply with the new ACA reforms. They could even raise premiums and cost-sharing and still stay grandfathered.

For plans that did not grandfather, a host of important new consumer protections went into place before 2014. For example, plans had to limit their profits and overhead to 20 percent of the premiums they collect. If they failed to meet this standard, they must pay rebates to their customers. As a result, small businesses have saved a total of $2.5 billion on their premiums since 2011.

Mr. Speaker, in November 2013, the President announced that individuals and small businesses who are not yet ready to transition into the new, more fair, secure health coverage guaranteed by the ACA could remain in their existing plans for another year.

In March of this year, the President extended that policy, so that individuals and small businesses could keep their plans into 2016, but this bill goes much further and allows these plans to be sold to new customers.

So we are not talking about people keeping their plans. We are talking about selling old lousy plans, discriminatory plans, to new customers.

Since the ACA was passed, we have added key new benefits and protections to employer coverage, but at the same time, we have added 10 million jobs, we have helped 10 million people get health coverage, we have seen premiums rise at historically low levels, and we have extended the life of the Medicare trust fund by 13 years.

This is amazing progress, and we should not turn back. That is what the Republicans would have us do with this

other repeal of the Affordable Care Act: turn us back to the old days where the insurance companies reigned, where discriminatory practices reigned, and where preexisting conditions were a basis for not getting coverage.

I urge Members to vote ''no.'' This should not be.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS for his diligence on this effort and on behalf of the American people to allow them the choice and the options that they are seeking in their health care.

My colleague is concerned that we are looking at repeals and that we are looking at replacements and we are looking at allowing choice and options for Americans. We are going to continue to do that because what we have found, Mr. Speaker, what we have found is that premiums are rising.

□ 1615

In my State, they are going to go up another 18 to 20 percent this year. We have an insurance product in the marketplace that many of our constituents tell us is too expensive to afford. We are seeing narrowed networks. People have an insurance card, but guess what. They don't have access to the queue. They can't see the doctor. We are hearing from our hospitals that they are seeing their emergency rooms crowded.

So yes, indeed, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act. It is the right thing to do. If you like your health care plan, under this bill you would be able to keep your health care plan. We would be helping the President to fulfill a promise that he broke. Let's get back on track and let's fulfill that promise.

This is what the American people want right now, by the administration's own admission. These aren't my numbers. It is the administration's number. Up to 80 percent of the small business health plans would not make the ObamaCare cut because they are not government-compliant. The operative word here is they are not government-compliant. The government is forcing people into a plan that they don't want, don't like, and can't afford. This is the administration admitting this. They are taking away options and choice in the marketplace.

We have heard from small business owners all across our district who are struggling to find ways to provide health insurance to their employees and still manage to stay in business. What they are looking for is a way to provide jobs and increase wages. ObamaCare is making it more and more difficult.

We have heard from our constituents about how their insurance premiums and their copayments are escalating and the complaints they have from employees because they don't like the ObamaCare plans. We have heard that they do not understand why they are forced into purchasing government-compliant insurance which does not meet their needs.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act, will provide some relief to the small business community by allowing them to maintain their current health insurance plans. If you like the health insurance plan that you have, you would be able to keep it. It is fulfilling a promise. It is what small business employers want. It is what the American people want.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a very simple question: When will the Republicans accept their share of responsibility in guaranteeing the health security of all Americans?

The bill under consideration today, H.R. 3522, is really nothing more than a senseless, heartless, 53rd vote by the Republicans to eviscerate the Affordable Care Act.

Where the ACA is a historic leap forward in health security for millions of Americans, this bill is a shameless stumble backward to the days when insurance companies could exploit the American people with impunity.

Where the ACA promotes women's health and security, this bill allows health companies to charge more to women for their coverage than they do for men.

Where the ACA ends the reprehensible practice of price-gouging Americans with preexisting conditions, this legislation allows insurers selling small business health plans to charge more for coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

This legislation would also allow insurers to impose annual limits on coverage, meaning that health security will run out for many Americans when they get sick—a tragic state of affairs that often results in folks going bankrupt in the face of a pile of unpaid medical bills.

This legislation sends us back to a dark day when too many American families had to choose between a roof over their head and food on the table or paying their health care bills.

The ACA was passed into law to protect hardworking Americans, in part, by making bad, exploitative health insurance plans a thing of the past. The fact that they are wanting to add more people to it is really reprehensible. This legislation allows insurers to sell the same bad business plans that they had before to more people until 2018.

The Republicans have been in charge here and haven't proposed any alternative whatsoever. This legislation jeopardizes the health security of American families by rolling back vital insurance protections made law by the ACA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: When will the Republicans act on behalf of the health security of the American people? When will they stop having these PR campaign events just before we are going home so they can send out press releases and say they have done something, when they have done absolutely nothing except try to remove the ACA? When will they care about the people?

Sadly, not today.

This bill is an embarrassment and demands a ''no'' vote.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BILL CASSIDY, a valued member of the Health Subcommittee and prime sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about keeping a promise and doing right by the American people. The Employee Health Care Protection Act is a bipartisan bill that allows American workers, if they choose, to keep their employer-sponsored health care plan that they depend upon for health care security.

I am amused my colleagues across the aisle seem to think the American worker doesn't know what is best for herself, her family, or her business. It just amazes me they have so little regard for the average American. They feel like they must tell the average American what is best for them. They cannot make their own decisions.

Frankly, I am disappointed that this legislation is even necessary. President Obama and congressional supporters of ObamaCare made unequivocal promises dozens of times that Americans can keep their plan if they wished. Yet, last year, millions of Americans found their health care canceled because it did not comply with ''Washington knows best, you don't'' rules set forth in ObamaCare.

Ninety-three thousand Louisianans lost their health care in the individual market, and thousands more in the group market are in danger of losing their plans unless we pass this bill.

The President apologized to Americans who lost their coverage, saying that he is ''sorry that they are finding themselves in this situation based on assurances they got from me.'' If the President were truly sorry, he would call Senator REID and tell him to pass this bill and provide relief from ObamaCare to the millions of Americans who relied on a false promise. He would then work with this body to repeal and replace ObamaCare with market-based solutions that give the power

to the patient, not the Washington bureaucrat.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill. The Employer Health Care Protection Act allows American families to save money on health care, increases access to affordable health care choices, and will raise wages for workers. On top of that, it will decrease the deficit by $1.25 billion over the next 10 years. It is a commonsense bill that provides relief to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let's keep the promise to middle class workers and ensure that, if they like their health care plan, they can keep it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3522 marks the 53rd vote to repeal or undermine ObamaCare. But worse, it means taking away guaranteed benefits for the consumers that you seem to be so concerned about.

Does anyone really believe that Americans want insurance companies to be able to deny them coverage or charge them more due to a preexisting condition? Do they want insurance companies to be able to refuse to pay for their lifesaving treatments because they have hit an annual limit? Do they want insurance companies to be able to not cover maternity services for pregnant women, as so many plans did?

I believe we can all agree the answer is ''no.'' That is why we have to reject H.R. 3522 and all other efforts to repeal or undermine the consumer protections of ObamaCare. Americans simply can't afford it. They can't afford to have insurance companies back in charge of their health care.

This isn't about consumer choice. This is about turning over decisions to insurance companies that want to cut the benefits.

I want to end my remarks by just mentioning one story of why the Affordable Care Act is so important to constituents. This is from John. He says:

> I wanted to share with you the good news that by accessing health insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act, my little business, a law firm, was able to avoid a substantial premium increase and, in fact, obtain the same full coverage at reduced deductibles and copayments and add dental care for thousands a month less than our old premiums costs, which we had just been advised was to be raised approximately 14 percent. I have been practicing law for over 37 years and have always felt a responsibility to provide full health care benefits for all my employees, including clerks and staff, paying the total premium for all participants. My firm expanded at one point to include my then-partner, seven associate lawyers, and multiple staff, though we are now downsized to three lawyers and two office staff that we now are able to provide insurance for. Thanks for your efforts. Thanks for the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, another valued member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

I would like to begin with the words President Obama first said to the American Medical Association in June of 2009 before any committee in Congress held a markup of what later became the Affordable Care Act. He said to that group of physicians, and repeated on many occasions after that:

> If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away from you, no matter what.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, like many assurances that were delivered to the American people about the President's health care law, this has been nothing more than an empty promise. Since the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, millions have been notified their insurance plans have been canceled.

I commend Chairman PITTS of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce for holding numerous hearings to examine this very issue. That is precisely why we need to pass H.R. 3522. Mr. Speaker, this commonsense legislation would simply allow health insurance companies to continue to offer group coverage that was in effect in 2013.

I commend our physician colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, for his leadership on this legislation.

If the President will not keep his promise to the American people that ''if you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan,'' then we need to do it for him. H.R. 3522 accomplishes that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is frustrating to me because, again, we have just another effort to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act when we should all be working to implement the Affordable Care Act. Just to show what a waste of time, if you will, that this debate is today, I wanted to read a statement of President Obama's policy that was issued today with regard to this legislation. It says:

> The administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 3522 because it threatens the health care security of hardworking middle class families. The Nation is experiencing the lowest rate of health care price inflation in nearly 50 years, and exceptionally slow growth in other measures of health costs, which have combined to dramatically slow the growth of small business premiums.

□ 1630

> With health care costs rising at low rates and choices for small businesses improving through the Health Insurance Marketplace, this bill would be a major step backwards.
>
> H.R. 3522 would roll back the progress made because of the Affordable Care Act and would allow insurers to deploy practices such as charging businesses more when a worker has a preexisting condition, or when it has more workers who are women than men. The bill would allow insurers to go back to capping the amount of care that enrollees receive, or to excluding coverage of proven preventative care. The administration supports policies that allow people to keep the health plans that they have. Its transition policies allow States and issuers to do just that. But policies that reverse the progress made to extend quality, affordable coverage to millions of uninsured, hardworking middle class families are not the solution. Rather than refighting old political battles to sabotage the health care law, the Congress should work with the administration to improve the law and move forward.
>
> If the President were presented with this bill, he would veto it.

So, again, this is just a waste of time. We have so many other things that we need to work on in this House before we adjourn, particularly jobs and the economy. Instead, we are trying to repeal, again, the same legislation that actually has created more jobs and kept health care costs low, and it is just, again, a complete waste of time.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) another member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this piece of legislation, also the sponsor, Dr. CASSIDY, for his leadership on this particular piece of legislation.

I rise today in support of the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

When the President said, ''If you like your plan, you can keep it,'' that was deemed PolitiFact's Lie of the Year.

Then, millions of Americans across the country in the individual market received cancelation notices. They felt the impacts of the broken promises of the President's health care law.

Now the specter of cancelations looms again. Up to 50 million people who get health care through their employers could have their plans canceled or disrupted because of rules and regulations in the President's health care law. That is 1 in 6 Americans, Mr. Speaker.

If one of my constituents wants to keep their plan, they should be able to. Support this bill, and make the President keep his promise to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President of the United States.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), another member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS for his leadership, and my colleague, BILL CASSIDY, for this wonderful bill, H.R. 3522.

This bill is very simple. It will allow people to keep the health insurance

they had before ObamaCare took it away, their choice.

Eighty percent of those people in this country are women who have made those choices in health care, and this would put it back in place.

President Obama infamously stated, as my colleague before me stated, ''If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period.''

However, many plans offered prior to the ACA were not compliant with the numerous requirements this law required. As a result, millions of Americans were no longer able to purchase their old plans.

One of many of the business owners who provide health care coverage for their employees right there in my district, Mr. Steve Lozinsky, who runs Sparkle and Shine Cleaning Service in Apex, North Carolina, called me just the other day concerned about this issue.

Steve has about 240 employees, and he will be forced to lay off 31 of them because of the ObamaCare mandate.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of employers like Steve Lozinsky, who take care of their employees, who consider them family and want to do the right thing, it is because of them, and every American and every family in this country, that we need to pass H.R. 3522.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a direct assault on the health security of American families. The bill would allow insurance companies in their small business health plans to charge more for women's coverage, meaning workers in small businesses with more women than men have to pay more.

It would charge more for coverage for those with preexisting conditions, meaning workers in small businesses that have more people with preexisting conditions have to pay more. And these small businesses would face higher premiums and would continue to see their premiums spike year to year if an employee had an accident or got diagnosed with cancer.

Under the legislation, insurers group plans' could also impose annual limits on coverage, meaning that insurers could cease to provide any coverage after an individual's care reached a certain overall cost and impose extensive waiting periods before an employer could enroll in coverage.

Now, if the Republicans were serious about helping America's small businesses, they would be bringing up, instead, a bill to expand access to the ACA's small business health care tax credit, as actually proposed by the Obama administration.

The President has proposed allowing small businesses with up to 50 workers, rather than the current 25, to qualify for the credit, and adopting a more generous phaseout schedule.

Furthermore, instead of strengthening the small business tax credit, Republicans have actually voted to repeal the tax credit three times.

Republicans are completely misrepresenting what this bill does, calling the bill's section 2 ''If you like your group health insurance plan, you can keep it.''

Well, first of all, the bill does not require that insurers keep selling these group policies. Insurers discontinue policies every year, and there is nothing in this bill that prevents them from doing so.

But more important, the bill goes well beyond the issue of people keeping plans they have now. Instead, it allows insurers to sell group plans that do not include ACA consumer protection to new customers through 2018.

Once again, the Republicans are misrepresenting what this bill does, and they are simply trying to repeal or undermine the ACA, which has been so successful in expanding insurance coverage, keeping down costs, and eliminating discriminatory practices.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on the time remaining for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 16 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, congressional Democrats constantly say that the ACA is not a perfect bill, and that they want to make changes. If they are sincere about that statement, they should join us in supporting H.R. 3522, a bill that received bipartisan support at Energy and Commerce to protect American workers who will lose their plan under the Affordable Care Act.

Thirty-nine Democrats joined us last year and voted for a similar bill to let Americans keep their plan in the individual market. We should work together to provide that very same protection to the tens of millions of American workers who depend on employer-sponsored health coverage.

Last fall, millions of Americans all across the country had their health plans canceled, despite repeated promises from the President and his allies in Congress that if you liked your health care plan, you would be able to keep it. And so, in the fall of 2013, health plan cancelations were concentrated in the individual market.

Sadly, millions of Americans with employer-sponsored coverage, group plans, will also face plan cancelations because of the Affordable Care Act. And some experts have testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that approximately 50 million young American workers with fully insured coverage face plan cancelations or disruptions because of ACA requirements and regulations.

Forbes warned last year, and I will quote: ''Starting in October 2014, many employees of small businesses will start getting the same notices that are now being mailed to individuals, informing that their existing health plans are also being canceled.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, Americans rightly feel misled by the President, by congressional Democrats. Their false assurance that Americans could keep their health care plan was recognized as the 2013 ''Lie of the Year.''

So, we have this legislation before us this year to apply to the group plans. As long as they were in existence in 2013, they could be available today. And I urge Members to support the legislation.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is bad for consumers. It is bad for small businesses. The only beneficiaries of this bill are the health insurance companies that want to sell bad policies, charge higher premiums for women, for children with preexisting conditions, and who want to put limits on health care coverage when people need it the most.

I want to take a minute to go back to the time before the Affordable Care Act and remind my colleagues why we passed that health care reform in the first place.

Before the ACA, consumers were seeing health insurance premiums rise by double-digits each year. Not anymore.

This morning, the Kaiser Family Foundation released a new report on small employer premiums. The report found that since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, premium increases for small business coverage have slowed considerably. This past year, premiums barely budged.

Before the ACA, there was no requirement for how much of your premium dollars go to an insurance company, how much of that had to actually go for your health care. Your premiums could be used to pay for exorbitant executive salaries, lavish conferences, and other expenditures that had nothing to do with the health coverage for the insured.

Now, consumers are saving billions of dollars from this new requirement that insurers actually spend premium dollars to provide health care.

Before the ACA, parents could find that they had no coverage at all for a child's preexisting conditions, even something as common as asthma. Today, all parents are guaranteed the peace of mind that their insurance will cover their children's medical needs.

Before the ACA, an individual struggling with cancer could find that the insurance plan would impose annual coverage limits and simply stop paying for care. Today, this is no longer the case.

Before the ACA, small businesses had few choices and no leverage with insurance companies. The ACA put consumers and small businesses back in charge, and it did so in a way that is cutting health cost growth and providing coverage to millions of previously uninsured Americans.

So what do we have on the other side of the aisle from the Republicans? Sour grapes.

We took a Republican idea, implemented by their very own Presidential candidate in Massachusetts, and we took that idea and made it work for the whole country, made it work for families, made it work better than even the most optimistic supporters had expected.

And Republicans are mad. So rather than work to implement the law, they have been working to thwart it. Sour grapes.

This bill is just another example of that mentality. It would not help small businesses. To the contrary. Small businesses that wish to grandfather and keep their old coverage already have that opportunity.

This bill would let insurance companies sell non-ACA-compliant policies to any business, policies that do not protect against benefit limits, rate hikes, discrimination against women or against children with preexisting conditions.

□ 1645

The bill would allow insurance companies to cherry-pick, offering low rates for inadequate, bare bones policies for some groups and then discriminate against, charging higher prices or offering weaker coverage for others.

Mr. Speaker, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities yesterday released a new analysis of the bill and what it would mean. The analysis concluded that it would ''likely cause premiums to rise substantially for many small businesses and undercut health reform's small group market reforms and consumer protections.''

So I am opposed to this bill. It is not about helping businesses. It is not about helping families. This bill puts insurance companies back in charge, and it returns the insurance market to the days when they could discriminate with impunity. I am not for that, and I hope my colleagues are not for that. I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

The President not only made a promise that, if you liked your doctor you could keep your doctor, he said, if you liked your health care plan, you could keep your health care plan no matter what—period. He also promised reductions in premiums of $2,500 per family.

Americans are not seeing the $2,500 reduction in premiums that the President promised under the ACA. Instead, Americans are seeing higher premiums and deductibles under the President's health care law. Some of the premium increases are outrageous, and the deductibles—I don't know how a family could save the $10,000 to $15,000 for their deductibles that some of them are telling us they are going to have. In fact, the administration's own actuaries have confirmed that premiums are going up under the ACA. Earlier this year, actuaries from CMS estimated that 65 percent of small businesses will see premium increases under the Affordable Care Act. Middle class Americans working for these 11 million small businesses will see higher premiums, meaning less take-home pay for working Americans.

The American people want real health care reform, but the ACA is making things worse. The President's health care law has led to canceled health care plans, fewer choices, higher premiums, and higher deductibles for middle class families. Ultimately, the law needs to be replaced with better solutions that lower costs and provide better health care choices.

However, let's be clear about what H.R. 3522 actually does. The bill does not repeal the ACA. We have heard the mantra of how many 50-some votes there have been to repeal. Instead, this bill simply lets American workers keep their health care plans, and it expands coverage options.

Congressional Democrats constantly say that they want to change the parts of the ACA that don't work. If they are sincere about that pledge, they should join us in supporting H.R. 3522. This is a bipartisan bill to protect American workers who will lose their plans under the health care law. As I said last year when we had a similar bill for the individual market cancelations, 39 Democrats joined us and voted for that bill to let Americans keep their plans in the individual market.

Congress should work together to provide the same protection to the millions of American workers with group coverage, and that is what the Employee Health Care Protection Act does. Families, not Washington, should decide if they want to keep their health care plans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

My friend on the other side of the aisle said that this doesn't repeal the Affordable Care Act, but in reality, it does. This is the 53rd time. When I was a little boy, I went to PS 53 in the Bronx. I feel we have now reached that level of 53, with no end in sight, and I really wish that both sides of the aisle could put their heads together and keep what we like and fix what we don't like.

All of the major bills that have ever been put into effect, be it Medicare, be it Medicaid, be it the civil rights bills of the 1960s, had to be tweaked because, when you have an omnibus bill, you really don't know what its effect is going to be until you roll it out and you see, and then you make changes. I mean, that happens with every major bill. The problem is that most of our friends on the other side of the aisle hated the law and never really wanted it to succeed. So, if you don't want it to succeed and if you throw roadblocks in its path and if you have a situation in which Republican Governors are refusing to expand it, you will have failure because, if you don't want to work with something and if you don't want to make it better, it won't get better. In my home State, where we embrace it, it has worked. It hasn't worked in every single instance but in a vast majority of instances. Again, we should change what doesn't work and keep what works.

In New York, this year's insurance rates, on average, were—and here is another 53—53 percent lower than the rates in 2013 for comparable coverage. Our exchange, New York State of Health, has already announced next year's rates, which will continue to be more than 50 percent lower than they were before our insurance exchange was established.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research & Educational Trust's annual Employer Health Benefits Survey, individuals obtaining health insurance from their employers are generally facing ''similar premium contributions and cost-sharing requirements in 2014 as they did in 2013.'' Furthermore, we know that these individuals are often benefiting from more quality, comprehensive coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to return to the bad old days when insurance companies where permitted to discriminate against small businesses that employed large numbers of women, older individuals, or those with preexisting conditions. I don't want to return to the bad old days when you couldn't keep your child on your premium until that child was 26 years old, as you can under the Affordable Care Act.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this legislation, and I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to really sit down with us. Let's put our heads together, and let's once and for all help fix this bill. There are a lot of good features in it. We should expand on those. The things that we think need to change we should change, but, please, let's not ever vote to repeal again. We don't need to have a 54th time. Enough is enough.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to close the debate.

The frustrating thing for me and for so many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle is that we know how successful the Affordable Care Act has been, and yet the Republicans continue

to negate the positive aspects of the ACA and seek to undermine it with the repeal or with legislation like this that would seriously undermine the goals and the success of the Affordable Care Act. I just want to point out that, since the Affordable Care Act was enacted in March of 2010, 9.9 million private sector jobs have been created.

According to the latest estimates from the CBO, the overall number of Americans receiving employer-based coverage is expected to grow from 156 million in 2014 to 166 million in 2023, and the number of uninsured is expected to fall by 26 million Americans. Also, since Massachusetts enacted health care reforms that were almost identical to those in the ACA, the percentage of employers offering coverage has increased from 72 percent in 2007 to 77 percent in 2010. Since the ACA was enacted, the Nation has seen 4 years of the slowest health care spending growth since recordkeeping began in 1960. Slower growth in health care costs translates into slower growth of employers' health benefit costs, helping businesses and workers save money. Indeed, employers' hourly health benefit costs rose just 1 percent after adjusting for inflation over the year ending in June 2014, near the bottom of the historical range.

In addition to slowing down the rate of growth of health care spending, which is benefiting employers, the Affordable Care Act is also producing premium savings for America's small businesses due to its 80–20 rule. That rule requires that insurers spend at least 80 percent of premiums on medical care rather than on CEO pay, profits, and administrative costs. If an insurer fails to meet this standard, it must pay rebates to its customers. As a result of this rule, according to a recently released report, America's small businesses have saved a total of $2.5 billion on their premiums since 2011.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is that the Affordable Care Act is delivering on the promise of affordable, quality, and dependable health coverage for millions of Americans, but that doesn't stop the Republicans. We can't shake their obsession with undermining the law, and that is what they are doing again with this bill. The vote on this bill will be the 53rd GOP vote to repeal or to undermine the ACA, so I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Employee Health Care Protection Act, a bipartisan bill authored by our committee, particularly by Dr. BILL CASSIDY as the prime sponsor, to protect the health care choices for literally millions of American workers.

Last fall, we learned the harsh reality that the President's oft-repeated promise that if you liked your health care plan you could keep it—you have heard that here today—was simply not true. Many were shocked to learn that their individual policies were being canceled because of the President's health care law. They didn't like that at all.

Sadly, the wave of canceled plans under the President's broken promise has not ended. The very backbone of America's health care system, employer-sponsored coverage, provides health care security to about 170 million American workers and family members. The President's health care law now threatens the health care plans of many of America's middle class workers who rely on employer-sponsored coverage. Many with employer-sponsored coverage will face the same plan cancelations that millions of Americans received with their individual policies last fall.

This legislation provides a thoughtful solution and relief from the President's broken promises. The bill before us simply allows America's small businesses and workers to choose from health care plans that were in effect in 2013. The bill would also allow other small businesses and workers to choose from more affordable group health care plans available before the President's health care law.

America's workers and families know their health care needs better than do Members of Congress or officials at the Department of HHS. This bill empowers Americans with more choices, the same choices that they were promised. If Americans like their health care plans, they should be able to keep them—period, end of story.

I am also pleased that, this week, the nonpartisan CBO confirmed that this bill would lower the deficit by more than $1 billion, provide more health plan options with lower premiums, and, yes, raise wages for American workers.

We have all heard firsthand of the struggles facing middle class American families because of the health care law. Tom Harmon, from my district, and the trusted workers at American Waste—in a little town called Union, Michigan—are seeing their health care premiums more than double. Sadly, their deductibles are much higher to boot, forcing them to deal with higher health care costs. Rather than make life easier, Washington, through this President's health care law, has, in fact, made life more expensive for Tom and the working families of American Waste in southwest Michigan.

In conclusion, I am proud to say that this bill, H.R. 3522, is a bill dedicated to helping workers across the country who are struggling with the costs and consequences of the President's health care law. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Dr. CASSIDY's bill. America's workers deserve the chance to pick the health care plans that best suit their needs, not lose them.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3522.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in support of Mr. CASSIDY'S bill—the Employee Health Care Protection Act H.R. 3522,

This bill is very important to ensure employers and their employees can keep their plan—a broken promise from President Obama.

Just last week I was contacted by the Cornerstone Staffing Inc. based in Omaha who is currently facing hard decisions in order to be in compliance with this disastrous law.

Cornerstone Staffing is a woman-owned nine-year-old local business that will now suffer due to a law that no one read.

Cornerstone Staffing Inc. has 15 full time employees with a range of 150 to 450 temporary employees at any given time.

Previously they didn't offer insurance to all temporary workers but had the flexibility to secure coverage for those workers who needed it.

Now, Cornerstone Staffing Inc. is forced to provide coverage to all of their employees—whether they need it or not—which means they can't afford to place as many individuals in needed jobs.

Not only will H.R. 3522 bring some relief to companies and their employees but it will also increase government revenue by $400 million. This is common sense.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and give some relief to families across the nation. I am submitting a letter Cornerstone Staffing Inc. sent to me regarding their problems with the President's health care law.

HELLO CONGRESSMAN TERRY, We have met briefly in the past, actually my company was previously located on the second floor of your office building on Burt Street. I work for Cornerstone Staffing Inc, we are a nine year old, local, woman-owned staffing firm servicing the Omaha metro area.

I'm very late in the game sending this message but we recently met with representatives from Silverstone Group regarding ACA and how it will affect our company in 2015.1 have to be honest, I don't fully understand the requirements or implications but we currently have 15 full-time, internal employees. We also employ temporary/contract employees and depending on the season we could have 150 to 450 contractors working for us at a time. Some might work one week, some might work twelve months and some might work for us 3 times in a year at a variety of our clients with months off between assignments.

It is my understanding that ''PEO'' (employee leasing services) are exempt from Obamacare. We W–2 all of our contractors (versus 1099) as many are required to be by Nebraska state law. Therefore we have the same obligations to offer a temporary/contract employee healthcare as if they are hired to work in a long-term permanent position.

We are not against offering benefits to our contract employees, especially if they work more than 90 days on a project. Our concern is that much of our temp/contract workforce is paid $10–$13/hour. If the individuals out of pocket healthcare costs can not exceed 9.5% of their income, we will be forced to pay the majority of their healthcare monthly. In our business, we may only make $2–$3/hour on each of these employees so they might have to work weeks before we make a profit especially after we pay taxes, background checks and payroll expenses. This has the potential to be a huge blow to our company profits and

it could have an adverse effect if we are forced to decide if it is even ''worth'' employing someone who is willing to work because the risk is too great on our end.

ACA is going to put a major strain on our industry. Omaha is home to many staffing firms including several large nationally focused firms. Is there anything more we can be doing to amend or exempt recruiting/staffing agencies from the standard requirements of ACA?

Thank you for your consideration and any suggestions,

BRAD JONES,
Vice President of Operations,
Cornerstone Staffing Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3522 is postponed.

□ 1700

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. And I will be joined by some other members of the Progressive Caucus to talk about issues that are important to this country and issues that are important to have a debate about in public.

This is our first week back. After 5 weeks of being in our home districts, we have a lot to get done in this Congress. And so far this week, we have not exactly risen to the occasion. We have important things to do regarding the continuing resolution. We have important things to do regarding situations overseas. We have important legislation that this Congress simply has not gotten done. And, instead, another week has gone by without addressing some of the most important issues of the day.

One of those issues that, I think, is front and center in people's minds is what is going on overseas, what is going on with ISIL in Iraq, perhaps in Syria, and what does that mean for the American people.

And I am here today asking many of the questions that I get from people in the district. The President is going to address the Nation this evening, and he is going to give us his vision for where he thinks this country should go. And I am asking the President to please come to Congress before military action is taken against ISIL because it is so important that we are a part of this debate. We are the closest to the people in this country, and Congress needs to be involved. And I have some questions that I would like to see Members of Congress debate and the President help us address as we decide this extremely important issue.

I want to give props to Rachel Maddow who, last night, I thought did an excellent job on her program in looking at some of the questions that we should be debating in this body to make sure that we are doing the right thing by getting involved and that we have got the thought ahead of time going into it, unlike I think what we have done previously when we have gone into Iraq, as a country.

So these are some of the questions that we would like to have answered and we would like to have assistance with. One, why should the President seek congressional authorization and debate for military action against ISIL? Well, for one, it is in the Constitution. The Constitution, article I, section 8: ''The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.''

Directly in our United States Constitution is the power that this body, Congress, has to be involved if we are going to get involved in what would essentially be seen as war. And I think the debate that we have to have is, what are we looking at as we look at the situation in Iraq and perhaps in Syria.

John Nichols from The Nation magazine wrote: ''It is a healthy respect for the complex geopolitics of the region, combined with a regard for the wisdom of the system of checks and balances and the principles of advice and consent outlined in the US Constitution'' that we have a say. Those are the words of John Nichols.

This Congress, in July, before we left to go back to our districts, voted 370–40 for H. Con. Res. 105. We don't get many 370–40 votes in this House. It was a bipartisan resolution. It had overwhelming support and said: ''The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization.''

That is the resolution that was passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan way by this body just weeks ago. We are facing these questions today. And the President is going to present to the Nation this evening exactly what he would like to see us do and hopefully will let the Congress have a say in it because, clearly, the situation has escalated. It needs a debate.

The beheadings have certainly caught the attention of the country, but we want to make sure that attention is on our behalf, not the attention of someone who did that to try to provoke a reaction, and that we don't fall into the hands of doing the reaction that some people would hope that we would do to engage in a region that could be very complex.

And after this country has had so many unfortunate failures in Iraq—twice in my adult lifetime we have gone into this region, with very limited success, and we have gone into Afghanistan—we owe it to the American people, to our veterans, our servicemen and -women and their families, those who have gone in and put their lives at risk following 9/11, to have this rigorous debate in this very body before us.

This is a complex situation. But given the failures that we have had previously in going into Iraq—whether it be the lack of debate, the lack of buy-in from other nations and other partners specifically in the region and, quite honestly, the faulty intelligence that we had or that were told at the time—it has put us in a bad situation in the past in this region.

In fact, one of the reasons we have to have this debate is there are a number of Members who are right now writing authorizations for us to go in. In fact, there is one from the gentleman from Virginia, Representative FRANK WOLF, that would essentially be an Authorization for Use of Military Force that could authorize force virtually anywhere, with no expiration date and no specific targets.

And I can tell you, when I talk to people across Wisconsin, when I talk to my colleagues in this room and they talk to their constituents, I think people want better answers than that. I know a year ago, when we had the debate about whether or not we would get involved in Syria, within 2 weeks in my district, I received 2,200 responses, 97 percent to 3 percent who were leery of us getting involved in Syria. And while the situation is different from a year ago and is even a situation different from a month ago, I think the public still has questions, certainly questions that we need to debate in this body. So we need to have that debate in Congress.

What do we want from the President in a new authorization? Well, I think there are three things that should be in that. One is that Congress has a say. Again, we have the ability to have a vote. We are elected and accountable to our districts, and these decisions are not just made behind closed doors without the advice and consent of Congress. We will have a stronger effort if we have that public debate. So that is one. Two, that we have a narrow scope. We simply can't bomb our way into success.

And let me just go over a little bit of the timeline just in the very few months since ISIL has been out there.

Let me just talk a little bit about that timeline. Back on June 16 of this year, the administration announced it was sending 275 military personnel to protect the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. Three days later, they announced that 300 military advisers would collaborate and train Iraqi forces—3 days later. On June 30, the administration announced the deployment of 200 more troops to Iraq. On August 7, the President authorized airstrikes in Iraq. On the 12th of August, the administration announced 130 additional U.S. military personnel to assess the scope of the humanitarian mission. On the 26th of August, the President authorized surveillance flights over Syria. On September 2, the administration announced the deployment of 350 additional military personnel to Iraq, bringing our total to 1,100 U.S. troops now deployed in Iraq. And in the last month alone, there have been 153 airstrikes in Iraq. Just in the little bit of time that has passed, that is what we have seen happen. And I think we need to be very specific in the limited scope of what that is going to be so we don't have mission creep leading us into perhaps more involvement than we thought was going to happen in the beginning.

And third, I think—and others that I talk to think—it is important that we go in with a coalition, that we are not doing this either alone or largely alone and that we are doing this with partners from the region. Right now, there are 10 other countries that I know of that are involved in saying that they will commit to help work with us. But we need to build a moderate Sunni support and buy-in from some of the Arab States specifically to help us in this region because right now, this is a regional situation, and we need to have partners within that region to make sure that we can accomplish any goals.

There are many questions that we continue to have, and I think there are many about what that strike would look like, what exactly does it mean to have that involvement.

I just mentioned who are some of the allies that we are going to have. But what are some of our short-term goals? What do we expect to accomplish when we decide that we are going in? What would we carry out in military action? It is one thing to say that we are not going to have boots on the ground, but clearly, we are having pilots in the sky.

Right now, we are using U.S. attack aircraft, fighter aircraft, and drone aircraft to do attacks within that region. So you already have a presence that—I don't like the term ''boots on the ground,'' because these are people with families, sons and daughters, nephews and nieces, brothers and sisters that we have who are overseas, and we need to know exactly what that means.

There has been potentially a request to aid some of the moderate Syrian rebels that may come out of the conversations. And, once again, I think there are questions that this body has to have a debate on. Steven Sotloff, the journalist, who was the second person that was beheaded, that we have followed very closely, as an American citizen, his family recently said that it was moderate Syrian rebels who essentially sold access to ISIL to get Steve Sotloff. And who is it that we are going to provide assistance to? And what does that assistance mean? And who are the people that we can potentially be doing that for?

What is our long-term commitment to military action? Now, if we would have asked this question years ago when we first looked at Iraq and Afghanistan, I don't think anyone would have expected to hear a 13-year commitment to Afghanistan. More than 2,000 Americans have been killed in Afghanistan and more than 4,000 in Iraq. The cost has been estimated to be 4 to $6 trillion in that region just since that last action was called years ago. And, as I mentioned, there have been 153 airstrikes just in the last month. How many more airstrikes will it take to say that that is enough? So we need to have more meat put onto this to have an idea of what that involvement is if we are going to be authorizing something.

And finally, the question I would ask is: How do we define mission accomplished? What is the end goal that we are going to have? And where does that end happen? I certainly hope the end goal is not flying in military gear on an aircraft carrier with a banner behind it that says ''Mission Accomplished.'' Because we all know, there was no mission accomplished at that time. We need to have clear and definite goals of what it means to defeat ISIL and to make sure that that region can have some stability after the instability of so long that it has had.

So, in conclusion, the President has a constitutional obligation, I feel, to work with Congress before engaging in extended military operations. The public is still very war-weary. And while right now, polls may say people think we should get involved in Iraq and Syria with limited airstrikes, we have to have that much longer debate.

Clearly, the public beheadings of two American citizens has raised the ire of the American people and I think many in Congress. It is a different situation than it was a year ago. It is a different situation than it was a month ago. But at the same time, we have got to be sure that we are not falling into doing something that could be counterproductive because, clearly, ISIL did that to provoke a reaction, and I think that needs to be a part of the debate we have.

After being entangled in a global conflict for 13 years, we owe it to the American people and to the servicemen and -women and their families and the veterans who have already made tremendous sacrifices and the support of our country that we have a transparent and thorough debate on any action that would happen with ISIL in Syria or Iraq.

So those are my hopes. Those are my questions. I am looking forward to hearing the President tonight, and I am hoping that this body will be able to have that full debate so we know everything that we can possibly have for information prior to continuing and perhaps enhancing any actions there.

□ 1715

Now, I am very proud to be joined by other members of the Progressive Caucus. We have one of the most senior Members of this body, who has become a mentor and a friend to me, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you sincerely.

It looks like it is going to be pretty lonesome in this House. I have been looking since I have returned from the recess to see how a nation that is about to embark on another intrusion, military intrusion, what concerns we would have to have and to explain when we go home and tell our constituents that we have done this because of you, that your Nation's security was threatened.

Now, I agree with the gentleman that when we see these atrocities committed something should be done, but by us? Haven't we suffered enough? Haven't we sacrificed enough?

So few Members of Congress have to attend the funerals of those dedicated men and women. Less than 1 percent are making this sacrifice. There is no financial sacrifice being made, no tax put on the war, and people think that people are volunteering to put themselves in danger. Well, the families don't always feel the same way about it. And I have been involved in being a part of getting citizenship for people who have come to this country and enlisted and fought and died for this country, and I give the family a little flag.

Now, it wasn't too long ago that America was under the impression that enough is enough. We have lost. We have sacrificed enough. We have got to get Iraq on its feet, help stabilize the government, and then we will get on and deal with Syria.

Now, in the old days, when I was in the Army, we knew who the enemy was. They had uniforms. They had flags. But as I understand, the fluid situation that came to our intelligence during the recent recess, it seems as though ISIS is worse than al Qaeda and all the other evil terrorists that we have been involved with and that now some of them have acquired weapons that we have given to some of the Arab cults that were our friends, but somehow the weapons have been taken and are in the hands of people that I am not certain which ones are our friends.

Now, I know the President has said no boots on the ground. I don't know what that really means, that we don't expect to lose any American lives. I don't know whether that means that only drones will be used and that we can rest assured that no American in

uniform is going to be fighting anybody in that part of the world.

But since the threat to our national security appears to be so uncertain, and since the President believes he already has the power constitutionally to enter into this stage of engagement with this threat to our national security, and since I know that, polls notwithstanding, very few Americans are going to have a problem going to sleep tonight thinking about ISIS, it would seem to me that one of the ways that we could discuss and debate this is a part of what I was saying when I introduced the draft bill.

I don't want to see our young people having to serve in the military. I think it is good to have some type of public national service, but I don't think people should be trained to kill. But I know one thing. If the security of this great Nation is at risk, it shouldn't be less than 1 percent of America that has to be placed in harm's way.

So, even though most of the lives we lost started off with not troops going in initially, but consultants, advisors, and those that are going to instruct our friends to defend themselves, but ultimately the number gets larger and larger and larger. So I am going to submit some kind of way that one criteria that Members can use when going back home when their voters ask, ''Well, what was it that impressed you so much after all our country has suffered in getting involved, all the trillions of dollars, the 6,000 lives, what did they say that caused you to believe that our Nation was threatened?'' you might say that we had attached to that a draft bill, and we said that if it appeared as though our Nation was going to embark on a military excursion in another country, every American must be registered between certain ages, men and women, if they are able, to say our security has been threatened, and we should be proud as Americans to say that that is the reason why we have done that.

I bet you one thing. If that is what we were talking about this recess, neither party would be anxious not to have a vote on this, and we wouldn't be getting out of here tomorrow or the next day or the day after if we have to explain why someone's son, husband, or brother or sister may have to be involved in Selective Service because we felt in our hearts that our Nation's security was threatened.

So I, like you, want to hear what the President has to say. When Republicans come to the floor and say they are going to join with Democrats to support the President, that is something I haven't heard of in years. So I do hope that the President is able to bring us together with a better understanding as to we as Members of Congress and Representatives of the Nation's citizens and noncitizens, that we can come together, not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Members of the House of Representatives where the people govern. And all of us would feel better in knowing it is not an easy choice, but we are convinced that it was the best choice.

So thank you so much for taking the time out, and I only hope that 435 of our Members would be doing the same thing so I can leave more secure in knowing that I have done the right thing. Thank you so much for the opportunity.

Mr. POCAN. Representative RANGEL, you have been an outspoken advocate for equality within the draft, making sure that everyone understands that there is an expense when we go into war. As someone who has had several nephews personally get involved and plenty of constituents, those decisions are something that are mighty, and this body has to have that as part of that debate, and that is why we should have that debate. Thank you so much for your time and your efforts.

One of the other issues that is extremely important that this body get done before we leave is addressing income inequality and addressing how we can best help those who need help the most, those who are aspiring to be in the middle class and helping the middle class. One of the very best ways and one of the priorities of the Democrats in this House is to give America a raise, to raise the minimum wage, through a bill that we have, to $10.10, to make sure that people have more money in their pockets. When that money is in their pockets, they will spend it in the community, and that will lift the economy and help create more jobs. It is exactly what we need right now.

For too long, we have not raised the minimum wage. If the minimum wage were the same and kept up with inflation from 1967, it would be well over $10.60 an hour. And we are not. We are at a much lower rate, and we need to have that.

One of my colleagues from California has been an outspoken advocate for raising the minimum wage, and I yield some time to my colleague from the great State of California, Mr. ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about working families, and I will be talking about the minimum wage.

I just want to preface that it was an honor to listen to Congressman RANGEL really talk about what is probably the most important issue before us in terms of how we as a deliberative body deal with issues of war and peace and where our Nation is going. I, too, hope that we have, as this goes on, a really thoughtful discussion as you have laid out for us tonight. And I hope that we follow up with what the President says later on tonight and that, when we reconvene, we do talk about this in a very, very thoughtful, thoughtful way.

But I am also concerned about how working families and individuals are struggling to make a living on our current minimum wage of $7.25. That is why I think Congressman POCAN and my colleagues and I are discussing this issue. It is a key component of raising this minimum wage, of closing the opportunity gap and building an economy that works for our working families.

We spend a lot of time in this body talking about building the economy. We spend time discussing tax breaks for large corporations. But really what we should be about is: How do we rebuild the middle class? How do we give people an opportunity to join the middle class? Raising the minimum wage is a critical component.

By raising it from $7.25 to $10.10 an hour, we would lift 900,000 Americans out of poverty. Do we raise it into wealth? No. We just take the first step. And this is a minimum step. It would raise it for 28 million people, including more than—in my home State, 2.7 million Californians live below the poverty level, working Californians, we are talking about, live below.

Who are they? Seventy percent of them are women. The average age is not as it is often told to us, young people, 18 to 25. We are talking about the average age of a person on minimum wage is 35 years of age. That is a significant year.

I think I meant to say 1.3 million Californians in my State. It is going to raise it for 2.7 million, and of those, almost a million and a half are women who would be impacted by an increase.

This is a bill we are talking about that is a bill that was put forth by Senator TOM HARKIN and Congressman GEORGE MILLER, and it is going to go have a tremendous impact upon job growth. Sometimes we hear, well, if you raise the minimum wage, we are going to lose jobs. But if we really get through the scare tactics, we will listen to what people who are experts and who have studied the issue have said, that a recent analysis by the Economic Policy Institute has calculated that a higher minimum wage within 3 years creates 85,000 new jobs and it has a boost of almost $22 billion into the economy.

So, when we raise the minimum wage, we are talking about protecting families, protecting individuals. We as a Congress have, I think, a responsibility to support those families who are the foundation of our workforce. And now is not time to turn our backs on the people who are raising the next generation. We are talking about working families. We need to help the men, women, and children who provide the foundation for our economy and our country, who are raising the next generation.

If we cannot provide an adequate wage for Americans who are living in poverty and working, why are we here? What is our role? Our role, I think, is to listen to those working Americans who are desperately trying to make ends meet, who work two and three jobs, and say: We hear you; it makes economic sense for the Nation; we will support you. And we should not leave this Congress until we take the first

step, and that is to raise the minimum wage to at least $10.10 an hour.

□ 1730

It is a minimum raise of the minimum wage.

So with that, I thank you for providing me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. POCAN. If I could just ask you, gentlemen, one question—and I will go to Mr. RANGEL again for a comment.

Let me ask you a question. The leadership in this House, the Republican leadership, has refused to schedule a bill to raise the minimum wage, and we have one other device to do that called the discharge petition.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Yes.

Mr. POCAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if you signed the discharge petition so that we can force a vote in this House to raise the minimum wage in the remaining weeks we have before we finish the session for the year.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Absolutely would I sign a discharge petition, one of the most important things that we can do.

Mr. POCAN. And we have done that.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. All we are asking for is a right to vote.

I still remember when the President came, in his State of the Union speech, and it was really just after—in my first year here in the Congress and he was talking about the horrible episode that happened at Sandy Hook and said, ''Give the people the vote. Just give us a vote.''

That is all we are asking our Republican colleagues. Let us vote on raising the minimum wage. That is all. That is the democratic way and ''democratic'' with a small D. That is the American way. Give the people a vote.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL.

Because that is the problem—we have been told the Speaker won't schedule the vote, but there are other ways. Every single Member of this body can sign a discharge petition, and if we get a majority of us, 218 of us, to sign that, it will come to this body. So there are no excuses not to get this done.

I would like to yield to my good friend from New York, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. We were talking about war and peace. To me, we are still talking about a moral issue.

Here in this great Nation, the richest in the world, we are asking people to work 40 hours, many without sick leave, many without vacations or vacation pay, and—at the end of the day—end up in poverty. There is something terribly wrong with that picture.

It seems to me that it goes beyond just doing the right and the moral thing. Even churches and synagogues and mosques should recognize that their membership is going down because you can't pay the rent, buy the food, and still give your money to the religious institutions.

Beyond that, what are they going to do with the money? I will tell you: they are going to be able to get nutritional diets for their kids. They will be able to buy clothes for their kids. They can aspire that their kids get a better education and be able to get higher jobs and have higher ambitions.

They can make America more productive because they have more self-esteem because being poor is not the worst thing in the world, if you feel that you can come out of that poverty and you have an opportunity to do it.

There is something worse going on in this country today. I was privileged years ago to sponsor a bill that we all know is the earned income tax credit, and the earned income tax credit says this shouldn't happen. If you have got a family and, after you follow the Federal formula, you are still poor, why, we will give you a check. You won't owe taxes; we will give you a refundable check.

Guess what? Some of the people that are hiring these people at very low wages also hire accountants that advise the potential applicant how to become eligible for the earned income tax credit. So they give a little bit, the government gives a little bit, and the people still end up poor.

It just seems to me this is not a Democratic issue; it is not a Republican issue. It is an issue of: What does America stand for? Where is the equity involved if we are not going to allow our country to be pumped up by the middle class people who made this country great?

We are not a country of rich and poor folks. It is the middle class that have demands, that want to go to the local store, so that they can sell and hire people and have communities that feel proud about themselves.

I know one thing: with the rents that are going up in communities all over this country and people who used to consider themselves middle class, you miss one or two payments of your rent—and Judge Judy doesn't want to ask you what were the circumstances.

If you didn't pay your rent, you are going to get evicted. If you don't have resources, if you have no place to go, you can go from a plateau that you thought was middle class into a homeless shelter.

Getting out of that situation and seeking employment is almost impossible. How much does it cost? Hundreds of billions of dollars in social costs because you wouldn't give Americans an opportunity to earn a living wage.

So it is lonely down here with you guys, but I do hope before we leave that we can have not just Democrats, but all of the Members be able to go back home and say, ''I was late getting this started, but we do have the issues, and we are going to make you proud.''

Thank you so much for taking the time to allow us to express what we know most people believe, but politically, they can't support.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Mr. RANGEL.

One of the things I look at—it is pretty simple math to someone like me, coming from America's heartland, when productivity is going up and wages are flat, the money is going somewhere.

In 1988, the average CEO made 40 times the lowest-paid employee. Now, it is 354 times the lowest-paid employee. Now, if you put extra money in the pockets through raising the minimum wage of someone who is in the middle class or aspiring to be in the middle class, it is going to go back into the economy. If they can afford a long weekend vacation to the Wisconsin Dells in my area, that helps boost the economy, helps create jobs—but you know what? That CEO can't take 354 vacations to make up for it.

Clearly, when the money goes into the pockets of those who need it the most, it is going to go instantly into the economy, help create jobs, and help do everything that we need to, to stimulate the economy to the point that we can be as great as we possibly can be.

To me, it is a no-brainer. I think to many of the constituents I talk to it is a no-brainer.

You are very articulate in talking about the troubles that people go through in trying to just get by. It is another thing this body simply has to take up before we leave.

If we don't take this up before November, quite honestly, those who didn't try to take it up shouldn't come back because we need people who will take it up because it is the will of the people. Democrats, Independents, and even Republicans are looking at this as an issue that is important and has to happen.

Again, thank you so much for all your work on this for so many years. ALAN LOWENTHAL and I are freshman here. We are the newbies. We are taking up the fight, but you have been doing it for so many years and been a mentor to so many of us. Again, thank you, Mr. RANGEL, and thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. LOWENTHAL went through all the numbers for the State of California. It has the same effect in my State of Wisconsin. When you look at it, if you raise that minimum wage to $10.10, as the bill from Senator HARKIN does and the one that Representative GEORGE MILLER from California has introduced in this body, not only is it 28 million people in this country that will get a raise, but it is half a million people just in my home State of Wisconsin, a half million people.

One of the things that I have heard sometimes when you talk to people, they say, ''If you raise the minimum wage, all you are doing is giving extra pocket money to teenagers who are living with their parents.''

Well, that is one of the great myths that is out there because here is the reality: the average age of a minimum wage worker is 35 years old. When you look at the exact breakout of who it is, 90 percent are over 20 years old, and

more than half of them are older than 25 years old.

You are not talking about a teenager living at home. You are talking about people who are living independently in the community, trying to get by on $7.35 an hour or close to $15,000 a year, in a job that often has no benefits—health benefits, pension, et cetera.

Fifty-five percent of the people on minimum wage are working full time. Forty-four percent have some type of college education, an associate degree or bachelor's degree or other higher education. That is the reality of the minimum wage worker in this country. It is not the myth of a teenager living at home, looking for some pocket money.

These are hardworking people trying to get by, often on two or three jobs, without the benefits. Without that ability, if they miss their rent, they get evicted, and then they are homeless. As Mr. RANGEL said, these are some of the same people that then show up on our health plans that States provide for being low-income.

So you know who then is subsidizing their salaries? We all are. Every single individual who is a taxpayer pays into those programs. While that employer may not offer a wage that they can live on, we all subsidize it, so that they can actually get something as basic as health care.

So there is a real need to pass the Fair Minimum Wage Act that is proposed. We have tried and tried in this body to get a vote on it. We have signed a discharge petition. Virtually every Democrat in the House of Representatives has signed that.

We need those Republicans, especially those Republicans who are on record supporting a minimum wage, to also sign that, so we can get a vote before we leave in a few weeks, before the November elections, before the end of the year—because I think a question that I would want to ask my Representative when I see them in the community in the coming weeks before the election is: What have they done to help make the middle class stronger? What have they done to help people who are aspiring to be in the minimum class? What have we got done in Congress?

There was a Congress in 1948 that was called the do-nothing Congress because they got so little done. The first year of that session, they passed 350 bills. Last year, this body passed 88.

Here we are sitting another week back in Congress, and we haven't raised the minimum wage, we haven't passed equal pay for equal work so that women make just as much as men do, and we haven't done anything about the affordability of higher education, allowing students to refinance their loans.

These are simple issues that aren't partisan issues. They are not Democratic/Republican. They are not liberal/conservative. They are about whether or not you are fighting for the middle class and those who aspire to be in the middle class or whether you are here trying to help out the special interests and the lobbyists who represent the special interests. It is really that simple.

So we need to pass a raise for the American people. That means you pass an increase in the minimum wage. As other Members have said, it will lift so many people out of poverty and give a raise to so many people to help stimulate the economy.

So the Progressive Caucus is fighting each and every single day while we are here for a variety of issues: raising the minimum wage, trying to stop wage theft in this country, trying to extend unemployment insurance so that everyone who is out of work can still get some benefits while they are looking for work so that they can get that job. We all know the best social program is a job, and we want to make sure that everyone can get that job.

We need to continue to do the things that Congress needs to get done and we have not gotten done. So the minimum wage is one issue that we wanted to talk about today.

As we have the President speaking to us this evening, we want to make sure that this body has a very full and rich debate. As we passed in a bipartisan way, 370–40, we need to have a real debate and have real questions answered before we get involved, so that we never again have what happened the last time we got involved in Iraq because we are back again. There was no ''mission accomplished.'' A banner and a fly-in in military gear is not a successful end to an involvement.

We need to make sure whatever we do this time is thoughtful, done with consultation of Congress, with narrow scope, and with a partnership with other nations specifically in the region to make sure that we are doing this not alone or not largely alone.

With that, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus appreciates this time this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

ISSUES FACING THE NATION

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my colleagues across the aisle talking about the economy and pushing for a raise in minimum wage because that is what a party does after their party has totally devastated the economy. It is what you do after your party's President, with help from the majority in the Senate led by HARRY REID, are able to just wreak havoc with an economy that should be doing really well.

This economy is ready to take off. ObamaCare, as we have said for over 4 years, is going to harm the economy. It is going to knock people out of work. It is going to put people from full time to part time. Republicans have been explaining this ever since not one of us voted for that bill. We also explained there were $716 billion in cuts to Medicare.

A lot of seniors that vote Democrat voted for this President, voted for a Democratic majority in the Senate. They have now been shocked this year as they are not getting the health care they once did. Why? Because of ObamaCare—seniors are getting mistreated.

When we want to talk about the economy, the most staggering numbers I can imagine have come out in the last year, and the President has even acknowledged it was true. He complains we are not doing enough for the middle class.

Well, we agree with that. We certainly agree with that. We need to help those that are not making enough money. Then quit knocking them out of their jobs, Mr. President, HARRY REID. We have got over 360 bills down at the Senate. Passage of just 10 of them would help this economy, but they won't bring them up.

So the devastating, most incredible numbers are these: since Barack Obama has been President of the United States, for the first time in our Nation's history—it has never ever happened before in any President's tenure, whether it was 4 years or 8 years or shortened by tragedy, no President before Barack Obama has ever presided over an economy in the United States in which 95 percent of all the income in the United States went to the top 1 percent, never ever.

Only under the leadership of President Barack Obama, of all the Presidents, only this President has brought us to the place where 95 percent of all of the income in America goes to the top 1 percent.

People wonder why there is so much money that flooded into the Obama campaign in 2008. Not as much flooded into his campaign in 2012 because there was some people losing money. The economy wasn't doing as well as expected.

Is there anything more devastating than a President acknowledging the fact that 95 percent of all income has gone to the top 1 percent? Then he gives speeches and talks to people like he can't understand how the Republicans could allow this big growth between the poor and the rich. Well, we need the President to tell us how he has done it, but the trouble is we know how he has done it.

He talks about fat cats and then makes sure that they are the ones that get rewarded. He talks about going after Big Oil and proposes a bill that would do nothing to hurt Big Oil, but would absolutely have devastated independent oil producers who actually drill and produce around 95 percent or so of the United States' oil and gas wells.

Because of this President's ObamaCare, because of his overregulation, because of his top-down demands from the EPA wanting to usurp all authority for people that couldn't find their rears with both hands, they are the ones that are telling industry how to run their industries.

This President has created a mess. He demonizes companies for trying to survive by moving to a country that has a corporate income tax rate that is a fraction of the rate we have.

We now have the largest—the highest corporate tax in the world, and this President thinks the answer is more taxes. He has never been educated by people who know how an economy really works, people like Arthur Laffer that helped Ronald Reagan get the economy going after President Carter nearly killed it.

He has never sat down at the feet of people really who understand economies and what makes them work, what makes them fail. So he doesn't understand that when government uses its heavy, heavy hand, they hurt economies.

When the President pronounces laws out of his mouth that have never passed Congress and makes that the newly-enforced law, then it creates havoc in the economy because capital goes where it feels safest.

When you have a President, like a dictator, that just pronounces new laws because he doesn't like what Congress has passed and prior Presidents have signed, then companies are not going to be able to survive very well in that environment, so they move on and go somewhere where they can survive better.

The answer to getting people better jobs and higher wages is not to mandate further regulation. The answer is to lower the corporate tax, draw more companies back here, so that people can have better jobs, people can have more jobs.

I know at some point—because there is so much intelligence in the African American community, I know at some point a majority are going to figure out that the Democrats have done massive damage to the African American communities and that the answer is not making them more dependent on the Federal Government, but in pushing them to reach their potential, to reach for the sky, not with Federal handouts, but with good-paying jobs.

I was in Marshall, Texas, just in the last few weeks. There was a young African American who has been out of school for a while. He was so excited because he had been able to go through the 5-week truck driving school there, was getting his commercial driver's license, and for the first time in his life, he was going to get a good job paying $40,000 to $42,000. It excited me seeing him so excited. He is just a huggable guy that was so thrilled.

So now that he had a job promise that was coming up in a couple of weeks when he finished and he knew how much he was going to make and that, in 3 years, he had the chance of making $100,000, that he has now gotten engaged—because he wanted to wait until he had a job and he could take care of his wife and they could take care of each other.

He didn't want to be on the Federal dole. He wanted to provide for himself. This man had all kinds of capability, and now, he is going to be able to meet it, not because of this President or the overregulation, but because he took a 5-week training program and was going to get a good job.

That is where you help people, not in the handouts, but in the hand helping to rise up to the potential that God has given them.

Some have claimed Republicans have a war on women, that women only make 70 percent of what the men have. There are so many false statistics that are quoted. We know it is very unfortunate. We are very sorry that the White House penalizes women and rewards men because the men make a lot more in the same top positions than the women do. So apparently, that does happen some places, and we hope the President will address it in his own White House lawn, in his own house and yard.

The fact is if across the country everybody was paying women only 70 percent of what they paid men for the same job—people are smarter than the President realizes—they would be hiring nothing but women because they work for so much cheaper.

That is one of the problems that the African American community has. When huge businesses combined with the Democratic Party to bring in and lure as many illegal aliens into this country as they can and start giving massive numbers of amnesty, then they are not going to have as many job opportunities, and they are not going to make as much money.

People are beginning to see that in the African American community. That is why their unemployment rate is so much higher than that in other ethnic communities and the overall unemployment rate—such damage to such wonderful people.

Just like that young man in Marshall, Texas, another—he was a much older guy, big guy, African American, just thrilled for the man because he is graduating, he has got a job coming up, he has been out of work so long.

You don't help people by saying, ''We are going to pay you for a year not to work.'' You help create an environment where there are jobs where you can reach your potential.

Mr. Speaker, the question that my friends ought to be asking is, ''Why is one job no longer enough for so many Americans?'' If we get to the bottom of it, you will find out. ObamaCare is a problem, overregulation is a problem, stifling America becoming energy independent by propping up forms of energy that do not create a profit unless they are propped up by taxpayer dollars—let this economy run. Let people reach their potential.

One other thing: I know the President is going to be making a speech on Syria. I literally thank God that the President was not able to do a bombing campaign like he wanted to do a year ago, in which he literally would have done so much damage to—not a good man, but the leader in Syria, Assad, that it would have allowed ISIS to be in charge now. People across America have figured out ISIS is a threat to all of us.

I will wait to see what the President has to say, but when you know that the President was wrong about Egypt, about the Muslim Brotherhood taking over in Egypt, was wrong when he was pushing to keep the Muslim Brotherhood and a tyrant like Morsi in charge in Egypt, when over a third of the population in Egypt came to the streets and said, ''We don't want radical Islam; and you, America, under Barack Obama, you helped us with a constitution that doesn't even include impeachment, it is shari'a law''—and they have now passed a constitution that requires the Christian churches and Jewish synagogues be rebuilt with government money, and this administration continues to be heavy-handed against them because they didn't want radical Islamists in charge.

□ 1800

In Libya, as moderate Muslims in the Middle East have told me in visits over there: None of us really liked Qadhafi, but he was helping you and helping us against terrorism and you helped al Qaeda-backed rebels take him out.

But for America's bombing, the radical Islamists would not have control of Libya, Algeria, or Tunisia today. Thank God for the Egyptians rising up and saying, as moderate Muslims, as secularists: We stand with the Jews and the Christians, and we don't want radical Islamists running our country.

I hope this country—our country's leadership, at least, under the President—will wake up. Stop hurting the freedom-loving Egyptians that don't want the radical Islamists you supported in Egypt back in charge of Egypt. Don't help ISIS in Syria. Don't help them in Iraq. And if he had just signed the Status of Forces Agreement that President Bush had all but had ready to sign, getting cute with that so it fell apart, then we wouldn't be having all these problems today in Iraq and Syria that we are.

He is getting horrible advice, and it is time the President took a hard look at who he really gets advice from, because the moderate Muslims in the world don't want radical Islam taking over and they don't, as they have told me privately, like the people that this President has advising him.

The economy is ready to take off, if this President will get out of the way, and people can make money and get back to where one job is enough for a person to make it and do well. And if

we cut down on the massive expenses ObamaCare is causing, we can get rid of that and get back to real health care reform. Because even if you save $100, $200 a month, that would get you a vacation that people have not gotten this year.

There is so much we can do for America if the government of this country, the people at the top of the government, will just finally realize the American people have more answers than we do, and then they will show us.

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

U.S. ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to talk about the United States economy. I want to talk about the number one thing that politicians talk about when they ask you to support them when they are on the campaign trail, and that is that we want to put America to work.

I know what it is like to put America to work because I am very proud to say that, before I got elected to office, my full-time job was to put Americans to work. I owned a business, and there were dozens of families who depended on me as the leader of that business, as the owner of that business, to make sure that we were successful. So I had to do my job so that dozens of people could go to work and do their job.

Every year, millions of Americans go to the polls and hope and pray and think and expect that their elected people are going to focus on putting America to work. But unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, the leadership of this House under Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has been delinquent in doing one simple thing, and that is to focus on bills that create jobs. In some cases, it is bills that move government out of the way to make sure that people can put people to work in private industry. In some cases, it is about changing laws that are broken and old and just don't work for today's economy, changing those laws to make sure that Americans can go to work.

Democrats have made jump-starting our economy a priority, and I believe in that priority. Since I have been elected to Congress, I have been fighting for that priority to try to get bills heard in our committees that will create jobs, that will move America forward, and that will move Americans who are hard-pressed and want to get off of the unemployment lines back into work. I have been trying to get them through committee and eventually to the floor of this House so we can have the debates and we can cast our votes for America. Unfortunately, those bills just languish, sitting somewhere in the corner, and don't see the light of day.

For example, the biggest bill to ever pass either the House or the United States Senate since this 113th Congress has come into session was a bill that was passed by the United States Senate with bipartisan support. There are 100 United States Senators, ladies and gentlemen, and 68—Democrats and Republicans—voted ''aye,'' voted ''yes,'' voted affirmatively for that bill. If this House would have taken up that bill, or H.R. 15, a bill that looks just like it, that would have boosted our economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, you hear people all the time right now today on the campaign trail saying, ''Reelect me,'' or, ''Elect me,'' and they are talking about the economy and talking about deficit reduction. That one bill was analyzed by a third party. It was not analyzed by the Democrats, not analyzed by the Republicans, not even analyzed by the Independents. It was analyzed by a third party whose job is just to call it like it is. That bill, if passed by Congress and put on the President's desk, would give us an opportunity to have a deficit reduction of at least $900 billion. But that bill doesn't see the light of day—not in this House.

That bill has not been taken up in this House. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has said over and over: I'm not going to take up that bill. I'm not going to take up that issue. I'm not going to support the American economy with that bill. I'm not going to do the right thing by America and give the economy of the United States of America the biggest boost we could ever see coming out of the actions of the United States Senate and this House of Congress.

It has been sitting here in this House in the corner collecting dust while too many Americans are having their unemployment run out, while too many Americans are losing their homes, while too many Americans are telling their children: I'm sorry, son, we can't afford to continue to send you to college. We don't have any money because we don't have a job.

The United States economy can do better, but unfortunately, it is because this Congress chooses not to do the right thing that the United States economy moves along slowly, picking up just a little bit. That is not good enough. That is not right.

What I am doing here at this moment tonight and the reason why I came to this floor, the reason why I asked the Speaker to give me some time to speak on an important issue—the economy of the United States of America—is because it tears me apart to know that the lack of leadership in this House and the lack of leadership of Speaker BOEHNER is crippling our economy.

We have $900 billion of deficit reduction wrapped up in one bill, and that bill has sat in this House and has not heard a debate in any committee. It has not heard a debate on the floor of this House. The people that you elected have not had an opportunity. The 435 Members of the United States Congress have not had an opportunity to stake a claim on whether or not they believe that we ought to put Americans to work, that we ought to get out of the way and fix a law that is broken, a law that does not work, a law that should have been changed a long time ago; but we can change it at any moment on any given day in this House, and this Speaker refuses to allow that to happen.

What is going on right now in the United States Congress is just like what happens in your home or sometimes in a workplace. Let's say you have a family and everybody in the family has been assigned their chores, their responsibilities. Let's say you have a workplace where everybody has their job duties and their titles.

In the United States Congress, we have our chores and we have our responsibilities. Our job is to pass laws to help America move forward and to make sure that all the different dynamics of the number one economy in the world can flourish. That is our job. But the United States Congress, this House, has refused to do its job.

What is going on is just like that example I gave you. Let's say in your home one member of your family chooses not to do their part. You know what happens? Something good eventually happens. Somebody in that house, somebody in that home, somebody in that workplace sees that that job is not getting done, even if it is not their primary responsibility, and they think of the bigger picture. They think of the whole family, the whole house, the whole home. That person in the workplace thinks of the whole body of workers there and says: Somebody ought to take that job and get it done, even though so-and-so isn't doing their part—and that is their job.

Congress is not doing its job. It is not passing this law. But you know what happens eventually? Somebody walks over there and does it themselves, even though it is not their primary responsibility. But we ought to be grateful that there are people like that in every community, in every household, in every business, in every work environment. But not in this House, not as long as JOHN BOEHNER, our Speaker, chooses not to allow us to have a debate, to do our job, to have a vote. Maybe it passes, maybe it fails, but our job as Members of Congress is to legislate, put ideas, good, bad, and otherwise, before the Members of this House and vote up or down, ''yea'' or ''nay'', ''yes'' or ''no,'' to move America forward and let the votes fall where they may.

There is a bill that has been languishing in this House for close to a year and a half, and the bottom line is we have not taken up our duties and our responsibilities. As a result of that, in another branch of government there is that one person—not 435, not 100—that says: I want to move the economy of the United States of America forward. I want to fix a broken system. I want to see it fixed. I want Congress to

put this on my desk so that I can do my job and sign it and watch Americans go back to work. All of a sudden, the one person who says: Since you won't do your job, I will go over there and to the best of my ability, to the extent that I legally can, I am just going to have to do as much as I can, lift as much as I can and do the heavy lifting because Congress won't, and he gets criticized.

□ 1815

That is a shame, ladies and gentlemen. That is a shame.

When, in the workplace, or somebody's household, somebody decides to step over and say, you know what, since you won't do it, and it is the right thing to do, I am going to do it. And then they criticize that person. He is the bad guy.

No, no, no, ladies and gentlemen. The bad guy, the bad person is the one that says, I know I have duties, I know I have responsibilities, I just don't want to do it because I can say I don't want to. And if I don't want to, it doesn't get done, at least not in this House.

That is what is going on, ladies and gentlemen. The United States Congress is sitting on a bill that will supercharge the economy of the United States of America, to the tune of deficit reduction of as much as $900 billion with one bill, one vote of this House. And our current speaker, the Republican leader, does not want to let that happen.

The President of the United States is another branch of government. The President of the United States is part of that balance of power. But when one branch of government is delinquent, is derelict in their duties, there comes a time where that person has to say, hey, what can I legally do? I want to step up. I want to put America to work and, as a result of that, has to take action.

Now, to me, that is a duty bestowed upon every single one of us elected officials, and I am so disappointed that I got elected to a Congress that has been labeled as a do-nothing Congress. I got elected to a Congress that the statistics, not just opinions, but the facts show that this Congress has passed so few laws that people can actually legitimately say that we are do-nothing Congress.

That is a shame. We have responsibilities to this country. When we act responsibly, we make our country what it is, the best country on the planet, and when that happens, the whole world is a better place. But that has not been this 113th Congress, not under this Speaker, not now.

But the most important thing that I want to get across today, that could change. That could change tomorrow morning. We could have that bill on the floor of this Congress tomorrow. We could have it on this floor next week, and we can unleash what Americans go to vote for, and that is action.

Let the votes fall where they may, ladies and gentlemen. Our duty, as Congress, is to hear bills on this floor, have the debate from the left and from the right, from the center and all, come one, come all, Members of Congress, and then the Speaker says, open the roll, and there go the votes, green ones, red ones, ''yea,'' ''nay.''

But just on that one bill, ladies and gentlemen, more Americans will go to work as a result of one piece of legislation than any other thing that this Congress has been poised to do in this 113th Congress.

So right now, as the clock ticks, as Congress might adjourn in just a couple of weeks or so, it is going to be left for another branch of government to decide to move this economy forward, to put Americans to work.

That is a shame. That is not the way it should be. That is not the way it was designed to be.

But the Constitution of the United States, you have all heard it, everybody who has taken government class, it is called the balance of powers: executive branch, judicial branch, the legislative branch.

But when one of those branches is derelict in their duties, as this House has been derelict in their duty to put Americans to work, it takes a committed American, it takes a brave American, to step up and say, ''I will do it''; to be careful about how it is done, to be doing it in a way that is legal and does follow the Constitution of the United States of America.

But more importantly, ladies and gentlemen, to get the job done, to put America to work, to break a broken system, to break a set of laws and renew that into a law, into action that will actually put America to work and allow us to continue to be the great Nation that we have become.

But, unfortunately, there is a piece of our government, this House, that is not living up to that greatness. It is not living up to its responsibilities. It is not living up to its duties, this House, this do-nothing Congress.

When I say do-nothing Congress, that is so painful to me. I am the son of parents who used to wake me up, sometimes before the sun came up, to go to work in my father's business. And what my father used to tell me—I was 5, 6 years old when he had me working with him—he used to say, son, the work is not done. We have got to keep working.

Sometimes, so much that my hands would bleed, and I would put on my best crying game and I would say, Dad, look, my hands are bleeding. Can I sit in the truck?

My father was a handyman. We used to clean fields and clear out houses or whatever odd job that people had for us. He would take me to work with him. And I remember the first time I thought I was going to be able to sit it out and not do my part because my hands were bleeding. I had blisters, they turned into—they busted, and then they turned into blood, and I showed them to my dad and I tried to give him my best sob story.

And he told me, son, the work is not done. We have got to get back to work. Now get back to work.

Oh, I hated him for it.

That is a leader, someone who can look someone in the eye and say, you need to be what you need to be right now. And that is someone who gets the job done, not someone who looks for excuses, not someone who tells stories, not someone who tries to get off the hook. You need to be the person that gets the job done.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, this House is not the House that gets the job done. It hurts for me to say that. I hate saying it. But sometimes the truth hurts. That is not my opinion, ladies and gentlemen. I am just restating the facts.

I hated my father when he taught me that lesson. But it wasn't until I grew up, and it wasn't until I had to put food on the table for my family, it wasn't until I grew up and ran my own business, that I realized that it is not about the easy way out. It is not about quitting. It is not about being derelict in your duties. It is about accepting your responsibilities, acting out on those responsibilities, working through your responsibilities, not making up stories, not holding press conferences and hoodwinking the American public into thinking that it can't be done.

No, no, no, ladies and gentlemen. We can take care of business on this floor from today to tomorrow and get a bill to the other House, or take a bill from the Senate, take it through this House and get it to the President overnight.

So any time some Congressman or U.S. Senator tells you, no, no, no, there is not enough time, as long as there is at least 1 day, 1 day of legislation left—oh, as a matter of fact, both Houses have the authority to call back their entire House and say, our business is not done. We can get it done tomorrow. Call every Member of Congress, call every Member of the United States Senate to their Chamber, and say, we have got work to do.

There is no time off for us. There is no time away from these Chambers, we are going to get the work done.

But this House chooses not to do its job.

Some people might think, well, this Congressman, this Congressman CÁRDENAS, he is kind of talking a little strong about this House. You better believe it. We are the Congress of the United States of America.

There have been moments in this House where we have been applauded by America for the kind of bravery and the kind of work that gets done in this House. That hasn't happened much lately, not in the 113th Congress.

One bill, ladies and gentlemen, one bill has been sitting in this House, languishing, collecting dust, while millions of Americans are out of work. That is a shame. That is a shame.

I wish there were more Members of this Congress like my father, who knew how to get the job done, who knew how

to focus on the people that depended on him, who had a ''don't quit'' attitude.

My father was a man of few words. Few words. But when he spoke, he was serious, he was forthright, and he got the job done. And he had the guts, he had the fortitude, he had the character to know that sometimes, when it meant him getting the job done, it meant that maybe he wasn't going to be too popular, even with his own son.

I am so glad, so proud to be the son of a man and a woman, Maria and Andres Cárdenas, who taught me how to go to work every single day, and whatever my duties were, whatever my responsibilities were, it wasn't about me, it was about the work that I committed to do and to get it done.

Every week I leave my family in my district in California, in the San Fernando Valley, and I kiss them goodbye, and I hope and pray that they put me to work, that I get to do the work that I was elected to do. But that hasn't been happening in this House.

And I am not alone, ladies and gentlemen. I talk to a lot of Members of this House and they feel the same. They want to move America forward. They want to get this economy up and running the way it should be, the way America deserves to be.

□ 1830

This House refuses to help make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I really do hope and pray that we can put America to work, that we can pass a bill that will create $900 billion of deficit reduction opportunity. I hope and pray that we can do that. Unfortunately, it is not up to me. I am not making excuses, ladies and gentlemen. It is not up to me. I do not have the authority or the ability to put a bill in the House of Congress.

I have introduced bills. That is my right—I can introduce bills, and I do do that—but the only person who has the authority to decide if a bill will be heard by this House is the Speaker of this House, and he is elected Republican JOHN BOEHNER. He is the man. He is the person who refuses to put a bill on the floor of this House, so that every Member of Congress can have the opportunity to do his job and help put America to work.

I am a proud American, and I am so honored and privileged to be a Member of the United States Congress, to represent the 29th District in California, the place that I was born and raised in and the community that I love. It is just a microcosm of what this great Nation is about, what it is, and my hands are tied. I am not making excuses, ladies and gentlemen. I am just telling you the truth.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, please, please put that bill on this floor. Put it in motion. Do your job, so that we can do our jobs, so that Americans can have jobs, so that we, as Members of this Congress, can put America to work.

We have a broken immigration system, and one bill can fix that. We have a broken system in this country, and that one bill will put $900 billion toward deficit reduction for America. That one bill will unleash our economy and create hundreds of thousands of opportunities for Americans to go back to work.

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

REAUTHORIZE THE ZADROGA ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the 13th anniversary of the terrorist attack of 9/11. It is a day for us to remember and mourn those we lost, to comfort those who suffer still, and to honor those who responded on that day with courage and determination.

In New York on those dark days, there were thousands of anonymous civilians and first responders who, without a second's thought, gave their aid. They ran into burning buildings to save the lives of others. It is a day on which we lost 3,000 people, and thousands more lost their health in the wake of 9/11.

In response to the health crisis that the responders and others faced, this Congress came together in a bipartisan way and introduced the Zadroga Act. The Zadroga Act would provide health care to those who risked their lives to save the lives of others.

Whenever we talk about 9/11, we have to acknowledge the heroes and heroines of 9/11, some who lost their lives that day and those who are still sick and dying from the injuries and illnesses related to 9/11. As a Congress, we came together in groups all over America to comfort one another, and we stood together in our Nation's capital and vowed that we would never forget.

Never forget means that we don't forget next year or today, but we are always there to honor and to provide the health care to those who risked their lives to save the lives of others that day.

We came together this week in New York with a determination to put forward a reauthorization of the Zadroga Act for 25 years, which would continue this program, so that the certainty would be there, so that the services and health care would be there for the first responders, the victims, the residents, and others who became ill.

That vow of never forget comes with an obligation on the part of Congress, which is to ensure that we as a country remember, honor, and care for those who are now sick and for those who may still become sick from exposure to the deadly toxin mixes down at 9/11, mixes of fuel and glass and toxins and all kinds of chemicals that they breathed that day.

A major piece of that promise was the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act. This legislation established the World Trade Center Health Program to provide medical monitoring and treatment for 9/11-related illnesses and reopened the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to provide for economic losses and harm incurred from the aftermath of the attacks.

We know that there are thousands of individuals with at least one 9/11-related illness or injury. That includes over 2,900 people in the World Trade Center Health Program who have been diagnosed with cancer.

We know that more than 800 New York Fire Department members and more than 550 New York Police Department personnel are struggling with serious 9/11-related illnesses.

We know that we have already lost over 70 firefighters and 60 New York Police Department officers who have died from their 9/11-related illnesses since 9/11. These are people who got sick while working at the pile, and they have died because of their exposure.

We must continue to provide the specialized medical monitoring and care these heroes received through the World Trade Center Health Program and continue to provide economic compensation for the terrible costs they have borne by caring for those who cared so much for us.

As it stands, the Zadroga Act is set to expire in October 2015, yet the medical and economic crises of sick 9/11 responders and suffering survivors will not end in 2 years. They will only get worse over time. Research shows significantly higher rates of cancer among the 9/11 population, a disease with a long latency period. Diseases can take decades to manifest themselves.

That is why I plan to introduce, along with PETER KING, JERRY NADLER, the New York delegation, and many others, legislation that would reauthorize the Zadroga Act's program for 25 years.

Named after Detective Zadroga, who was the first to die from 9/11-related injuries, many others have been helped through this important program. It would continue the specialized Centers of Excellence, the national health program, the research into new medical conditions, and the victims compensation fund for those who may develop 9/11 illnesses later and suffer related economic damages.

This is not just a New York issue, and I would like to share this map with my colleagues to demonstrate how widespread it is. This map shows that there were first responders and volunteers who came from every corner of America.

They returned to their hometowns, and that is why we have Centers of Excellence across this country to serve the responders and the volunteers who came to 9/11. Many of them are now sick from the toxins that they were exposed to at Ground Zero.

Some from the tristate area have since moved to other parts of the country. The map demonstrates the health programs participating, and participants are in 429 of the 435 congressional districts. This means that in almost every Member's district, there are constituents who are accessing or who are being treated under the Zadroga health program.

These are your constituents who are being monitored and who may be receiving treatment for 9/11-related diseases.

These Zadroga Act programs are vital to the sick and dying. They are vital to those to whom we said we will never forget. If we do not continue this program, then we are forgetting, so it is critical that we keep this promise and renew this program.

Together, we can affirm what we said 13 years ago, that we will never forget what happened here, that we will never forget what was endured, and that we will never forget what we promised.

As I said, this map illustrates that the populations in most of the congressional districts are being served by this.

Today, there was a Gold Medal given to the museum in New York City for 9/11, to the museum at the Pentagon for 9/11, and to the museum in Pennsylvania for 9/11. I urge my colleagues to visit all of these museums and the National September 11 Memorial and Museum which, so far, has had more than 14 million visitors since opening in September of 2011.

The museum serves as the focal point to examining the implications of the events of 9/11, documenting the impact of these events, and exploring the continuing significance of September 11, 2001. The 12,000 artifacts, 23,000 images, and almost 2,000 oral stories displayed at the museum remind all of us of that tragedy and what befell and happened that day.

I want to tell the story of the man with the red bandana. He has since been identified as an equities trader who stayed behind and tied a red bandana around his face and helped many, many people get rescued, yet he fell when the towers fell.

It tells the brave stories of many heroes and heroines—of first responders and participants—who helped others in the burning buildings that day.

Now the museum has a new exhibit, one that marks an important event in our Nation's response to 9/11. It now displays at the museum a uniform worn by one of the members of SEAL Team Six.

This is the courageous team that raided Pakistan, where Osama bin Laden was found and killed. It is a magnificent exhibit. I am proud to have had a role in helping to secure this artifact, and I hope people will have the opportunity to visit this new exhibit.

The story of 9/11 is not just of the suffering and of the tragedy of that day, but also of the response—how we came together, united and determined, as a Congress. We came together to fight back, and I have never seen us work so strongly towards a common goal.

In 2002, Congress created the Department of Homeland Security, which brought together 22 separate agencies and offices into a single Cabinet-level department in order to secure our country from threats such as border security and cybersecurity, as well as coordinating efforts to respond to emergencies.

We also created the bipartisan 9/11 Congressional Caucus, which eventually led to the creation of the 9/11 Commission to investigate what exactly went wrong with our security and to make recommendations to protect our Nation against a terrorist attack.

The Commission and its staff reviewed over 2.5 million pages of documents; interviewed over 1,200 individuals in 12 countries, including every relevant senior official of both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations; and held 19 days of public hearings across the country, with over 160 witnesses testifying.

This independent bipartisan Commission produced a book, the ''9/11 Commission Report,'' which is a well-informed report that served as a blueprint for improving our security. The book sold more copies than Harry Potter, and it came out with suggestions of what we needed to do to make our country safer.

□ 1845

Released in August of 2004, the Commission's report diagnosed the national security failures that led to 9/11 and offered steps that we needed to take to avoid future attacks. We worked together in the Congress—Chris Shays and myself and other Members of Congress—to support all of the 9/11 Commission Caucus' recommendations and the Commission recommendations.

This led to the biggest reorganization of our country's security system, the biggest reorganization of our government, since 1948, after World War II, and it created the Department of Homeland Security and forced all of the independent intelligence agencies to share information, not only on the national level but on the local level, with people who were working in the intelligence area for our protection.

Since 9/11, former Police Commissioner Kelly has informed us that well over 14 attacks on the city of New York were stopped because of the improved intelligence and police work that came out of this reorganization that we passed and put in place in Congress.

Congress established a whole Civil Liberties Oversight Board in 2004 and later strengthened it in 2007. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board was there to ensure that privacy and civil liberties concerns are fully considered when implementing antiterrorism laws, regulations, and executive branch policies.

So the story of 9/11 is not only the suffering, the health challenges, but also the story of how this Congress came together to address the challenges to reorganize, rebuild, change our government, our intelligence system, and put in place many safety measures that have served us well and have built our country into a stronger country and one that is better able to address terrorist attacks.

I am pleased to have with me now JERROLD NADLER from New York. He represents the 9/11 site. It is in the district that he is privileged to represent. He has worked long and hard not only on the 9/11 Caucus, on the 9/11 Commission Report, the laws that we have worked hard to put into law, but also the Zadroga Act, which together we worked on for over a decade, and yet it is now nearing a time when it will expire.

We have to make sure that this bill is reauthorized and that never forget means just that, that we will never forget, and that means continuing the health care and compensation for those who sacrificed so much to help others. They were there for us. We need to be there for them.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from the great State of New York, JERRY NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, Osama bin Laden orchestrated the deadliest terrorist attack in American history, killing almost 3,000 people immediately and wounding thousands more. The attacks also created an environmental nightmare. Hundreds of tons of contaminants poured onto the streets and canyons of Manhattan and Brooklyn and other areas, northern New Jersey, covering responders and survivors in toxic dust.

In the days following the attack, the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States Government, contrary to ample evidence, insisted that the air in lower Manhattan and Brooklyn was safe to breathe. Thousands of responders remained on the site for search, rescue, and cleanup efforts; and thousands of survivors returned to their homes, but the air was not safe to breathe. The EPA was not telling the truth.

Now, I don't get angry at the government for the first few days, maybe even a week or two, encouraging people to help with the rescue operation when we still thought it might be a rescue operation, but after that 2 weeks, when people were working at the site for weeks and months without proper respiratory protection because the Federal Government was telling them that no protection was necessary because the air was safe to breathe, that was no longer a rescue operation. It was a cleanup operation. There was no one alive to be saved at that point, and people whose lives and health were put in danger at that point were put in danger in vain because the air was not safe to breathe, despite the assurances of the EPA.

Today, more than 30,000 first responders and survivors are sick and in need of special care because of that. It was for those tens of thousands of brave, selfless, and innocent responders and survivors that Congress came together in 2010, after many years of struggle and negotiation, to pass the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act in order to fulfill a moral obligation to, as Lincoln said, ''care for him who shall have borne the battle.''

Today, the programs are working. Residents of all 50 States and 431 of the 435 congressional districts receive health care through the 9/11 health program. More than 7,800 individuals have been found eligible for compensation from the victim compensation fund. More than $490 million has so far been awarded, and new applications are processed every day.

But the Federal Government's duty to support those who have become ill in the aftermath of 9/11 and those whose illnesses have yet to manifest themselves—because we know that many of the illnesses and many of the cancers take years to show themselves, that duty is not done, even as the programs we authorized in 2010 are set to expire.

We must continue to provide health care coverage to the tens of thousands currently enrolled in the 9/11 health program and ensure that no eligible individuals are denied access to the victims compensation fund. Our obligation will carry us far into the future.

Thousands of individuals exposed to the toxic air on 9/11 and in the weeks and days following that—even those who are healthy today we know will face major health issues in the years to come, as latent cancers and other illnesses emerge. For that reason, I am proud to work with Representatives MALONEY and KING and Senators GILLIBRAND and SCHUMER to try to reauthorize these critical programs.

I urge all of our colleagues to work with us in support of a reauthorization and to move this bill through Congress and onto the President's desk as soon as possible.

Just as we stood together, as a Nation, in the days following September 11, 2001, just as we stood strong together in 2010 to create these vital programs, we must join forces again to ensure that the heroes of 9/11 are not abandoned when they need us most. We must pass a new reauthorization to sustain these programs. We must protect the heroes and survivors of 9/11.

There are really two separate moral imperatives here that we must meet. The first is that we must show that the United States takes care of its own. We take care of those who fall in our battles, who are wounded in our struggles. And the attack on 9/11 was not an attack on New York City. It was not an attack on the World Trade Center. It was not against the Port Authority of New York. It was an attack on America, an attack on the United States. The particular victims happened to be located in New York. And we must show that we do not leave people behind on the battlefield, that we take care of those who are wounded on our behalf.

The second moral imperative is that much of the injuries that continue to be felt, much of the illnesses with which people suffer, much of the illnesses which we don't know about but which people will suffer from in the years to come are the direct fault of the Federal Government because of its assurances, contrary to known facts at the time, that the air was safe to breathe, that people should go back to work, stay working on the pile, and go back to school. We knew better. Many of us said, don't believe the EPA. Don't go back to work. Don't go back to school. This is poison. And it was clear.

And at first, when the EPA was saying this, there was no data to support their safety assurances, and they kept saying it when there was plenty of data to say that the air was not safe to breathe. So because of the false assurances by the Federal Government, many thousands of people relying on those assurances worked without the proper respiratory protection to clean up the site, worked in the area, and helped revive the economy at the expense of their health. And we must, to the extent possible, make them whole today. That is a second moral imperative.

And finally, it must never be said that the United States remembers its heroes and honors its wounded for 13 years and then forgets about them. It has been 13 years. In 2 years, the 9/11 health bill will expire. Let it not be said that we remember for 13 years and take care of people for 15, and that is it. That would be a heck of an epitaph on a moral country.

As we are involved in a war—which it is, unfortunately—against many terrorists across the world, and the President is going to address us on some aspects of that tonight, let us not abandon those who fell, who gave up their health, who continue to suffer on our behalf. It would be wrong. It would be immoral. It would not be worthy of the United States. This is a great and moral Nation. This Congress must show it by reauthorizing the 9/11 bill in a timely fashion.

It is one of the things we must do in response to 9/11. There are many other things we must do, many other things that we have done. But taking care of our own wounded is one of them and one of the attributes of a civilized today.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and so many other important issues.

I would now like to recognize a leader on this issue from New York, Representative of Staten Island and Brooklyn, Congressman GRIMM.

Mr. GRIMM. I thank the gentlewoman from New York. And I echo the sentiments of my colleagues with the need to reauthorize the Zadroga bill in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise alongside my colleagues in the New York delegation also to honor and commemorate the nearly 3,000 innocent Americans whose lives were cut short in the unspeakable attacks on our Nation 13 years ago. Like so many of my constituents in Staten Island and in Brooklyn, I have images of the most horrific sight that I have ever seen burned into my memory forever.

I will never forget what it was like searching for the survivors in the rubble after both towers of the World Trade Center disintegrated into ash. I will never forget the look in the eyes of the firemen, the police, the construction workers as we worked side-by-side. It was a look of overwhelming despair.

And though our hearts broke at the loss of those taken from us, I am very proud of the fact that Americans soon rallied together. We united around an unshakable truth that the servants of hatred and terror did not strike the greatest Nation on Earth at random but because we embodied the very freedom and liberty that they so despise.

As Senator MCCAIN said on the floor of the Senate the day after the attacks, ''Those who unleashed these attacks and those who support them are not our enemies alone. They are the enemies of freedom and independence, of justice and peace. And they wage war on the United States because we are and will remain the principal guarantors of freedom.''

Mr. Speaker, in the Arrochar neighborhood of Staten Island lies a beautiful memorial dedicated to some of the 274 Staten Islanders murdered on 9/11, many of whom were first responders and fallen heroes of our beloved FDNY and NYPD, all of whom went above and beyond the call of duty to bring their fellow New Yorkers to safety.

Amidst the pictures and devotions to the fallen lies an inscription: ''On September 11, 2001, the World Trade Center was attacked by terrorists. From that hatred, a little piece of heaven evolved here called Angel's Circle.''

It reminds us, Mr. Speaker, that from the horror and despair our Nation endured on 9/11 and endures in all of our hearts until this day comes the constant reminder of strength, our pride, and the unwavering heroism at the heart of the American spirit.

May God eternally bless the victims of 9/11. May he bring peace to their loved ones. And may we never, ever forget the sacrifice they bore for our freedom.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for joining us tonight on this Special Order.

Tonight is a time to remember how just 13 years ago, this entire country and even this fractious Congress came together. We were united and determined as I have ever seen this Congress before, strong in our resolve and ready,

without question, to put country before self.

□ 1900

We worked together to bring comfort to the afflicted and justice to the terrorists behind this attack. With bipartisan cooperation, we rebuilt Lower Manhattan, the Pentagon, and put in place a memorial in Pennsylvania honoring the heroes on United Flight 93 that was headed towards our Nation's Capitol.

There is still much more left to do, and we need to have that same spirit to approach the challenges, such as the crucial Anti-Terrorism Risk Insurance Plan, the TRIA bill, has not been reauthorized yet, and the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2010 needs to be reauthorized. This and still much more needs to be done, not some day, but now.

Around 9/11, there is a great deal of rhetoric, but actions speak more than words. Let us come together, and let us get these two important bills and other bills done in a bipartisan way.

We shall never forget.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1934. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey the Clifford P. Hansen Federal courthouse to Teton County, Wyoming; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 11, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6976. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral (lower half) Kevin J. Kovacich, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6977. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral Sean S. Buck, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6978. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; City of Newport News, Virginia [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6979. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Harrison County, Indiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0004] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6980. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Cass County, Indiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6981. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Montgomery County, Texas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6982. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Oceana County, Michigan [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6983. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6984. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Technical Assistance on State Data Collection--IDEA Data Management Center [CFDA Number: 84.373M.] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6985. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Technical Assistance on State Data Collection--IDEA Fiscal Data Center [CDFA Number: 84.373F.] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities, pursuant to Section 141 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6987. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a declaration that circumstance exist justifying an authorization pursuant to Section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. Section 360bbb-3(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6988. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Vitamin D3 [Docket No.: FDA-2012-F-0138] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6989. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Early Warning Reporting, Foreign Defect Reporting, and Motor Vehicle and Equipment Recall Regulations [Docket No.: NHTSA-2012-0068] (RIN: 2127-AK72) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6990. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board [CC Docket No.: 80-286] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6991. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6992. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Taiwan Relations Act, agreements concluded by the American Institute and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6993. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of Understandings Reached at the 2005, 2012, and 2013 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) Plenary Meetings and a 2009 NSG Intersessional Decision; Additions to the List of NSG Participating Countries [Docket No.: 090130094-3271-01] (RIN: 0694-AD58) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notice of a Determination on Imposition and Waiver of Sanctions under Sections 603 and 604 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6995. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Corrections, Clarifications, and Movement of Definitions (RIN: 1400-AD64) received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6996. A letter from the Acting 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 April 16, 2014 — June 14, 2014 reporting period, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a waiver determination pursuant to the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6998. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-14-3948); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination pursuant to Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act for the use of funds to provide non-lethal assistance to the Syrian Opposition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7000. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for a Drawdown under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to Provide Airlift and Refueling Services to France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7001. 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 Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7002. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7003. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of the Navy, transmitting six reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7004. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7005. A letter from the General Counsel and Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7006. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Sufficiency Certification for Washington Convention and Sports Authority's (Trading As Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operation and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7007. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species: Critical Habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean Loggerhead Sea Turtle Distinct Population Segment (DPS) and Determination Regarding Critical Habitat for the North Pacific Ocean Loggerhead DPS [Docket No.: 130513467-4401-20] (RIN: 0648-BD27) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7008. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2013 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section Criminal Division, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7009. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Resources, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at the Joslyn Manufacturing and Supply Co. at the covered facility in Fort Wayne, Indiana, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7010. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Activities of the Review Panel on Prison Rape in Calendar Year 2013 and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Data Collection Activities for 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7011. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) for fiscal years 2015-2019, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7012. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Debris Removal: Eligibility of Force Account Labor Straight-Time Costs Under the Public Assistance Program for Hurricane Sandy [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0004] (RIN: 1660-AA75) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7013. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 49.0 to 50.0, West of Harvey Locks, Bank to Bank, Bayou Blue Pontoon Bridge, Lafourche Parish, LA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0411] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7014. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Treasure Island, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0319] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7015. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mantua Creek, Paulsboro, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0710] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7016. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gay Games 9 Triathlon, North Coast Harbor, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0427] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7017. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Annual Events on the Maumee River, Toledo, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0714] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7018. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Raccoon Creek, Bridgeport, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0711] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7019. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gay Games 9 Open Water Swim, Lake Erie, Edgewater Park, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0635] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7020. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0807; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-191-AD; Amendment 39-17888; AD 2014-13-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7021. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AgustaWestland S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0478; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-017-AD; Amendment 39-17902; AD 2014-07-51](RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7022. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Specially Adapted Housing Eligibility for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Beneficiaries (RIN: 2900-AO84) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7023. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2014 annual report; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of September 9, 2014]

The Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4067 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5431. A bill to impose sanctions on foreign financial institutions that engage in certain transactions with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 5432. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree or doctoral degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN (for himself and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 5433. A bill to prohibit certain assistance to the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5434. A bill to suspend the visa waiver program in order for the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the national security risks posed by the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5435. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5436. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide research, training, and navigator services to youth and young adults on the verge of aging out of the secondary educational system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5437. A bill to expand the Pajarita Wilderness and designate the Tumacacori Highlands Wilderness in Coronado National Forest, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5439. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to Microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the Transportation Security Administration from accepting as valid identification an I-862 Notice to Appear form; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5441. A bill to amend the Federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to reflect the service of women in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5442. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of total corporate tax paid by a corporation in each annual report required to be filed under such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end tax deferrals on profits accumulated offshore and to terminate the deferral of active income of controlled foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the interest deduction for excessive interest of members of financial reporting groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 5445. A bill to impose a temporary moratorium on the closure or consolidation of any mail processing facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5446. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to exempt certain consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5447. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to increase the availability of pesticides for the management of parasitic pests that adversely impact the health of managed pollinator bees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 719. A resolution recognizing the 20th Anniversary of AmeriCorps on September 12, 2014; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. 5431.

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. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5432.

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; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years. Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5433.

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

Article I, Section 8 ''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. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5434.

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

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

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5435.

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

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5436.

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

Clause 1, of section 8, of article 1.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5437.

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

U.S. Const art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 5438.

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

Sixteenth Amendment

Congress shall have power to levy, or repeal, taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5439.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5440.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5441.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5442.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5443.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5444.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5445.

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

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5446.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5447.

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

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to law 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;

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 36: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 259: Mr. PERRY and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 292: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 640: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 647: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 842: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1030: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1263: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1278: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1314: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1507: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1563: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1652: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1653: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. AMODEI, Mr MEEHAN, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1699: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1801: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1812: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1827: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1852: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1915: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2130: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2305: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2350: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2355: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2364: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2366: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2450: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2500: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2502: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2504: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2536: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2607: Mr. TERRY and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2651: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2664: Mr. GRIMM and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2770: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2835: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2955: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2981: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3043: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 3150: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3279: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3297: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3374: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3482: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 3486: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3489: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 3560: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3673: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3712: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3717: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3833: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3877: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3899: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3912: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3988: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4013: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 4056: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4119: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 4128: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4136: Mr. COSTA and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4149: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4161: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4190: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4223: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4256: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4259: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4351: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4395: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4432: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4462: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4504: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4510: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 4551: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4552: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 4567: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4577: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4580: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4629: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4675: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4679: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4682: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 4716: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4717: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4727: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4790: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4793: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4814: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENYART, Mr. VELA, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4818: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4837: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4852: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4854: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4857: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4885: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4920: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 4957: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 4960: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COTTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4963: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 4969: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4977: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4981: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4998: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5065: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 5083: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 5087: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5088: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5110: Mr. HARPER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 5156: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5159: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5168: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 5182: Mr. HOLT and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 5213: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5217: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VELA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5219: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5226: Mr. POLIS, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5227: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5228: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 5256: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 5268: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 5314: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 5334: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5364: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5370: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5384: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 5392: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 5403: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LANCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5406: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 5407: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5409: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 5415: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 5425: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 5430: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.J. Res. 119: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 109: Mr. PETRI.
H. Res. 281: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H. Res. 428: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 456: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H. Res. 522: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 543: Mr. CONAWAY.
H. Res. 558: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Res. 596: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H. Res. 620: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H. Res. 668: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 684: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 711: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POCAN and Mr. RANGEL.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2014 No. 129

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our rock, our fortress, and our deliverer, You know when we sit and when we rise. Before a word is on our tongue, You know it completely. Guide us and our lawmakers with Your spirit's wisdom, keeping us from paths that lead to ruin. May we seek the wages of righteousness that will bring us life. Make the mouths of our Senators fountains of life that will bring peace and stability to our world. Give us all a reverence for You that will enable us to serve Your purposes for our lives in this generation.

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, September 10, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res 19 postcloture. That is the legislation of the constitutional amendment to allow us to set the campaign spending limits and not have the battle with the billionaires trying to buy America. At 2 p.m. all postcloture time will be considered expired and the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion to proceed. I expect this vote to be done by voice.

Shortly after 2 p.m. we expect a rollcall vote relative to the paycheck fairness bill. That legislation deals with, for example, my daughter doing the exact same work as her male counterpart. She should make the same amount of money. That is what this legislation is all about. We tried to move forward on it once before and we were blocked by the Republicans. We will see what happens again today. It seems fair that my daughter should make the same amount of money for doing the same work as her male counterpart.

SUPPORTING OUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday I had the opportunity and good fortune to be invited to the White House with Speaker BOEHNER, Leader PELOSI, and Leader MCCONNELL. We spent more than an hour with the President and Vice President talking about what is going on in the world.

We do know what is going on in the world separate and apart from that meeting at the White House. There is a murderous, vile terrorist group that is taking over parts of Iraq and is trying to move into other parts of the world in the Middle East. Their brutality is unprecedented, especially unprecedented in that they want to advertise how vile they are. They are so vicious, going after everyone—civilians, women, children—trying to eliminate anyone who they think disagrees with them. They have targeted minorities, they have targeted Jews, Christians, and anyone whom they disagree with—religious minorities. We saw that. We had thousands and thousands of ancient religious minorities trapped on a mountain by these vicious, vile people.

Of course, they are after any American. The two innocent journalists who were out just covering the news were beheaded and they advertised the beheadings. The Islamic State or ISIS—whatever we want to call them—will be stopped. They must be stopped and they need to be destroyed and they will be destroyed.

President Obama has taken decisive action during the month of August to protect Americans and help prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. Yesterday the President described his initiative to take on this terrorist group as we move forward, and I support him. President Obama has made it clear it is going to take decisive action to destroy the Islamic State through the use of air strikes and drones. This is a smart, strategic, and effective approach and I support it.

But there are people in Congress who are taking advice from Dick Cheney. He was here yesterday. I think they better be very careful of the advice they take from Dick Cheney. Dick Cheney is more responsible than anyone else for the worst foreign policy decision in the history of the country, the invasion of Iraq. Almost 6,000 dead Americans and tens of thousands

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

wounded, thousands and thousands grievously wounded. Our fighting men and women did a yeoman's job. They made us proud. But was that war necessary? In hindsight, it appears to me it wasn't. Not only have we lost thousands of American lives, it has destabilized the whole Middle East and hundreds of thousands—hundreds of thousands—hundreds of thousands—hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have been killed. They are now gone.

But there are some pushing hard in Congress to authorize use of military force right now—right now. Dick Cheney was here yesterday. I guess that is whom they are following. But wouldn't it be a good idea for us to stand back a little bit and see what the President of the United States has to say tonight? He is addressing the Nation. Let's allow him to speak to our country, to our fellow citizens, and lay out his plan.

It is absolutely critical that the American people and Congress hear directly from the President of the United States.

In the Senate we are going to have an all-Senators briefing tomorrow afternoon. The administration will come to one of our classified rooms in the Capitol complex and lay out to us in detail what is going on that is not in the news. So every Member of this body will have a chance to get as much information as possible. The President speaks tonight. Tomorrow afternoon there is a briefing.

It is clear—the President has said so publicly, his administration has said so publicly, and the officials who work directly with the White House—he is doing his utmost. He just returned from Europe and much of the time that was spent there in the NATO conference was about what they are going to do to go after this evil in the Middle East, this ISIS group. He is doing his utmost to build a robust international coalition including the Sunni Arab States.

For this mission to be successful, of course, Sunni Arab countries must play a role and they will do that. That is being worked on as we speak.

It is clear to me that we need to train and equip Syrian rebels and other groups in the Middle East that need some help. It is called title 10 authority. The rebels have tried to get it from us and they should get it. That is our way of building an international coalition. Congress should do that. The Republicans are worried about money. There is money to do that. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee is on the floor and he can certainly vouch for that. It would give authority for the President to help equip these rebels.

Going it alone is not going to work. We must have the support of the international community if we are to rid the world of ISIS. We know France—I at least believe that—has stepped forward, I believe Great Britain has stepped forward, I understand Poland is part of the coalition that has stepped forward, and there are many other countries the President met with in Europe just a few days ago. We need to build a coalition, and that is what he is doing, rather than declaring war today. Title 10 authority is something we need.

I repeat. Going it alone will not suffice. I also believe that as Commander in Chief the President has the authority he needs now to act against ISIS. I believe the vast majority of the Members of Congress agree with that. Now it is critical we support our Commander in Chief as he takes this decisive action. I am amazed—amazed—that some Members of Congress want to rush to war, because that is what they are talking about is a war. How did that work out for us last time? Not so well. The Bush-Cheney strategy of rushing into conflict didn't work then and it will not work now. Let's be cautious and let's be deliberate.

I repeat. Former Vice President Cheney was here yesterday giving the Republicans a pep talk. He gave them advice on foreign policy. Please—please—taking advice from Dick Cheney on foreign policy, that is a terrifying prospect. We should be learning from our past mistakes, not repeating them.

Air strikes and strategic use of drones and of course covert action are the most effective ways to take out ISIS without committing American troops, placing troops in harm's way. So I support President Obama's decision not to send in ground troops. That is not an option for the American people. I can guarantee everyone that within the sound of my voice.

But now that the Republicans are taking advice from Dick Cheney on foreign policy, I am concerned they once again will rush to commit U.S. troops to a ground war in the Middle East when we could accomplish the mission in a more strategic way.

I say to Democrats and Republicans, let's destroy these despicable terrorists, but let's do it the right way this time. The President knows and the American people know we have to take decisive action. The President knows how to destroy terrorists and their organization. Osama bin Laden is proof of that.

Let's give the President of the United States the time to do this the right way. Troops are out there defending us as we speak. They are not Democrats. They are not Republicans. They are not Independents. They are fighting for us to protect Americans. We need committed, decisive action to stop ISIS.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

MIDDLE EAST STRATEGY

Mr. McCONNELL. Last month I got to spend a lot of time with the people of Kentucky, and since there has been no shortage of issues to keep people up at night over the past few months, I got a lot of straight talk on a lot of topics. I heard a lot about the crisis at the border, about lost health care plans, the chronic shortage of good jobs, stagnant wages, even Ebola, the spread of which is a threat that must be taken seriously.

Yet one issue that kept coming up is America's role in the world and the growing sense that some in Washington are more or less content to let others shape our destiny for us. For many that concern was crystallized when they witnessed the barbaric execution of an American citizen by an ISIL terrorist and the halting reaction to it by a President who has yet to find his footing when it comes to dealing with this group that clearly has the will, the means, and the sanctuary it needs to do more.

Last week the White House announced that the President plans to explain the nature of the threat ISIL poses in a speech to the American people tonight. Well, after spending a month talking with folks in Kentucky, it is pretty clear—to me, at least—that the American people fully appreciate the nature of this threat. After the beheadings of two American citizens, they don't want an explanation of what is happening, they want a plan. They want some Presidential leadership.

I hope the President lays out a credible plan to defeat ISIL. I hope he outlines the steps he intends to take beyond simply the defense of Baghdad, Erbil, Sinjar, and Amerli, and what legal authorities and resources he thinks are required to execute a successful campaign against ISIL. But the fact is the rise of ISIL is not an isolated failure. The spread of ISIL occurred in a particular context, and if we hope to defeat this threat, we need to come to terms with that now.

So before speaking with a little more specificity about ISIL and the ongoing threat of global terrorism, I would like to briefly restate my concerns about the consequences of the President's foreign policy, as I warned a few months ago, because ISIL's military advance across Syria and Iraq carries a much larger lesson—a lesson that should prompt the President to reconsider and revise his overall national security policy and better prepare the country and our military to confront the threats that will survive his time in office.

First, it is important to note a few of the consistent objectives that have always characterized this President's national security policy: drawing down our conventional and nuclear forces, withdrawing from Iraq and Afghanistan, and placing a greater reliance upon international organizations and diplomacy.

As I have noted on other occasions, I have serious differences with the President over this approach. In my view, we have a duty as a superpower without imperialistic aims to help maintain international order and balance of

power, and that international order is maintained by American military might. Indeed, American military might is its backbone. But that is not a view this President seems to share.

The defining bookends to the President's approach were the Executive orders signed his first week in office which included the declaration that Guantanamo would be closed within a year without any plan on what to do with its detainees and the Executive orders that ended the CIA's detention and interrogation programs at the same time. In May of this year the President also announced that all of our combat forces would be withdrawn from Afghanistan by the end of this term whether or not the Taliban is successful in capturing parts of Afghanistan, whether or not Al Qaeda's senior leadership has found a more permissive environment in the tribal areas of Pakistan, and whether or not Al Qaeda has been driven from Afghanistan.

All of this underscores something I have been suggesting for some time—that the President is a rather reluctant Commander in Chief—because between those two bookends much has occurred to undermine our Nation's national security. Yet, tragically, the President has not adapted accordingly.

We have seen the failure to negotiate a status of forces agreement with Iraq that would have allowed for a residual military force and likely prevented the assault by the Islamic State of Syria and the Levant.

We have seen how the President's inability to see Russia and China as the dissatisfied regional powers they are, intent on increasing their spheres of influence, has exposed our own allies to new risk. The failed reset with Russia and the President's commitment to a world without nuclear weapons led him to hastily sign an arms treaty with Russia that did nothing to substantially reduce its nuclear stockpile or its tactical nuclear weapons. And, of course, Russia was undeterred in its assault upon Ukraine.

The President announced a strategic pivot to the Asia-Pacific without any real plan to fund it. This failure to invest in the kinds of naval, air, and Marine Corps forces we will need to maintain our dominance in this region in the years to come could have tragic consequences down the road.

Of course, we have all seen how eager the President was to declare an end to the war on terror, but as the President was focused on unwinding or reversing past policies through Executive order, the threat from Al Qaeda and affiliated groups only metastasized. Uprisings in north Africa and the broader Middle East resulted in additional ungoverned space in Syria, Libya, Egypt, and Yemen. There were prison breaks in Iraq, Pakistan, and Libya, and the release of hundreds of prisoners in Egypt. Terrorists also escaped from prisons in Yemen—a country that is no more ready to detain the terrorists at Guantanamo today than they were back in 2009.

The President's response to all of this has been to draw down our conventional forces and capabilities and to deploy special operations forces in economy-of-force train-and-assist missions across the globe. Speaking at West Point in May, he pointed to a network of partnerships from South Asia to the Sahel to be funded by a $5 billion counterterror partnership fund for which Congress has yet to receive a viable plan. In those cases where indigenous forces prove insufficient and a need for direct action actually arises, the President announced his intent to resort to the use of armed, unmanned aerial vehicles for strikes, as has been done in Yemen and Somalia. By deploying special operations forces, the President hoped to manage the diffuse threat posed by Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, Boko Haram, terrorist networks inside of Libya that now threaten Egypt, the al-Nusrah front, the Taliban, ISIL, and other terrorist groups.

But as the nature of terrorist insurgencies has evolved, the President sees no need to reverse the harmful damage of the defense cuts he insisted upon, to rebuild our conventional and nuclear forces or to accept that leaving behind residual forces in Iraq and Afghanistan is an effective means by which to preserve the strategic gains we have made over the years through tremendous sacrifice.

The truth is that the threat of some of these al Qaeda affiliates, associated groups, or independent terrorist organizations has simply outpaced the President's economy-of-force concept. In some cases the host nation's military, which we have trained and equipped, has proven to be inadequate to defeat the insurgency in question, as is the case with AQAP, the Taliban, or ISIL. In some cases the insurgency does not affiliate itself with al Qaeda or builds upon territorial gains before aspiring to attack the U.S. homeland.

The growth, advance, and evolution of ISIL presents a turning point for the President. Will the fall of Anbar Province and the threat posed by ISIL to Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey lead to a reconsideration of his entire national security policy, the kind I have alluded to here and elsewhere, or will the President confine himself within the bookends of shortsighted national security policies that were originally conceived on the campaign trail back in 2008?

If prior events or arguments left the President unpersuaded, the emergence and recent actions of ISIL should convince him that the time has come to revisit his prior assumptions and rethink his approach. ISIL is large and lethal, and its rapid growth has outpaced the capacity of either the Peshmerga, the Iraqi security forces, or the moderate Syrian opposition to contain it. Ominously, ISIL has developed expertise in small-unit infantry tactics, the use of insurgent tactics, and as a terrorist organization. As a result of oil sales, ransoms, bank robberies, and donations, it is also well funded.

We need a plan, and we need it now. The President has now declared that defeating ISIL is his objective, and that is a very good start. But Americans don't want a lecture, they want a plan—a credible, comprehensive plan to deal with this menace that clearly wants to harm us here at home and is only becoming stronger by the day.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Dempsey has said that defeating ISIL will require military action within Syria, and the President has now declared that defeating ISIL is his objective. Tonight the President needs to set forth the military strategy and the means required to defeat ISIL and to link those actions to any additional authorization and appropriations he would like to see from Congress. If the President develops a regional strategy, builds a combat-effective military coalition, and explains how his strategy will lead to the defeat of ISIL, I believe he will have significant congressional support. This is no small matter. If Congress is asked to support a strategy, it needs to be a strategy that is designed to succeed and not a mere restatement of current policy which we know is insufficient to the task.

The President must seize this opportunity to lead. This is not the time to shirk or put off his solemn responsibilities as Commander in Chief because passing off this threat to his successor would not only be irresponsible, it would increase the threat ISIL poses to Americans by enabling it to secure its gains within Iraq and Syria. In my view, ISIL's campaign across Syria and Iraq presents the President with an opportunity. It is an opportunity to reconsider his failed national security policy.

The President and his advisers may have convinced themselves of their standard straw man argument that anyone who disagrees with this failed approach is bent on serial occupations or bent on invasions, but that is really a false choice, and it is certainly not a plan.

It is time to put the straw man aside and to realize the fight is not with his critics here at home, it is with ISIL. That is why this morning I am calling on the President to present us with a credible plan the American people have been waiting for, explain our military objectives, and rally public support for accomplishing them. That is what the Commander in Chief should be doing at a moment such as this.

If the threat from ISIL demands the commitment of American resources and the risk of American life, the President has a duty to explain that to the Nation and Congress this evening even if it doesn't conform with the tidy vision of world affairs he outlined as a candidate 6 years ago. If his strategy is little more than a restatement of the current policies, if all he plans to do is

manage this threat and pass it off to his successor, well, we need to know that too because Americans are worried and they are anxious. They want and deserve the truth. Most of all, they want a plan, and that is what I am hoping for tonight.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL MATTHIAS N. HANSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to mourn the loss of a U.S. marine and a Kentuckian from the hometown of Abraham Lincoln. LCpl Matthias N. Hanson hailed from Lincoln's birthplace of Hodgenville, KY, and was killed on February 21, 2010, of wounds suffered as a result of conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. He was 20 years old.

For his service in uniform, Lance Corporal Hanson received several awards, medals, and decorations, including the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Purple Heart.

''Matt's our hero because of how he lived,'' says the Reverend Norm Brock, who spoke at Matt's memorial service. ''Matt didn't miss life. He lived life.''

Service was a proud tradition in Matt's family. His father Lowell R. Hanson, Jr., served in the Army. One of Matt's brothers is currently Active Duty Army, while the other is in the Army Reserve. Matt himself was born in Germany on a military base. As Mary Huff, Matt's mom, puts it: Matt ''had to go rogue and join the Marines.''

Matt had a strong work ethic in high school says his father Lowell:

> He used to get up at 4:00 in the morning to milk cows on a nearby farm, then go to school, then onto football practice, and back to work on the farm. Other people noticed and were impressed by his work ethic, and I was proud of him. He was determined that when he got old enough, he would join the Marines and serve his country.

Growing up, Matt was known for his blue eyes and sneaky smile, and he had a way of talking himself out of anything.

He had an easygoing manner and a lust for life. ''He was quiet, a trickster and a charmer,'' says his mother. But ultimately, he was a country boy who wanted to do right by his country. Matt was a country music fan who particularly liked the song ''Way Out Here'' by Josh Thompson. He was ''funny, energetic, really outgoing,'' says family friend Emily Johnson. ''He could make anyone laugh. He had the brightest blue eyes ever. That's what we'll remember him as.''

Matt graduated from LaRue County High School in Hodgenville, where he was a member of the football team and the Student Technology Association. Next to his picture in the school yearbook he put the following quote: ''Life moves pretty fast. If you don't look around and pay attention, you could miss it.''

Soon after graduation he enlisted in the Marine Corps in the spring of 2008. ''He was very proud of what he had done when he signed up to go to the Marines,'' remembers LaRue County High School football coach and assistant principal Rodney Armes. ''He got his hair cut short and he was a Marine from the day he signed up.''

Matt was trained as a rifleman and assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force based in Camp Lejenue, NC. He was deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in January of 2010. Matt played a key role in a crucial multiday battle in Afghanistan just days before his death in mid-February 2010. Matt's platoon came under fire from Taliban forces in the town of Marjah. Matt walked up, under air cover, to the fortified bunker where the enemy fire was coming from and fired a grenade launcher into the bunker with great poise and accuracy, killing the enemy forces. ''The battle was over,'' said Matt's father, thanks to his bravery. ''He played a critical role,'' says Capt. Gordon Emmanuel, Matt's platoon commander. ''Anytime he shot he was on impact. Marines were cheering with his shots.''

Matt's father was told by Matt's platoon sergeant and by Captain Emmanuel that Camp Hanson, once the biggest U.S. position in Marjah and well known to any Marine who has served in the area, was established at that site in Matt's honor because of his actions.

''The last time I saw [Matt] was on Christmas Eve 2009,'' said Matt's father. ''He hugged me around the neck and said: Daddy, don't worry about me. Everybody dies. Not everybody has Jesus. Not everybody gets to be a Marine.''

We are thinking of Matt's family as I recount his life for my Senate colleagues today. They include Matt's mother and stepfather Mary and Larry Huff; his father and stepmother Lowell R. Hanson, Jr., and Cynthia Hanson; his siblings Megan, Samantha, Erika, Lowell, and Brendan; his grandparents; and many other beloved family members and friends.

Matt was buried with full military honors in Hodgenville. The town that is the birthplace of one of America's greatest patriots, Abraham Lincoln, is also a fitting resting place for this brave young man and Marine. The Commonwealth of Kentucky will never forget the life and service of LCpl Matthias N. Hanson or his ultimate sacrifice given freely to his country. It is thanks to men like him that our Nation is free.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 471, 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business for up to 4 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIL

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I believe the President will lay out a strong approach against ISIL tonight. That approach will include going after them wherever they are located, including Syria. The President and Secretary Kerry are making every effort to help lead a broadly based coalition which is so critically important to avoid the consequences of a Western go-it-alone approach which was mistakenly used when we invaded Iraq.

This President, like all Presidents, will welcome bipartisan Congressional support, even though he has the authority in this situation to act without explicit Congressional authority. I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle will lay aside partisan attacks and make a true effort to find a way to take on ISIL in a united manner. A strong bipartisan approach here in the United States will help the President and Secretary Kerry attain the explicit open support of a broad cross section of this world, including Arab and Muslim countries.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about our constitutional amendment. I think we have had a very good debate this week—an overdue debate. I want to thank my colleagues for coming to the floor and for speaking out. But there have also been many misrepresentations by the other side about what our constitutional amendment would do.

Michael Keegan, the President of People for the American Way, wrote a piece in the Huffington Post yesterday. He summed up the debate from the other side of the aisle quite well. He said, ''a good rule of thumb in politics is that the scarier someone sounds, the more you should doubt what they're saying.''

We heard some scary things in the last couple of days. Lorne Michaels is

going to jail. And he is sharing a cell with a little old lady who put up a $5 political yard sign. Books and movies are banned. The NAACP, Sierra Club, and moveon.org have been prohibited from speaking about politics—scary stuff but none of it is true.

Erwin Chemerinsky, a great constitutional scholar, recently wrote an op-ed in the Hill, rebutting many of the claims we have heard. He wrote:

The amendment—

He is talking about our constitutional amendment here.

—gives no authority to the government to ban or limit anyone's speech. It provides the government no power to ''muzzle'' messages the government doesn't like. It does not change in any way the longstanding First Amendment principle that the government cannot restrict speech based on the content of the message or the views expressed. The amendment would do no more than allow the government to regulate spending in election campaigns.

That is the heart of what we are doing, regulating spending—out-of-control spending—in election campaigns, dark money, big interests weighing in in an unprecedented way.

Professor Chemerinsky is right. S.J. Res. 19 reaffirms the First Amendment principle of equality. It will undo the damage done by the Court over the years, most recently with Citizens United and McCutcheon that said: Those with the most money have the most free speech. Nothing in the amendment would permit the arrest of anyone for engaging in political speech. It would not allow books or movies to be banned.

All the amendment does is restore to Congress and the States the power to set reasonable limits—reasonable limits—on campaign contributions and expenditures, a traditional power that the Court has stripped from us. The amendment returns the First Amendment to its pre-Buckley interpretation when money and speech were not the same thing.

Prior to Buckley, we did not see the kind of legislation against free speech that my Republican colleagues envision, offering extreme examples of laws Congress could pass. That is one way to argue against this amendment. But it ignores the long history of laws Congress did pass to protect the voices of individual voters.

These reforms were not radical. They were narrowly tailored responses to restore America's faith in the political system after a lack of regulations led to scandals and corruption. Let's not forget that any law must pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President. That is a significant check against any radical legislation getting passed or these days, against almost any legislation getting passed.

Critics also fail to acknowledge something else. Our amendment does not give Congress free reign to pass any and all campaign finance laws. When the Court interprets any amendment to the Constitution, it reads in a reasonableness requirement. This means that even if Congress did abuse its authority and passed the extreme laws that conservatives suggest, they could still be overturned as unreasonable.

But more importantly, Members of Congress who pass extreme laws can be held accountable by their constituents. The same cannot be said for Supreme Court justices willing to strike down sensible regulations by a narrow majority.

We also heard a quote from the late Senator Ted Kennedy. Senator Kennedy did oppose a similar amendment in 1997 and 2001. The truth is, we do not know if he would oppose the amendment today.

Citizens United and McCutcheon changed the landscape and changed it dramatically. Senator Kennedy was a champion for the underprivileged throughout his career—in civil rights, education, health care, the minimum wage. He stood up for those who did not have a voice, the very people who are harmed by most of these misguided Supreme Court decisions.

We do know some of Senator Kennedy's colleagues who also opposed the amendment in the past are still here in the Senate. They have reconsidered. Chairman LEAHY, Senator DURBIN, the chairman of the Constitution subcommittee. Thoughtful Senators who felt an amendment was unnecessary in the past now see that it is the only way to fix a broken system.

Changing the Constitution is a big step not to be taken lightly. In the Federalist Paper No. 49, James Madison argued the Constitution should be amended only on ''great and extraordinary occasions.'' I agree. I also believe we have reached one of those occasions.

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the op-eds I referenced by Michael Keegan and Erwin Chemerinsky be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huffington Post, Sept. 9, 2014]

THE FIRST AMENDMENT ACCORDING TO MITCH MCCONNELL

(By Michael Keegan)

Have you heard that Senate Democrats are working this week to repeal free speech? I did, yesterday morning, from Mitch McConnell.

Have you heard that Democrats are going to go out and ''muzzle'' pastors who criticize them in the pulpit?

We did, from Ted Cruz.

Did you hear that Democrats are going to shut down conservative activists and then ''brainwash the next generation into believing that this is how it should be''?

We did, last month, from the Family Research Council's Tony Perkins.

A good rule of thumb in politics is that the scarier someone sounds, the more you should doubt what they're saying. Another good rule in politics is not to trust what Mitch McConnell says about money in politics.

Because, yes, that's what we're talking about here. Not a secret new Orwellian regime. Not a new anti-pastor task force. What we're talking about is simply limiting the amount of money that corporations and wealthy individuals can spend to influence our elections.

This week, the Senate is debating a constitutional amendment that would overturn recent Supreme Court decisions that have paved the way for an explosion of big money in politics. In those decisions, including Citizens United and this year's McCutcheon, the Supreme Court radically redefined the First Amendment to allow corporations and the wealthy to drown out the speech of everyday Americans with nearly unlimited political spending. The Democracy for All amendment would restore to Congress and the states the power to impose reasonable restrictions on money in politics, just as they had before the Supreme Court started to dismantle campaign finance laws.

So, what are Mitch McConnell and Ted Cruz so scared of?

In fact, it wasn't that long ago that Mitch McConnell supported the very laws that he is now dead-set on blocking. Back in 1987, McConnell said he would support a constitutional amendment to allow Congress to regulate independent expenditures in elections—just as the Democracy for All amendment would. And then he introduced that very constitutional amendment. Either McConnell has dramatically changed his mind regarding what constitutes a threat to the First Amendment, or he's motivated by something more cynical.

So, if Mitch McConnell doesn't actually think that limiting the amount of money that wealthy interests can spend on elections is a violation of the First Amendment, what is he up to? Could it be that he now finds it more useful to court the dollars of major donors than the votes of his constituents?

Washington is the only place where campaign finance reform is a partisan issue. A poll this summer found that 73 percent of voters support a constitutional amendment to get big money out of politics. Americans know that our First Amendment is about protecting the speech of citizens, not the interests of wealthy campaign donors.

Faced with a large, bipartisan grassroots movement that threatens their big-spending friends, the only arguments that Mitch McConnell and Ted Cruz have left are wild accusations, flat-out falsehoods, and outlandish interpretations of the Bill of Rights.

[From thehill.com, July 3, 2014]

TED CRUZ SHOULD BE ASHAMED

(By Erwin Chemerinsky)

Reasonable people can disagree on whether it would be good to amend the Constitution to overcome the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, but Sen. Ted Cruz's (R–Texas) false claims about the proposed amendment have no place in an informed debate. In a series of speeches and writings, Cruz has lied about what the amendment would do. Surely we can and must expect more from our elected officials.

The occasion for Cruz's wrath is a proposed constitutional amendment concerning campaign finance that is now being considered in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The amendment's purpose is to overturn the Supreme Court's recent decisions that have limited the ability of Congress and state governments to regulate campaign spending.

In Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, in 2010, the Court, 5–4, declared unconstitutional a provision of federal law and held that corporations have the right to spend unlimited amounts of money in independent expenditures in election campaigns.

This year, in McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission, again by a 5–4 margin, the Court held unconstitutional another provision of federal law that regulated the total amount that a person could contribute to candidates or political parties in a two-year period. As Justice Breyer lamented in his dissent, these cases ''eviscerate'' federal campaign finance law.

The proposed constitutional amendment seeks to restore the power of Congress and the states to enact laws of the sort that the Court declared unconstitutional in these cases. These laws existed without problems for many years until the Supreme Court declared them unconstitutional. In fact, seven years before Citizens United, the Supreme Court upheld the very provision that it invalidated in that case.

The proposed constitutional amendment, in its key provision, simply would say: ''To advance democratic self-government and political equality, and to protect the integrity of government and the electoral process, Congress and the States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.'' Another provision would make clear that the government can limit campaign spending by corporations.

It is impossible to reconcile this language with Cruz's claims about it. In a statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee, Cruz declared: ''This amendment here today, if adopted, would repeal the free speech protections of the First Amendment. . . . This amendment, if adopted, would give Congress absolute authority to regulate the political speech of every single American, with no limitations whatsoever.''

Similarly, in an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal, Cruz said, the amendment ''gives Congress power to regulate—and ban—speech by everybody.'' In remarks at the Family Research Council, Cruz declared: ''What it [the proposed amendment] says is that politicians in Washington have unlimited constitutional authority to muzzle each and every one of you if you're saying things that government finds inconvenient.''

The amendment does nothing of the sort. It gives no authority to the government to ban or limit anyone's speech. It provides the government no power to ''muzzle'' messages the government doesn't like. It does not change in any way the long-standing First Amendment principle that the government cannot restrict speech based on the content of the message or the views expressed. The amendment would do no more than allow the government to regulate spending in election campaigns.

Cruz's repeat statements are more than just political hyperbole. They are false assertions intended to scare people into opposing the proposed constitutional amendment.

In a statement before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Cruz said, ''Any politician who put his or her name to an amendment taking away the free speech rights of every American, in my view, should be embarrassed.'' But it is Cruz who should be embarrassed by his false assertions. Ted Cruz is a lawyer who had a very distinguished career in government and private practice. I have debated him on several occasions and know that he is a person of great intelligence. He knows exactly what the proposed amendment would do and yet has chosen to vilify it by misrepresenting it.

Whether it is desirable to try and amend the Constitution to allow campaign finance regulations is the question to be debated. In this, and all debates, we should expect and demand honesty from our elected officials. Cruz, in his statements about the proposed campaign finance amendment, is far below the most minimal standards of honesty.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, most Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the American people are awaiting the President's speech this evening. It is a critically important speech about America's national security from our Commander in Chief. It is going to address the horror of terrorism in the Middle East and particularly the Islamic state, a terrorist group like few others—maybe like none we have ever seen.

This Islamic state, known as ISIS or ISIL, has been moving in full force in Syria and in Iraq. They are different than other extremist terrorist groups because they take and hold territory. That has not been seen in the past. They are also hell-bent on establishing resources and ongoing visible treasury. Some say they generate $1 million a day in revenues from the oil production they are in charge of. They swoop into a city and take over the banks, raiding them of all the money they can get their hands on.

In addition, they are engaged in some of the most barbaric and depraved tactics we have seen. The beheading of two Americans comes to mind instantly. It is a heartbreaking situation for their families and friends but an enraging situation for all of America, to think that innocent journalists would be subjected to such horrific treatment. And they threaten to do more. It isn't just Americans who are in their sights. They have targeted minorities. They have targeted those who are struggling in Iraq to survive, and they are prepared to literally force them into starvation or death. It is a harrowing situation. To think that some 11,000 or 12,000 of these ISIS terrorists have wreaked such havoc on the country of Iraq and the neighboring country of Syria really is a wakeup call for America.

The President is going to speak to the situation this evening. We, of course, want him to lay out the threat, and he will. We want him to spell out why this threat is important to the security and the future of the United States. I am certain he will. I want him to speak as well to our approach and how we are going to deal with this threat, and I believe he will, in some detail. I want to know who else is on our side in this effort as we move forward, what the scope of our activities will be, and the limitations of that scope of activities. The duration and the justification, the constitutionality and the legality are all critical issues, and we await the words of the President of the United States.

Most of us have held back at this point, waiting for the President's statement, but some have not. Some have already come to the floor of the Senate this morning to criticize the President when it comes to this issue of foreign policy. That is unfortunate. I think the President is entitled to at least present his case this evening before people come to the floor and condemn the President's foreign policy. We need to hear from the President what his plan is. And my hope is—and it would be nothing short of a political miracle in Washington, DC—that there would actually be bipartisan support for a plan emerging from the President's statement tonight.

Some of us may have our differences with some part of it. That is natural. That is our responsibility in the legislative branch of our government. But we should try to find common ground where we can. When America speaks in unity, with one voice, with one determined effort, that is when we are strongest.

There was a time in the history of this country—and I have lived through part of it—when there would be vigorous debates on foreign policy on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate, leading up to a vote on a critical question such as the invasion of a country or a war. Even after a contentious and sometimes partisan debate, without fail—without fail—there would be bipartisan support for the emerging policy.

People remember the war in Kuwait. I was one who voted against it. Do my colleagues know there was offered on the floor of the House immediately after the vote in favor of the President's policy a bipartisan resolution supporting the President's policy? That was considered the natural, reasonable thing to do.

We can look back to the war in Iraq. Go back to October 11, 2002. On the floor of the Senate we had a debate that ended in a vote on the invasion of Iraq. It is one of those moments in my career I will never forget because 23 of us voted no, including 1 Republican, Lincoln Chafee, and 23 Democrats. We voted no on the invasion of Iraq.

It wasn't long thereafter, though, that we were presented with appropriations bills to fund the military effort in Iraq. I voted for them. The reason I voted for those appropriations is pretty obvious. If it were my son, my daughter, my spouse fighting in Iraq, I would want them to have every resource necessary to accomplish their mission and come home safely.

So there was a bipartisan consensus, even though there was a difference in the formulation of foreign policy. I

hope that is what emerges tonight. I hope once the President has stepped forward and said that this is a plan, let us work together toward that plan, that we will see some bipartisanship emerging in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

We can have our differences and questions, but at the end of the day we need to come together as a nation. This horrible terrorist group, which has beheaded two innocent Americans and is absolutely depraved in its conduct, is going to continue. It is going to create chaos in Iraq. It is going to destabilize that country, and it is going to endanger not only innocent people but it is going to endanger innocent Americans. Let's listen carefully to what the President has to say.

This morning the majority leader HARRY REID of Nevada came to the floor and talked about a chance occurrence yesterday. Who should return to the Halls of the Capitol yesterday? Former Vice President Richard Cheney. What a moment for him to return to Washington as we debate foreign policy. We remember the foreign policy of Vice President Cheney and others. We know the price we paid for what turned out to be some very questionable, if not wrong, decisions.

At the end of the day in Iraq, 4,476 Americans lost their lives; 30,000 came home with serious injuries. We added $1 trillion to our national debt to pay for it.

It was Vice President Cheney's idea that the United States would be strong and muscular after the 9/11 attack, and he picked Iraq as a target. We would take out Saddam Hussein. The purported weapons of mass destruction never existed, never were found, but we invaded nevertheless. Now comes former Vice President Cheney again to inspire his troops in terms of this conflict.

I hope not only Democrats but Republicans as well will think twice about that advice. We have listened to this man's counsel before, and the world did not turn out to be the place he promised it would be.

Let us listen carefully, objectively, and honestly to the President tonight. Let us try to find some common ground as Americans where we can stand together against this terrorist threat.

The President has made it clear to all of us he is not going to be sending ground troops into this Iraq situation. We want to be careful that we don't engage ourselves in a long-term war involving the vulnerability of our troops for a long period of time, so I was disappointed with some of the statements made on the floor this morning on the other side.

I hope Americans will listen carefully, as I will tonight, to the President.

VETERANS SMALL BUSINESS ENHANCEMENT ACT

Tomorrow marks the 13th anniversary of 9/11. Our thoughts turn to the Americans we lost that day and to the men and women who showed such heroism above and beyond the call of duty. Firefighters, police, first responders, and Americans from all walks of life showed on that day that although terrorists might try to destroy our way of life, they cannot keep us down. Americans do stand together when we are threatened.

Since that day, to support the global war on terror, the Defense Department says about 2.5 million Americans—members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, and related National Guard units—have been deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq wars. Of those, more than one-third were deployed at least one time. More than 11,000 lost their lives in those two wars.

There are ways we can show our gratitude and help our veterans, including service veterans from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, now that they are home.

Tomorrow I am introducing, along with Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, the Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act. It will allow veterans who own small businesses to participate in GSA's excess Federal property program. This program makes items that the Federal agencies no longer need available to nonprofits and other groups that have a justifiable need for the property. We are talking about everything from vehicles to computers, office furniture, tools, and even heavy construction equipment. Participants in the program can claim the items for their businesses if they demonstrate a justifiable need for the property and they agree to pay for shipping and handling so there is no expense to the Federal Government.

By keeping their equipment overhead low, in this way the small businesses can grow their businesses. If unclaimed, the Federal property has to be disposed of by our government as excess property—and that costs money. The items have to be organized into one physical location, then photographed, catalogued, and ultimately auctioned off to scrap dealers who pay pennies on the dollar.

The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, which helps facilitate the GSA's excess Federal property program, estimates that taking surplus property off the Federal Government's hands, pairing it with those who could use it, saved the United States $200 million last year alone.

Minority-owned small businesses participate in this program now and have since 1999. My bill would extend that opportunity to veteran-owned small businesses as well.

Veterans throughout Illinois have contacted me to let me know how the surplus property program might help their small businesses.

Jim Ward, for example, a retired Army veteran, owns a popular tile business in Mount Sterling, in west central Illinois. His small business could benefit from maintenance equipment typically found in the Federal surplus program. Tile saws and cutters, kneepads, mixers, scrapers, trowels, and other hand tools are all items that appear from time to time in the program. He says he doesn't need state-of-the-art equipment. Getting his hands on something that works would be a big help to his veteran-owned business.

Then there is veteran Jim Sodaro. He owns a bar and a snow removal business in Springfield, IL. There are quite a few surplus items that could help him operate his business and free up resources for employees and overhead. Jim says he needs things such as tables, brooms, paint, and hand tools to run his bar. His snow removal business needs a pickup truck and other vehicles.

We heard from Jason Harris, a Marine Corps veteran who runs a popular landscaping business in Carbondale, IL. Shawnee Landscaping designs and installs patios, fencing, and retaining walls for gardens and porches. Mr. Harris would benefit from Federal surplus equipment too: Bobcats, tractors and loaders, hand tools and office supplies.

Tom Lomelino is a retired Army veteran and owner of the Lomelino Sign Company in Jacksonville, IL. Mr. Lomelino makes and installs advertising signs. He can use a bucket truck, a backhoe, or other equipment needed for installation and maintenance.

All of these Illinois veterans have a legitimate need for items that otherwise would go to waste and we would pay to destroy. Wouldn't it be better to put these items in the hands of veterans so their businesses can succeed and they can hire people in their local communities? I think so. Small business is the engine of the American economy. Our veterans have served our country well. Let us serve their next phase in life and make sure their businesses are successful.

I encourage my colleagues who want to support the veterans and dispose of surplus property in a productive way—not an expensive way—so that it continues to make money for the United States to join me in support of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. I rise today to speak about an issue that is fundamental to our democracy and vital to the future of our Nation. This is an issue so important that it requires us to take the monumental step of amending our Constitution.

This is not an action any of us should take lightly, but our democracy is under assault and I will not stand by and watch the damage being done without trying to do something to repair it.

Because of the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United, a tsunami of

undisclosed, unlimited campaign funding is corrupting our democracy. Our government is supposed to be about checks and balances. Citizens United and the recent McCutcheon decision make it more about who is writing the checks and how big is their bank balance.

In the 2012 election, 60 percent of the contributions to super PACs came from just 159 donors. Sixty-four percent of the money raised by the Senate candidates came from a mere .04 of 1 percent of the population.

Our government is in jeopardy of no longer being of the people but instead becoming of and for the wealthy. The voices of the majority of the American people, those of middle-class families, seniors on fixed incomes, workers making minimum wage, are being drowned out by an ocean of campaign cash. This is utterly undemocratic and it needs to stop.

Congress has tried to stop this tidal wave of unlimited money, but the Supreme Court interprets the First Amendment not as a guarantee of free speech but of who can pay to speak. As a result, our democracy is in peril.

Campaign finance limits don't limit our free speech. They increase it by ensuring that every citizen can be heard and that no one gets unfair access to our government at the expense of everyone else. Campaign finance laws don't stifle democracy, they enhance it.

We need to fix our broken campaign system. We need a constitutional amendment that overturns the Citizens United and McCutcheon decisions.

Our democracy is based on the fundamental principle that all voters, and each and every vote cast, are created equal. People, not dollars, are the true currency of our Constitution and democracy.

That is why I will be voting for Senate Joint Resolution 19, to support a democracy for all attitudes in the United States.

NET NEUTRALITY

I also rise in support of another principle that enshrines democratization to access of information and ideas: net neutrality.

Net neutrality is as basic to the functioning of the Internet as nondiscrimination is to the U.S. Constitution. In fact, net neutrality is just a fancy word for nondiscrimination.

The Internet is a success today because it is open to anyone with an idea. An open Internet enables freedom of expression and the sharing of ideas across town or across the world. Yet the vitality of this open platform is at stake. The FCC is currently considering a proposal that could allow broadband providers to charge Web sites, applications, and services more for faster delivery times to consumers. We cannot allow that to happen.

That is why I am proud to stand with the netizens—all Internet users—to show what the Internet would look like with fast and slow lanes.

Today is our battle for net neutrality. Today we demonstrate on our Web sites what paid prioritization really means: Web users stuck on a bumpy gravel path while the select few whiz by on a sleek highway with their Internet E–Z passes.

In solidarity with netizens everywhere, I have posted on my Web site a symbol familiar to Internet users everywhere—the loading symbol you get when your video is waiting to appear because there is congestion on the net. My Web site today, along with countless others, serves as a harbinger of the dark days that lie ahead if we let the broadband behemoths win.

I believe we should never forget that the net comes with a manufacturer's guarantee: No one should have to ask for permission to innovate.

To prevent this from happening, this summer I led 12 of my Senate colleagues in urging the FCC to reclassify broadband as a telecommunications service under title II, enabling the Commission to put the strongest rules on the books to prevent discrimination.

Internet access today is like traditional phone service was decades ago, it is essential for everyday living. But if the ISPs have their way, the FCC would turn the Internet from a democratic ''Field of Dreams'' into an exclusive set of gated communities.

But the good news is the online activist community—the Netroots and the startups, the Internet investors—have spoken out in favor of implementing title II to protect net neutrality.

I will continue to join with my colleagues in the Senate to fight for an open and nondiscriminatory Internet because the future of our country depends upon it.

I yield back the remainder of my time 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. TESTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, as many of you know, my wife and I still farm, and for part of August I had the pleasure to be able to be on the tractor and have some quality time to think about what makes our Nation great. There are many reasons, but one of them is the belief that everyone has a say in the decisions we make in this democracy, that each of us—from the richest to the poorest—has an equal stake in electing our leaders and impacting how we govern. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court has not figured that out.

From the Citizens United case to this year's McCutcheon decision, the Justices continually side with big money and corporations. They are siding with those who think government should work for the rich and the elite. They are siding with those who think that money equals speech and think it is OK for the wealthy to drown out the voices of the working folks, of the middle class, of everyone else.

Our current election system is hurting our democracy by reducing public confidence in our elections and increasing apathy in the political process. After all, why should someone take time out to follow our political process and vote when our system leads them to believe their vote does not make a difference? We simply cannot let that happen.

I agree with my colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, when he says that sooner or later our current system is going to cause a scandal in this body. This body cannot afford to fall further out of favor with the American people. After all, negative numbers are right around the corner.

The unprecedented amount of money—much of it unaccountable and anything but transparent—is allowing corporations to have an outsized say in not just who gets elected but how they act once they get into office. And trust me, corporate voices already have plenty of influence in Congress. It is putting up walls between regular folks and elected leaders who spend more and more hours on the phone with donors or bowing to those who might finance an outside ad campaign on their behalf and leaves less time for constituents.

Too many of the Justices—and too many of our colleagues—do not understand that many of Washington's current problems are tied to our campaign finance system. A lot of folks in the Senate and the House talk about working together. They talk about reaching across the aisle for responsible solutions that move our country forward. So what is holding them back? In many cases, it is the threat of big money coming after them in their next election.

We are not talking about Rick who works at Walmart or Amanda who teaches third grade chipping in $20 for a candidate they believe in. We are talking about corporate executives plowing millions—sometimes tens of millions—of dollars into independent and often secretly financed campaigns.

We have all seen colleagues hesitate to introduce legislation that is popular in their home State but were afraid it would spur big-moneyed outside groups to spend millions of dollars to defeat them. When that happens, it leaves constituents without any real say in who represents them.

Lawmakers are also held back by the hostile political climate that these expensive campaigns create. When you constantly see an ad that distorts your record, and then you see a fellow Senator from out of State endorse that ad, it makes it hard to compromise on legislation with somebody that, quite frankly, you do not trust.

Politicians also know that most of the money in campaigns is on the extremes of the political spectrum. And the extremes fight almost any sign of compromise and the folks who are willing to get things done. Heck, why are we having trouble confirming ambassadors? It is because ''compromise'' is a dirty word. It leads me to wonder: Could we do big things today like our predecessors did? Could we pull it together to build an Interstate Highway System or send a man to the Moon? Right now I think not.

Supporters of the current system defend their views by citing the Constitution. They put up some fun charts here on the Senate floor that cross out lines of the First Amendment, pretending as if this legislation actually changes the First Amendment. It is entertaining, but it is incorrect.

I guarantee you that our Founding Fathers—men such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson—would not want to see the Constitution used to justify our current campaign system. Leaders such as Washington and Jefferson had a vision for our Nation. They knew America would change with the times as new technologies were developed and new lands came into the Union. Back in 1787 there was no Montana.

If the Framers warned against political parties, I can only imagine what they would have to say about the rise of super PACs.

Folks who support Citizens United talk about protecting free speech and the First Amendment, but who is protecting the free speech of regular working-class folks? Who is protecting the voice of the schoolteacher or the repairman being drowned out by special interests? With this amendment, we are.

If the Congress needs inspiration, they should look at my home State of Montana. More than 100 years ago Montanans voted to limit the influence of Big Money elections. We were ahead of the curve. We called for fair elections after wealthy mining corporations bought influence, support, and even a U.S. Senate seat—and our laws worked pretty well for those 100 years. But 2 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Montana's law, citing its own Citizens United decision.

In 2012, Montanans stood once again to Big Money and its influence over a democratic process. In a voter referendum passed by a 3-to-1 margin, Montana voters called on Montana's congressional delegation to overturn Citizens United, and I proudly accepted that challenge. That is why I am cosponsoring Senator UDALL's amendment. Together we are saying enough is enough.

Congress and the States should have the power to regulate campaign spending to ensure that election spending does not corrupt elections. States should be able to decide whether to allow corporations' unchecked spending power in Governor and legislative races.

I heard one of my colleagues suggest yesterday that we are threatening to silence the voice of the little old lady who wants to put up a yard sign in front of her home. In fact, it is quite the opposite. We are working to ensure that her voice is louder than that Fortune 500 corporation—or at least as loud—when deciding the future of her town, her State or her country because that is what our country is supposed to be about, one person, one vote.

Spending for the Senate election in Montana in 2012 topped $50 million. That is more than $100 for every vote cast. In a State such as Montana, where the average household pulled in $45,000 in 2012, that is a big sum of money. It is the kind of money that can buy a lot of ads come election season. It can give a platform to drown out any other voice.

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, spending by outside groups in this 2014 election cycle is currently three times higher than the amount spent at the same point in 2010, and as of the end of August, outside groups have spent about $170 million on Federal midterm races—just the Federal part. Folks don't spend that kind of cash without thinking they are going to get a return on investment. Things are out of control, make no mistake.

Senator MCCAIN is right. Sooner or later it will lead to another Watergate or worse, and that is what is frustrating. We know how the story of unchecked money in politics ends. We have seen it before. Yet the Supreme Court has opened the door to yet another scandal. So it is time to overturn Citizens United, and it is time to overturn this year's McCutcheon decision which invalidated a 40-year-old law that limits the total amount of money an individual can contribute to campaigns each cycle.

Since that ruling in April, about 300 folks have taken advantage of that ruling, contributing over $11.5 million to political campaigns this year—just since April—300 in this Nation of 300 million. We must put regular people and their ideas back in charge of our elections.

Amending the Constitution is not something we should take lightly. The Constitution is our founding document, and it has held up under the test of time. But Big Money interests and defenders of Citizens United are distorting our First Amendment for their own gain. Getting Big Money out of elections is critical to improving how we govern, to make responsible decisions for all Americans. It is critical to electing leaders who put people first. I am proud to step forward in this fight. Our democratic system has worked for over two centuries. It has made our Nation the greatest Nation in the world, and I will not let that be jeopardized without a fight.

Back in Montana it doesn't matter whether someone has 5 acres or 5,000 acres: They jump on that tractor, and that tractor is still going to break down; the weather can be good, the weather can be bad. It is still going to happen.

The lesson is this. We are in this together, we all need to pitch in, and we all deserve a fair and honest say in how our election process works and our leaders are elected.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator UDALL on this important amendment. It is simply the right thing to do for our democracy.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I rise to speak against the bill before us, S.J. Res. 19. This is a constitutional amendment that would significantly curtail the free speech rights of all Americans.

I oppose this amendment because I believe that while it is critical to support speech with which we agree, it is even more crucial to support speech with which we disagree.

Whether it has been campaign finance laws or amendments to prohibit flag burning, I have consistently opposed amending the Constitution to limit the First Amendment.

As others have mentioned, if this amendment is adopted, it would be the first time Congress has limited rights protected in the Bill of Rights. This would be a very dangerous precedent to set.

By limiting the amount of money individuals and corporations can spend on elections, this amendment would clearly limit their rights under the First Amendment. The Supreme Court has made clear that this would be tantamount to a restriction on ''the number of issues discussed, the depths of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached.''

This amendment would allow us to decide what amount of money is speech and who can use it. This is a perilous amount of power to place in the hands of politicians. I don't think we need to protect incumbent politicians. I think we need to protect the rights under the First Amendment.

In addition to concerns with what we know this amendment will do, I am even more concerned about what we don't know. Before we amend the Constitution, we are obligated to understand the effects of the legislation.

What does it mean to ''influence elections,'' as the bill states? Who is a ''candidate''? What is the ''press''? Does this include bloggers? What about a citizen who writes his or her own newsletter to their community association and prints it on her home printer? All of these terms and more seem ripe for litigation, which leaves the true meaning of this amendment in the hands of unelected judges.

It also bears mentioning that opposition to this amendment is not limited to Republicans or conservative organizations. The ACLU wrote a letter to the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, opposing this legislation. The ACLU stated: ''As we have said in the past, this and similar constitutional amendments would fundamentally break the Constitution and endanger civil rights and civil liberties for generations.''

I could not agree more.

Amending the Constitution is serious business. I believe limiting the Bill of Rights for the first time in our history is a bad decision. I will once again vote to preserve and protect the First Amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same by rejecting S.J. Res. 19.

As an incumbent politician, I am the first to concede that elections are daunting. They are unpredictable. It is unnerving to see other groups and individuals spend money to run ads against you. But the alternative is to have me, as an incumbent politician, write rules and regulations to limit the speech of those who would run against me or support those who would run against me. That is wrong. It is wrong for people in this body to define speech and to define who is entitled to it.

We need to tread carefully. That is why we need to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

RACIAL PROFILING

Mr. CARDIN. I rise today to discuss the tragic shooting of Michael Brown last month in Ferguson, MO.

Michael Brown did not need to die. This cycle of needless sacrificing of our teens to violent ends must end. It has been heartbreaking to see yet another American town gripped by such a tragedy. I welcome Attorney General Holder's decision last week to begin a pattern or practice investigation into the allegations of unlawful policing by the City of Ferguson's Police Department. I also strongly support the Justice Department's outreach efforts through their Community Oriented Policing Services Office. This office, known as the COPS Office, can help better evaluate and train local law enforcement to carry out fair and impartial policing.

In addition to the recent investigation announced by the Department of Justice, I urge Attorney General Holder to expedite the issuance of new guidelines that would, once and for all, prohibit racial profiling by law enforcement officers at all levels of government, including the federal, State, and local law enforcement officials. Congress should also examine the program that provides for the transfer of surplus military equipment to local law enforcement agencies to ensure local government is not inhibiting the First Amendment rights of people to peaceably assemble and petition their government for the redress of grievances.

Local government must also respect the First Amendment rights of the press to do their jobs, report the story, and help provide the truth to the American people.

For a more permanent fix, Congress should take up and pass legislation that I authored, the End Racial Profiling Act, known as ERPA, which is S. 1038. I want to thank my colleagues who have cosponsored this legislation, including Senators REID, DURBIN, BLUMENTHAL, COONS, HARKIN, MENENDEZ, STABENOW, LEVIN, MIKULSKI, WARREN, BOXER, GILLIBRAND, HIRONO, WYDEN, and MURPHY. I also thank Congressman JOHN CONYERS, the ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee, for introducing the House companion legislation, H.R. 2851, which has 54 cosponsors in the House of Representatives.

This legislation provides training and monitoring for law enforcement agencies at all levels of government. By enacting this legislation, we can begin to reduce the racial disparities that plague our Nation's criminal justice system. We need to better educate more of our law enforcement officials in the differences between specific suspect descriptions and sweeping generalizations or profiling that wastes valuable resources. Racial profiling is un-American. It has no place within the values of our country. It turns communities against the partnerships needed to keep our neighborhoods safe.

Two years ago, I want to remind my colleagues, the Senate and the American people were having this very same conversation. So it is heartbreaking to me that we are having this conversation again without having taken more definitive action. In 2012 the Nation's attention was riveted to the tragic avoidable death of Trayvon Martin in Florida in February 2012. As we all know from the news, an unarmed Martin, 17, was shot in Sanford, FL, on his way home from a convenience store while wearing a hoodie and carrying a can of iced tea and a bag of Skittles.

After the tragedy I met with the faith and civil rights groups at the Center for Urban Families in Baltimore to discuss the issue of racial profiling. Joining me were representatives of various faith and civil rights groups in Baltimore, as well as graduates from the Center's program.

I heard there first-hand accounts of typical American families who were victims of racial profiling. One young woman recounted going to a basketball game with her father, only to have her dad detained by the police for no apparent reason other than the color of his skin.

Trayvon's tragic death led to a discussion in the Senate of the broader issue of racial profiling. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on ''Ending Racial Profiling In America'' in April 2012 which was chaired by Senator DURBIN. At the hearing I was struck by the testimony of Ronald L. Davis, the Chief of Police of the City of Palo Alto, CA.

I want to quote in part from Chief Davis's testimony, in which he said:

> There exists no national, standardized definition for racial profiling that prohibits all uses of race, national origin, and religion, except when describing a person. Consequently, many State and local policies define racial profiling as using race as the ''sole'' basis for a stop or any police action. This definition is misleading in that it suggests using race as a factor for anything other than a description is justified, which it is not. Simply put, race is a descriptor, not a predictor. To use race along with other salient descriptors when describing someone who just committed a crime is appropriate.

Then Chief Davis continued:

> However, when we deem a person to be suspicious or attach criminality to a person because of the color of his or her skin, the neighborhood they are walking in or the clothing they are wearing, we are attempting to predict criminality. The problem with such predictions is that we are seldom right in our results and always wrong in our approach.

After the hearing I was joined at a press conference by Baltimore's Reverend Dr. Jamal Bryant, a leading youth activist and adviser to the Trayvon Martin family. Reverend Bryant echoed the call of ending racial profiling by law enforcement in America, and let me quote him:

> This piece of legislation being offered by my Senator, Senator Cardin, is the last missing piece for the civil rights bill from 1965 that says there ought to be equality regardless of one's gender or one's race. Racial profiling is in fact an extension of racism in America that has been unaddressed and this brings closure to the divide in this country.

I have called for putting an end to racial profiling, a practice that singles out individuals based on race, ethnicity, national origin or religion. My legislation would protect minority communities by prohibiting the use of racial profiling by law enforcement officials.

First, the bill prohibits the use of racial profiling by all law enforcement agents, whether Federal, State or local. Racial profiling is defined in a standard, consistent definition as the practice of a law enforcement agent relying on race, ethnicity, religion or national origin as a factor in their investigation and activities. The legislation creates an exception for use of these factors where there is trustworthy information relevant to the locality and timeframe which links a person of a particular race, ethnicity or national origin to an identified incident or scheme.

Law enforcement agencies would be prohibited from using racial profiling

in criminal or routine law enforcement investigations, immigration enforcement, and national security cases.

Second, the bill would mandate training on racial profiling issues and require data collection by local and State law enforcement agencies.

Third, this bill would condition the receipt of federal funds by State and local law enforcement on two grounds. First, under this bill, State and local law enforcement would have to ''maintain adequate policies and procedures that are designed to eliminate racial profiling.'' Second, they must ''eliminate any existing practices that permit or encourage racial profiling.''

Fourth, the bill would authorize the Justice Department to provide grants to State and local governments to develop and implement best policing practices that would discourage racial profiling such as an early warning system.

Finally, the bill would require the Attorney General to provide periodic reports to assess the nature of any ongoing discriminatory profiling practices. The bill would also provide remedies for individuals who were harmed by racial profiling.

The legislation I have introduced is supported by a broad coalition of civil rights groups. These groups include the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the ACLU, NAACP, Rights Working Group, and numerous other national, State and local organizations.

Racial profiling is bad policy, but given the state of our budgets, it also diverts scarce resources from real law enforcement. Law enforcement officials nationwide already have tight budgets. The more resources spent investigating individuals because of their race, religion, national origin or ethnicity, the fewer resources are used towards suspects who are actually demonstrating illegal behavior. Using racial profiling makes it less likely that certain affected communities will voluntarily cooperate with local law enforcement and community policing efforts, making it harder for our law enforcement community to fight crime and terrorism.

Minorities living and working in these communities in which racial profiling is used may feel discouraged from traveling freely, which corrodes the public trust in government. This ultimately demonizes entire communities and perpetuates negative stereotypes based on an individual's race, ethnicity or religion.

Racial profiling has no place in modern law enforcement. The vast majority of law enforcement officials who put their lives on the line every day handle their jobs with professionalism, diligence, and fidelity to the rule of law, and they understand that racial profiling has no place in their work.

However, the Congress and Justice Department should still take steps to prohibit racial profiling and finally root out its use.

I agree with Attorney General Holder's remarks to the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee where he stated:

> In this Nation, security and liberty are—at their best—partners, not enemies, in ensuring safety and opportunity for all. . . . In this Nation, the document that sets forth the supreme law of the land—the Constitution—is meant to empower, not exclude. . . . Racial profiling is wrong. It can leave a lasting scar on communities and individuals. And it is, quite simply, bad policing—whatever city, whatever state.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the equal protection of law to all Americans. Racial profiling is important to that principle. It should be ended once and for all.

As the late Senator Ted Kennedy often said: ''Civil rights is the great unfinished business of America.'' Let's continue the fight here to make sure that we truly have equal justice under the law for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation I have introduced that will end racial profiling once and for all.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to express my strong frustration—and the frustration of Nebraskans—with the Senate's current debate.

Similar to many of my colleagues, I spent the past 5 weeks traveling my State and meeting with constituents. I held over one dozen listening sessions in communities all across Nebraska. Not a single Nebraskan told me to go back to Washington and vote to limit free speech. Not a single Nebraskan told me to come and play politics or take show votes.

The message I received from almost every Nebraskan was the same: Get something done, turn the economy around, deal with overregulation, help control the costs of health care, and help businesses create jobs. Prevailing concern with the economy and weak job growth exists all across our country. According to several leading economists, 225,000 jobs were supposed to be created last month. Instead, the number of jobs created was just 142,000. The real unemployment rate—those who are unemployed or underemployed—remains unacceptably high at nearly 12 percent. That is 19 million Americans who are out of work or want to work more hours.

It is a disgrace the Senate is not debating policies that will help them. Instead, we are debating a bill to limit free speech. It is no wonder the American people have such a poor opinion of Congress. Seriously, what are we doing here? In Washington, those in power are more concerned with winning elections so they can stay in power than with actually governing and making tough decisions that will protect our country and help our families, and that is what we are doing today with another show vote, another sound bite that is engineered by campaign strategists who don't have any interest in sound policy.

I wish to address the two proposals before the Senate this week—a resolution to amend the Bill of Rights and campaign legislation that is targeting women voters. The resolution offered by the Senator from New Mexico is, I believe, a clear attack on the First Amendment and a series of recent Supreme Court rulings. The measure grants unlimited authority to Congress and State legislatures to criminalize speech on any platform, and that includes the Internet.

This proposal guts the First Amendment and the principles of free speech that have endured since the Bill of Rights was ratified in 1791. It further empowers incumbent politicians to make decisions with less accountability, and it muffles the voices of private citizens. It is perverse that the Senate is actually devoting time to debating the constitutional amendment that would actually diminish democratic participation and decrease freedom.

What have we become?

In a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, the ACLU wrote that the proposed amendment ''would severely limit the First Amendment, lead directly to government censorship of political speech and result in a host of unintended consequences that would undermine the goals the amendment has been introduced to advance—namely encouraging vigorous political dissent and providing voice to the voiceless, which we, of course, support.''

The ACLU is not exactly an ally of the Republican Party, but their letter shows there is broad concern over this poorly crafted resolution.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand for free speech, to stand for democratic participation, and to reject this resolution.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

At this time I wish to address the issue of equal pay and the paycheck fairness legislation. Make no mistake, some women in this country continue to struggle with gender-based pay discrimination. Equal pay for equal work is a principle I strongly support. With 60 percent of women working as primary breadwinners, lost wages hurt families and single women alike. Republicans fully agree that gender-based pay discrimination in the workplace is unacceptable.

In April I worked with Senator COLLINS, Senator AYOTTE, and Senator MURKOWSKI on a reasonable proposal to modernize key portions of the 51-year-old Equal Pay Act. Our proposal prevents retaliation against employees who inquire about, discuss or disclose

their salaries. In fact, one of the President's April Executive orders also deals with nonretaliation, suggesting this is an area we can agree and work together.

Our proposal also reinforces current law which prohibits pay discrimination based on gender and it requires employers to notify employees of their rights.

Finally, it addresses the opportunity gap or the need to provide both men and women with good-paying jobs. It consolidates duplicative job training programs and provides Federal grants to States for the creation of industry-led partnerships. This program is meant to provide women and men underrepresented in industries that report worker shortages with the skills they need to compete.

I believe this proposal could pass the Senate. It is reasonable, it is targeted, and it is a serious solution. Instead, we have a Senate that is laser focused on election-year politics, bills that no Republican can support, and bills that even some Democrats reject.

The majority leader does not appear to have any interest in putting bills on the floor that can pass—bills we can work on together. That idea doesn't fit into that election-year playbook. At the end of the day, this is raw politics. That is all it is. Nebraskans expect more. Americans expect more. They expect us to do our jobs, to work together to offer solutions, to debate, to amend, and to vote.

There are so many proposals I would love to vote on. Sometimes you win, sometimes you lose, but we should be voting. We have to start having meaningful debate. We have to start taking votes, and they better be real votes. That is the only way we are going to do our jobs, and that is the only way we will be held accountable by our constituents. We should be tackling those very important issues we spoke to our neighbors and friends about when we were at home traveling our States during the August recess.

Enough with the sound bites, enough with the show votes, enough speaking to cameras. Let's listen to the American people. Let's get back to the Senate we all admired when we were in school and read about in our country's history. As students we studied those serious—and many times very heated—debates that took place on this floor.

As Senators we may not always agree on what is the best policy, but we better start doing our jobs. We need to return to debating real policy that addresses the very real needs of the American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I was not scheduled to speak at this time, but there is something going on today that is pretty exciting and I wish to share with everyone.

There is a new group that has been formed that is called the IDC, In Defense of Christians. I just came from addressing this group's summit, and it is pretty amazing. There are over 1,000 people in the Visitor Center's big auditorium. It is the largest crowd that has ever been down there, and it has been quickly formed because of the persecution that has taken place throughout the world and primarily in the ISIS area.

Unfortunately I don't have charts that are big enough to project this issue well, but at least the President is there and can see them. This is the area where ISIS is working. They are not just in Syria and Iraq. They are in Jordan and other areas. It is a very large area. They are not confined to any particular area.

One of the problems that is being addressed—we know about what they are doing. We know they are probably the strongest force and greatest threat against the United States we have ever faced.

I was very proud of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Hagel. He was very outspoken when he talked about the threat we are facing. He characterized it as a great threat.

Why is it a great threat? It is a great threat because they have already declared war on America, and that is why I stood here yesterday to get support in the Senate for authority to use military force—that is AUMF—and we are going to make every effort to get that done.

Tonight the President is going to speak about this issue. Hopefully he will come out stronger than he has in the past and say something meaningful about how he, as the President of the United States, is going to win this war. I am not expecting it, but I am hoping for it. There is no doubt that once we pass this resolution, he will have the authority to do it. This group is concerned with that matter, but the reason they are together is because they are concerned with the Christian and religious persecution that is going on.

I have a lot of background in this area. Way back—before a lot of you guys were born—in 1979, I was mayor of the city of Tulsa, OK, and I remember a man named Boris Penson. Boris Penson was sent to a Siberian gulag prison for 9 years. He was there because of the fact that he would not relinquish his Jewish faith. He was persecuted because of his faith, and we were able to get him out. That was a long time ago.

I had another experience in 1988 in Damascus. There was Christian persecution going on at that time. We were able to get them to change the geography a little bit so the people there could openly pray to their lord and savior Jesus Christ. That was unheard of in Syria. It was not like it is today. Today they are killing them. Back then they were putting them in prison.

I think it is important for people to understand that ISIS is the most well-organized, well-funded terrorist group in history. More than 1 million people have fled their homes in Iraq after being given the ultimatum by ISIS to convert to Islam or be put to death. Since they invaded Iraq, hundreds and thousands of men and women have been enslaved and have been beheaded as a result of the ultimatum to Christians. I will read it to my colleagues because I don't want to be misquoted. They issued the ultimatum to Christians living in the region I just showed: ''Convert to Islam or face death by the sword.'' That is what is going on today.

As I told this group a few minutes ago, now and then we have a happy ending. I have been active—and a lot of people know this—in Africa now for 20 years. I have actually made 135 African country visits. I have seen all kinds of things take place in terms of religious intolerance, persecution. But I remember very well being in the new country called South Sudan. South Sudan is to the south of Sudan. Sudan is up there near Khartoum. We are all familiar with that and the problems taking place there, and we know how intolerant they are there.

It happened there was a lady there named Mariam Ibrahim. I am going to show my colleagues a picture. We have never seen a prettier lady in her life. That is in her wedding dress. She is beautiful. She is Sudanese. She had been a Muslim. However, she renounced that and she now is a Christian. So they went to this beautiful young lady who had one baby and she was 8 months pregnant with her next baby, and they said, We are going to put you on trial. You have to renounce Christianity. She said, I can't do it. They said, Well, you have to do it. So she was found guilty of not renouncing her Christianity. She was sentenced to 100 lashes, which would kill her, and then they would hang her up by her neck for public display as an example of what happens.

Several of us were involved in this. We had a lot of cooperation from some of the surrounding African countries, including Uganda, President Museveni came through; President Kagame from Rwanda; President Kabila from Congo, and our State Department and others, and we were able to get them to have an appeal. As of today, she is now out of prison. She is back. She has two children, and she and her husband and children are living in the United States.

If it hadn't been for seeing what Mariam Ibrahim was facing and knowing that was going on and seeing the beautiful picture of her and a few of us finding out about it, she would be right now still hanging up for display.

This is what is happening. A lot of people out there are saying, Well, ISIS is a very serious thing, but this isn't our problem. Yes, it is. I can remember 3 months ago I made the statement that ISIS is a threat to our homeland and people didn't believe that was the case. There is a poll that came out yesterday that I thought I had with me and I don't. But the ABC poll shows that 71 percent of the American people believe ISIS is a direct threat to the homeland of the United States of America. That is 71 percent of the people. They also believe—the same 71 percent of the people—that our President does not have the strategy to win this war. So tonight we are hoping to hear something that is out of character for him. We are hoping it will be something strong that will allow us to win the war.

Let me wind up by welcoming those over 1,000 people who are downstairs right now in the Visitor Center who are from the Defense of Christians Summit that is taking place as we speak. We have a lot of people out there. They are doing the Lord's work and they will be richly blessed for it.

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. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I come to speak today on a question of enormous importance. Before I do so, I wish to take a moment, as I was just with the majority leader and the deputy leader and a number of our colleagues where we held a ceremony in commemoration of a Congressional Medal of Honor that was issued in remembrance of those who gave their lives on September 11, 13 years ago. Neither the Presiding Officer nor I were Members of the Senate at that time, but I think all of us remember where we were that early Tuesday morning, and the ceremony we just came from was an appropriate tribute.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Madam President, during the most recent recess in August, I crisscrossed Virginia in a variety of efforts. One that was particularly meaningful to me was where I did a statewide student debt tour, where literally I spoke with hundreds of students and graduates from families of nine Virginia colleges and universities about student debt and what this crushing amount of student debt is doing to their opportunities to get the same kind of fair shot the Presiding Officer and I both had.

The schools I visited ranged from big 4-year public universities, small, private liberal arts colleges, to one of our historically Black colleges, as well as a 2-year community college. The student debt figure right now is at $1.2 trillion, exceeding credit card debt. Student debt has exceeded the aggregate of auto loan debt, credit card debt, and home equity debt balances, becoming, next to mortgages, the second largest debt of U.S. households. That means that for far too many young people, and not so young people, they are forced to put off their decisions about starting a family, launching a startup business, or buying a home because of the burdens of student debt. Many young people find themselves working in jobs they didn't want or necessarily train for just to pay off their student debts.

At Old Dominion University I spoke to Carina. She is a bright and ambitious young woman who told me that in her sophomore year, she worked three jobs, at one point four jobs, to ensure that she met tuition. She mentioned that she was the first of all her family members to step foot on a college campus. She said: ''College is a foreign field in my family.'' She said: ''I am a pioneer.'' She is not alone. The challenges she faces are repeated time and time again.

At Virginia State University, one of our historically Black colleges, I met with Tobias, who mentioned that a lot of his peers had to drop out of school because they could not afford to take out any more loans or debt. He told me: Senator WARNER, I have made the decision to stay in school. It is the key to my future, but I do so knowing that I will have to spend a lot of years paying off student loans.

At one of our finer public institutions in Virginia, the College of William & Mary, I had a great conversation with Jacob, a junior originally from the far southwest part of our State, in Lebanon, VA. He is graduating from college in 3 years instead of 4 because of dual enrollment he took while he was in high school, at Southwest Virginia Community College. He told me that despite his ambition, it is financially impossible for him to go on to immediately get a graduate degree or buy a home or buy a car or start a business, because even with shortening college from 4 years to 3 years, he still has a tremendous amount of student debt.

I have to tell my colleagues, across Virginia I have heard over the last year more about this issue than virtually any other issue, from young people, from families, from parents. I remember somebody in Virginia Beach not too long ago, a young man, 31 years old, who actually served in elective office. He had graduated from the University of Michigan Law School, had worked as a lawyer, had been laid off, and was moving back in with his parents at the age of 31. I could almost see his ambitions being crushed because his student debt payments amounted to $2,000 a month. Where does he get the same kind of fair shot that many of us had?

I am the first member of my family to graduate from college. I got out of college and law school and worked for a while, started businesses, failed miserably twice. The third time I managed to do well in a startup industry called cell phones. But I came out of that experience with a total of $15,000 worth of debt. I am not sure I would have taken the first shot or second shot or, Lord knows a third shot, if I had come out with $50,000 $60,000, $70,000, $80,000, or $100,000 of debt that many people come out of school with now.

We have to get on this issue. This issue is having an effect on our economic recovery. I meet with homebuilders on a regular basis and with realtors on a regular basis. They are saying, The real estate market is recovering for everybody except people buying starter homes. Why are they not buying starter homes? Time and again because of crushing amounts of student debt.

I hope during this shortened period we will get a chance to have a conversation about a broadbased proposal to refinance student debt at lower rates. I am not sure we are going to be successful in that proposal, but I think it is a conversation and debate we ought to have. I look forward to supporting that effort. But if we are not able to get that effort across the finish line right now, we can't walk away from this issue.

I have worked on a series of bipartisan, targeted reforms that would reduce costs, increase transparency, and allow students to better manage their amounts of debt. Any one of these proposals isn't going to completely solve this problem, but this should not go into the bucket of issues we continue to kick down the road. The issue of student debt, the affordability of college, are issues of enormous economic proportion and, frankly, one that shouldn't be viewed as a Democrat or Republican issue.

Let me speak briefly about a couple of my proposals. First is a proposal I partnered with Senator WYDEN and Senator RUBIO on that in any rational place should be a complete no-brainer. It is a bill called Know Before You Go. The idea is quite simple. Let's do with higher education what we have done in real estate with the Zillow Web site or what we have done with the travel pricing, with Travelocity and a series of other Web sites, and try to take every 4-year institution, 2-year institution, career and technical education program, graduate program, and make them totally transparent on a single user-friendly Web site, where before you go, you know what your chances of graduating are, how much debt you might want to take on, if you major in art history, the way my daughter did, what your chances of getting a job are and how much it is going to pay, so that we can actually make people better informed consumers before they choose higher education.

Probably next to buying a house, higher education is the most expensive investment you will make in a lifetime. Maybe students will find out that

if they go to UVA and drop out after 3 years and come out with a lot of debt, they will not have much with which to get into the job market, whereas if they went to Piedmont Community College and actually came out with a 2-year degree in medical tech fields, they will have a 90-percent placement opportunity.

This Know Before You Go Act—we have collected most of this data already, so it should not be that big a stretch to put this in a user-friendly fashion. What if Tobias's friends at Virginia State had a better idea before enrolling in college how much they would be expected to pay, how this would actually break down grants versus loans, a recognition of the actual graduation rate and their job prospects upon graduation? Maybe some of them might choose a different path.

Better informed consumers of higher education would be one no-brainer step.

A second opportunity—and I do not know where it falls on the ideological spectrum, but on the commonsense spectrum it makes an awful lot of sense. Why does college have to be 4 years anymore? Why can't we have more students—particularly first-generation students—getting a jump-start on college with dual enrollment in high school? The key on this is to make sure the credits they get in their dual enrollment at community college actually count toward their degree requirement, which requires what are called articulation agreements between the 4-year institutions and the 2-year institutions. It does not do much good if you come into college with a lot of course credit but it does not count toward your degree requirements. Let's try to make sure more students can knock off a semester or a year of college in high school. That would save families $10,00, $20,000, $30,000, in effect, if we could make that happen.

If you are a low-income student and you qualify for a Pell grant, why not be able to use part of those Pell grant proceeds in high school if the credits you receive in high school in dual enrollment actually count toward your degree requirements? Again, that is a jump-start on college. It would make sure that a student such as Jacob at William & Mary, rather than being the exception, would become more the rule.

Let me talk about another proposal. Again, I am working with my colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, on this legislation. Senator RUBIO has a story similar to mine. He is the first generation in his family to graduate from college and law school. He tells stories as well of years of repaying student debt.

In our student debt processes, we already have a series of payment proposals. Unfortunately, most of them are confusing. Many of them end up like the student I know or the young person I know in Virginia Beach who is on a fixed payment proposal. This individual, as I mentioned—$2,000 a month, completely crushing his abilities to take any chances at all.

So what Senator RUBIO and I have done is we put together a proposal that would say the first option—it would still be the young person's option to opt out of, but the first option would be an income-based repayment proposal that would cap your student debt repayment at 10 percent of your income. What would this do? Ten percent of your income would allow you to take that chance on that startup business. Ten percent of your income, capped, would maybe give you the ability to say: Oh gosh, if I hit a rough spot, I will not get crushed. I will not have to move back in with my family.

This better structured, financially sustainable, income-based repayment proposal would allow young people to better manage their debt and avoid the impact of default.

Part of our proposal includes loan forgiveness programs that will provide borrowers such as Jacob in southwest Virginia the kind of relief they want.

Even if we cannot agree on a grand refinancing proposal, this income-based capping at 10 percent—which has been greeted by left and right alike as a dramatic step forward—ought to be part of our discussion.

Then I come to another proposal—one that, quite honestly, even this body with all of its dysfunction ought to be able to get done. I partnered with my colleagues Senator THUNE and Senator AYOTTE on a very business-friendly proposal that would be an option for an employer and employee. Right now, if an employee wants to continue with their education, an employer can take up to $5,000 of that employee's salary and apply it to their tuition, tax free, on continuing education. Well, if we are allowing an employer to do that for an employee to continue their education, to increase their skills, why not provide that same kind of option for an employer to apply that same amount—up to $5,000 of a person's salary—directly against an employee's student debt pretax and tax free as well? It does not cost the employer another dime. This is purely at the option of the employee. It would be a great retention tool for a company to say: Hey, keep working with us. We are going to give you this benefit.

That young or not-so-young person will get this money pretax going against their student debt. It is common sense, bipartisan, and something on which—even with all of our bitter battles back and forth—we ought to be able to find common ground.

As I mentioned at the outset, like many Virginians, like many probably in this body, as the first in my family to have graduated from college—I could not have gotten to college; my family did not have the resources. I had to work. I got grants. But I also had to take out student debt. The student debt that I had at $15,000 pales in comparison to the average amount of debt with which people come out of even public universities in Virginia right now—more than $25,000. I had $15,000 of debt after college and law school. Look at people who come out of graduate school. On average those numbers more than double.

This is an issue whose time has come for us to address. In America in the 21st century, you should not go broke if you decide to go to college. We all encourage our young people to get that education that will allow them to prosper in a knowledge-based economy, but we hold out a false hope when we say: Go get that education, but we are going to put you into such debt that for the next 20 years you are not going to be able to exercise that education in the way you wanted to because you are going to be scrambling to repay the obligations it took you to get those skills.

I say this as a former Governor. This is the case. I was proud of the amount of the investment we made in higher education when I was Governor. Quite honestly, if we look across the board at every State in our Nation as a whole, over the last 20 years Federal and State direct aid to higher education has been virtually a straight line down. The cost of a higher education has been a straight line up. How have we filled that gap? We have filled that gap with basically an unfair deal to a whole generation. We have said: Do not worry about the cost; just take out more debt. For a while, when the economy was good and you could get a job pretty much guaranteed coming out of college or graduate school, this did not present a crisis. In the last 4 or 5 years, as we have seen college graduates, law school graduates, graduate school graduates coming out without job opportunities, we have seen this house of cards collapse.

I again remind my colleagues that there is $1.2 trillion of student debt—greater than credit card debt. The cost of a higher education is continuing to escalate at a rate even higher than health care costs.

For those of us who are lucky enough to serve in this body, we all got our fair shot. If we are really going to honor our commitment to this next generation—and, quite honestly, the parents who are also helping to pay off this next generation—we have to deal with this crushing issue of student debt. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we address this problem in a reasonable, responsible, and timely manner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN.) The Senator from Texas.

ISIL

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we all are anticipating the President's speech tonight in which hopefully he will make the case for why it is in America's national security interest to eliminate the ISIS or ISIL threat from the Islamic State that is forming a new

caliphate in what used to be called Iraq and Syria and which hopefully will be restored.

When the President first campaigned for President in 2008, I know he did not promote himself as a future war President—just the opposite. He told supporters that on his first day in office he would give U.S. military forces in Iraq a new mission, which was ending the war. But just because one side of a war quits does not mean the war ends. I think now we found that to be painfully obvious.

When the President was running for reelection, time and time again he boasted that he upheld that 2008 campaign promise and brought the Iraq war to a close. He further assured us that the tide of war was receding. I am sure if he had a chance he would probably take back those words because history has disproved those very arguments.

As recently as mid-June, even after the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and Syria had conquered the second largest Iraqi city, the city of Mosul, a national security spokeswoman was still repeating the White House talking points that are 3 years old, telling the Wall Street Journal that President Obama promised to responsibly end the war in Iraq and he did.

Of course, America's complete withdrawal from Iraq in 2011 did not end the war, as I suggested a moment ago. It just ended the U.S. involvement in the war in Iraq until now. But it did make the resurgence of war much more likely. It was, in hindsight, a tragic mistake. We were the glue that held Iraq together, but once we left and pulled the plug without—because we did not negotiate a status of forces agreement or a bilateral security agreement, the old sectarian strife that is perhaps centuries or more old came back to the forefront. Iran continued its aggression in Iraq, as it had been doing all the time we were there, as well as their support for Bashar al-Assad and his support for Hamas and other terrorist organizations. Meanwhile, in Libya—remember, NATO went to war in Libya as well, primarily using U.S. assets and money.

Our complete and utter neglect of Libya following the neglect of Muammar Qadhafi did not end that war either; it merely created a security vacuum that was quickly filled by radical militias and terrorist groups with ties to Al Qaeda.

If we learned anything from 9/11—and I just returned from a Congressional Gold Medal service in the Capitol—if we learned anything 13 years ago, it is that vacuums get filled. If we do not fill the vacuum with constructive self-governance and respect for the rule of law and individual human worth and dignity, then that vacuum will be filled by terrorists and others who reject all of those fundamental values of our country. We did not learn it. We did not learn the lesson. We did not learn it in Libya. We did not learn it in Iraq. Eleven months after Qadhafi's death and less than a week after President Obama told the Democratic National Convention that Al Qaeda was on the path to defeat, Al Qaeda-linked terrorists killed four Americans in Benghazi, including our U.S. Ambassador—less than a week.

I mention all this recent history because it all comes back to the issue of credibility, not only of our Commander in Chief in the United States, but of the American people. It comes down to our Nation's credibility around the world.

Will we be trusted by our friends and allies? Will we be feared by our would-be adversaries, the bullies, the tyrants, the thugs, and the terrorists who will take advantage of the vacuum left once America withdraws?

From the Middle East to the Far East, from Baghdad to Beijing, to Mosul, to Moscow, this administration has done tremendous damage to America's credibility.

America is the one indispensable nation in the world. We may not like that sometimes; it may seem like too big a responsibility, but no one else can fill a void left when America retreats. Ronald Reagan understood that. That is why he stood for what he called peace through strength, and you know it works.

But when the President announced a withdrawal date from Afghanistan in the very same speech in which he announced a U.S. troop surge, he damaged America's credibility again. Is that any way to encourage people to support the United States and NATO's mission in Afghanistan, to tell them: Well, we are going to surge troops today, but we are going to be gone tomorrow, so you better make your bets in terms of your long-term interest—which, in Afghanistan, means they are betting with America's adversaries.

Of course, as we saw in Iraq, tragically—the investment the United States made in terms of blood and treasure, which was squandered in Iraq—he created another prospect of the squandering of America's blood and treasure in Afghanistan unless we have learned the lesson of Iraq.

Then there is Syria. The President has given speech after speech. The Department of State, Hillary Clinton, others, the national security advisors, have said it is American policy that there be regime change in Syria, that Bashar al-Assad has to go.

But then nothing happened—well, I take that back. Something did happen; 200,000 civilians have died in Syria as a result of that civil war.

The President came to Congress to ask for authority to conduct air strikes in Syria, but then when he couldn't explain what his strategy was, he got a lifeline from Vladimir Putin. Putin said: We will help you get rid of those chemical weapons in Syria. And the President retreated from that red line and nothing seemed to happen.

In addition to those 200,000 Syrian civilians killed since the civil war started, we have seen millions of Syrians displaced in refugee camps in Turkey, in Lebanon, in Jordan.

Then there is Ukraine. When the President promised to help Ukraine defeat Russian aggression, and to help it maintain its full territorial integrity and sovereignty, he subsequently refused to give the Ukrainians even modest defensive weapons. I think we sent them MREs, meals ready to eat. We sent them, maybe, some medical supplies which are important. But they needed not MREs but weapons to defeat Russian aggression, to raise the cost to Putin and his regime in their continued invasion of Ukraine and Crimea.

Then the President decided: Well, we are just going to use economic sanctions against Putin. Putin could care less about the economic sanctions.

Again, as to the extent to which our allies and friends can rely on us when they get in trouble, they begin to doubt our credibility. The bullies, tyrants, and terrorists lick their lips and take full advantage of the situation. We have seen that time and time again.

Then there was when the President—I bet this is another couple of words he wished he could take back in light of subsequent events—dismissed the Islamic State terrorists as the JV team. Even though they were gaining a stranglehold over eastern Syria and western Iraq, again the President—by underestimating a threat, a threat I am sure he will confront head on tonight—undermined America's credibility.

Make no mistake. America's credibility does matter. And when America loses credibility, the world becomes a much more dangerous place. That is exactly what has happened over the past several years.

I would say that despite the criticism I have made of the President's policy, I believe he has an opportunity tonight, starting tonight, to reverse some of that damage. Beginning with this speech on U.S. policy in Iraq and Syria, he has an opportunity to reverse the impression that he is aloof and detached from the ongoing chaos. He has the opportunity to lay out a clear strategy for destroying perhaps the richest, most well-armed terrorist group on the planet. He has an opportunity to describe how our strategy might utilize Syria's more moderate anti-Assad rebel groups and describe how he plans to work with Congress on implementing that strategy. He has an opportunity to sell the American people on his strategy.

Make no doubt about it. While the President thinks he can go this alone and he doesn't need to come to Congress for additional authorization, he does need and we do need the support of the American people. There are practical reasons why the President should come to Congress. Because if he makes the case to a bipartisan Congress and Congress issues the authorization for him to act because we actually believe he has a strategy that can

work, then I think the American people will be much more inclined to support that strategy.

Tonight I hope he will speak not only to Congress, he will speak to the American people candidly about the threat and about our military goals and how he intends to achieve those goals by the strategy he lays out.

He has an opportunity to explain the evolving nature of the terrorist threat and also explain what he is going to do and what we can do together to defend U.S. interests and to keep America safe.

Yesterday the Washington Post-ABC News poll revealed some very important data with regard to the American people's understanding of the threat and their support for what the President is talking about doing. In some ways it seems as if the American people were way ahead of their leadership in Congress and in the White House. From the Washington Post-ABC poll I will read three questions.

No. 1:

As you may know, a group of Sunni insurgents called the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, also known as ISIS, has taken control of parts of Iraq and Syria. How much, if at all, do you see ISIS as a threat to the vital interests of the United States?

Ninety-one percent of the respondents responded said they see it as a serious threat to the vital interests of the United States.

No. 2:

Do you support or oppose U.S. air strikes against the Sunni insurgents in Iraq?

Seventy-one percent support.

No. 3:

Do you support or oppose expanding U.S. air strikes against the Sunni insurgents into Syria?

Sixty-five percent support.

So we can see from the first question people recognize ISIS as a threat. Fewer support kinetic strikes against the insurgents in Iraq and Syria, but still a two-thirds majority do.

My point is, while the President of the United States may take what I think is a very generous view of his authority as Commander in Chief and under the Constitution to do this without congressional authorization, I think it is a terrible mistake for him to do so for two reasons, one I just mentioned, which is he needs and we need the support of the American people before we send any American into harm's way to deal with this threat. We need to have a robust debate and there needs to be bipartisan support for this effort in order for the American people then to see we are united and thus to unite them in common cause against this terrible threat.

Then the last reason is practical too. The President wants, it is reported, $5 billion. We have already burned up about $½ billion with air strikes in Iraq. War is expensive, and if the President says this is going to go on for another 3 years, which is one estimate I saw, he needs to come to Congress in order to get the appropriations, to get the money, in order to carry this out. If he thinks he can just come and request $5 billion and Congress is going to rubberstamp that or write him a blank check without any strategy, I think he is terribly mistaken. From what we have seen, since our Nation has been at war in Afghanistan and Iraq for these many years, 13 years in Afghanistan, we know war is expensive and $5 billion is a very minimal downpayment on what it will cost the American taxpayer to conduct this effort.

The President may have a very narrow view of his responsibility to come to Congress and get authority, but there are very practical reasons why he should, as I said—both in terms of gaining the support of the American people for this effort before he sends more Americans into harm's way, and the fact that under the Constitution the Executive, the President, can't appropriate one penny. That is going to have to come from Congress.

One party can't do this. Heaven forbid our national security would break down along purely partisan lines. But if the President doesn't have a plan and if he doesn't lay it out tonight, it is hard to see how he will get either the support of Congress, whether it is official or not, or of the American people.

It is hard to see where this is going to go if he thinks he can fund this on the cheap when, in fact, by his own estimate and others' it is going to take 3 years or more to defeat ISIS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCOME EQUALITY

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, as the Presiding Officer is well aware, as one of our great leaders on our economic agenda, of what we are calling a fair shot, it is incredibly important in the time we are in session that we have an opportunity to vote again on each of those items and hopefully pass each of the items at the front line of what American families, American people, care about in terms of lifting their standard of living and creating more opportunities.

It is great that we have seen the stock market more than double in the past 5, 6 years. It is great that someone who is living off of interest earnings has a better portfolio. That is great.

But the person who is getting up every day, going to work, and maybe takes a shower after work, ought to have the same fair shot to get ahead so that this economy is growing—and that is great—but it needs to grow and create opportunity for everyone.

We can help with that by having the right support and the right policies, and that is what the fair shot agenda is all about.

This afternoon we are going to be voting on a very important piece—which I frankly can't believe we are even having to talk about in 2014—whether we are going to actually enforce equal pay for equal work laws.

When I think about my own family, my daughter, daughter-in-law, and granddaughter at 7 years old—I hope by the time she grows up we are not still going to be talking about this issue. I think about they are working hard every day and the assumption they have is that they will get paid just as their male counterparts are.

There are those who have said: Well, this is a distraction. This isn't really an issue. There are some in Michigan who have said: Women don't care about equal pay. What they care about is flexibility.

My response is flexibility doesn't buy my groceries. It does not buy my daughter's groceries. It does not put gas in her car. It does not pay her mortgage.

The reality is, in America, in 2014, there is absolutely no reason—zero—that we would not have a 100-percent vote not just on the procedural vote to proceed but on a final bill to make sure enforcement is in place on equal pay—a pretty big deal. An awful lot of women who are the sole breadwinners in their families are counting on us to get this right so they can make sure their kids, who are now going back to school, can have the school clothes they need, they can put the food on the table, they can put the gas in the car to get them to school and get to work, and so on.

Another big piece of all this agenda in terms of creating opportunity for people is to make sure you can afford to go to college. That same person who is trying to put food on the table would love to put money aside in a bank account for their kids to go to college and would love to know that, when they are doing the right thing—they are making the grade, they are going to college—they will not be stuck with mounds of debt, buried in debt, because we do not have the right kind of system that provides funding for higher education and access to low-interest loans.

So another piece of the fair shot agenda, which is absolutely critical, is to make sure—let's start with ground zero, which is ''at least''—that anybody who has a student loan now will have a chance to refinance it, just like you would a house, at the lowest possible interest rate, which is impossible today.

Now, what does that do? We know there is more student loan debt today than credit card debt. Think about that for a minute. There is more student loan debt than credit card debt—$1 trillion. There are mortgage bankers in Michigan saying to me: You have to fix this because I have folks who want to buy a house and they cannot qualify because of their student loan debt. They want to start a small business and they cannot get a loan because of their student loan debt. We also know there are actually people who are on Medicare who are holder than 65 years

of age in this country who are still paying off student loan debt. When we talk about opportunity and a basic value of America: Work hard, go to school, have opportunity, it seems to me this flies in the face of that.

So another really important piece we want to get to and we want to pass is the ability to allow people, step one, to renegotiate and to refinance their student loans at the lowest possible interest rate from last year, which is 3.86 percent for undergraduate students. So that needs to get done so we are addressing one of the huge burdens and costs on middle-class families.

We also know that, unfortunately, we have another agenda item that came about because of the Supreme Court deciding that for women—that for women only—our choices on preventive health care, on birth control—if we are on the job covered by insurance our boss can actually overrule personal decisions about what type of birth control a woman will choose for herself, for her family. So we have a bill called Not My Boss's Business. I think it is pretty clear. It is not your boss's business what decisions you make, and you should be able to have your birth control decisions and what you need covered just like anything else in terms of preventive health care for men are for women.

So that is another piece of all of this that needs to get passed to make it clear. This is an economic issue for people. I know in my own family, when I think about my daughter and son and nieces and nephews who are planning their families and making decisions, these are economic issues about health care coverage.

We have two other critically important economic issues that are part of what we want to get done before this session ends in September. One is raising the minimum wage. It seems to me pretty basic that if you are working 40 hours or more a week you should not be in poverty, plain and simple. If we are going to reward work, if we are going to expect people to work, then working should pay more than not working. If you are working 40 hours a week, you ought to be making more than the poverty level. It has been way too long for American workers to get a pay raise.

So that is an important part of it.

Then finally there is a bill that I have introduced that, to me, ought to be a no-brainer. I do not understand; we tried to pass it a couple years ago. It was blocked. And it was blocked again by Republican colleagues a few weeks ago. We need to get this done. It has to do with a part of our Tax Code that allows a company that packs up shop and moves the factory overseas to write off the cost of the move, so the American taxpayers, including workers who just lost their job, would be paying for it.

Unfortunately, over the years, we have seen too much of that in Michigan. Now things are coming back. Manufacturing is coming back. We are very happy about that. But we want to send a very strong message that if you pack up shop and decide to move overseas, American taxpayers, the workers and their families, the communities are not going to pay for the move. But if you want to come back, we are more than happy to allow you to write off those costs through the Tax Code, and we will even give you another 20 percent tax credit for those costs on top of it.

So it is very simple. The Bring Jobs Home Act simply says: If you want to come back to America, great, we will help you do that. We will help you pay for those costs to come back to America. But if you want to leave the country, you are on your own.

So those are the five items that we want to get done before the end of this month that all relate to whether we are going to have opportunity and we are going to focus on the middle class of this country. Too many folks are barely holding on or are not holding on or used to see a path to get to the middle class and cannot anymore. That is not going to work for America. If we do not have people who know they have a fair shot to make it—that they have opportunity, that they see opportunity for their children—if they do not have money in their pocket so they can take care of their family and invest in the future, we are not going to have a strong economy. That is just a fact.

So we are glad that Wall Street is doing well. But it is time to focus on Main Street, middle-class Americans. That is what the fair shot agenda is all about, and I hope colleagues will come together and help us get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, when I was home last month, I heard a lot from Missourians, for really the first time over and over: What about all of the bills the House has passed that the Senate has not taken up? What about funding the government? My good friend from Michigan just mentioned the five things she would like to get done before we get to the end of the year. I think everybody on the other side of the aisle knows those five things, for various reasons, will not happen this year.

But what are we not doing? We are less than a month away from the beginning of a new spending year. We have not voted on a single one of the appropriations bills. There is no budget. The fundamental work of the government is not going on while we continue to debate the same things over and over because there are some people who think there is a good title to the bill or a good headline: The five things we want to get done.

Equal pay. Who is not for equal pay? The law requires equal pay. In fact, when the President signed the Lilly Ledbetter Act, he said: This solves the problem. Well, suddenly, it does not solve the problem because we want to get that title back out there again where we can talk about the title.

Access to college. I am the first person in my family to ever graduate from college. I had the chance to be a university president. I believe people's lives are affected by the right kind of education after high school. Nobody is opposed to access to college. We ought to be talking about that. But we ought to be talking about that in a way that can produce the right kind of result.

When the people of Missouri are saying: You are not getting the work of the country done, that is clearly right—just the fundamental things that need to get done, and here we are back in Washington, reminded by our friends on the other side that really we are here to just hold votes we have already had. Not a single thing was mentioned in the preceding remarks that we have not voted on already and not a single thing was mentioned in the preceding remarks that has any chance of passing both the House and the Senate and, frankly, has no chance of advancing in either the House or the Senate. But here we take these critical 2 weeks—the government is unfunded, no budget to talk about, with work not being done—to talk about these things.

Right now, the joint resolution we are on—with all the critical challenges we have not solved, we are talking about changing the Constitution. The only person in the Senate who can decide what bill comes to the floor is the majority leader, and the majority leader has brought a joint resolution to the floor, an amendment to the Constitution, an amendment that would take 67 votes in the Senate to pass, an amendment that has 45 sponsors, all from the other side—not very close to 67. Nobody believes this is going to happen.

To amend the Constitution, two-thirds of the Senate has to agree. That will not happen. Two-thirds of the House has to agree. That will not happen. Two-thirds of the States have to approve the amendment. That will not happen. More importantly, it should not happen. We are talking about amending the Constitution of the United States when there is no chance of doing it. So the only thing we are surely talking about is just trying to score some kind of last-minute election-year points. But if people are paying attention, the points that will be scored will be scored by those defending the Bill of Rights and those defending the Constitution.

What is being proposed here would have a chilling effect on the First Amendment, which says ''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging [among other things] the freedom of speech.'' We are thinking, for the first time ever, we would amend the Bill of Rights? Now, nobody really thinks we are going to do that so apparently everybody thinks, as long as it is just a show vote, it does not matter. But if you can take these freedoms today and decide they are worth bandying around as a show vote, I suppose you could

take them tomorrow and actually think about taking these freedoms away.

The Constitution would not have become the Constitution of the United States without the promise of the Bill of Rights. The Founders got a lot of things right. They did not get everything right. But one of the things they got right was the Bill of Rights. One thing that the States demanded when the Constitution was shown to them was: We can do that, but we are not going to do that unless we are promised that these fundamental rights that make us who we are and have the potential to make us more than we are—that these fundamental rights are guaranteed. We have never amended the Bill of Rights. So suddenly 45 Members of the Senate—with no enthusiasm for this anywhere else that I can find in the country—45 Members of the Senate have decided that for the first time ever we would amend the Bill of Rights.

Now, what does the Bill of Rights give us? It gives us freedom of religion—the first right. There will be another debate, I assume, late in the next 2 weeks to once again talk about how important is that right of conscience, that the Constitution in the Bill of Rights guarantees—the very first freedom it gives us is the freedom to believe what we believe. In fact, President Jefferson said in the decade after the Constitution was written that of all the rights, that is the one we should hold most dear: the freedom to hold our beliefs and not let the government decide how you conduct yourself in ways that violate your faith beliefs.

But right after that comes—what we are talking about—freedom of speech, the second of all those freedoms. There may be people here not at all offended by the fact that we can just bandy that around with no chance we are going to change this amendment. It is not like there are 67 cosponsors of this amendment.

I find it offensive we would talk about this as if it is a freedom so easily discussed and so easily utilized for political reasons that we just bring it up here a few weeks before the election and talk about it, even though there is no chance it could possibly be changed at this point and shouldn't be changed in the future.

The right of conscience, the freedom of speech, the freedom of press, the right to peaceably assemble, the right to petition the government—those are the five freedoms given in the First Amendment to the Constitution, and here we are talking about them as if they are nothing more than political talking points. They are who we are as a nation.

The chilling effect this discussion has on the First Amendment is concerning. I suppose part of it is to convince people: You don't want to participate in the system because you are going to be criticized if you participate in the system.

One of the great rights we have as Americans is the right to criticize those who are participating and, if we do participate, the right that others have to criticize us. This is an effort that if it occurred would certainly be a great thing for the current occupants of public office because you begin to write the rules in a way that makes it harder for those who don't hold public office to challenge those who do. No one likes being criticized, but in our country it is a fundamental part of who we are.

The Constitution wouldn't have been agreed to without the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights, as I said before, hasn't been changed. The freedom of the press is one of those rights, but it is not the only one. This amendment would go a long way toward making the press the only way people get their information and news. The press—the media generally—has a guaranteed right to do what they do, but individuals have a guaranteed right to say what they want to say, to participate as the courts and the Constitution allow in this great debate we call America.

To see that dealt with in this way—I actually wonder what people would think if they thought this was going to happen. Nobody believes this is going to happen because it is not going to happen. We are taking the people's time. We are taking the time given to us by the Constitution and the people to do the people's work, to instead talk about things that shouldn't happen, to talk about things that will not happen.

To suggest there is a real debate going on in Washington, when this is exactly what people are tired of—people in Washington not doing their job and trying to convince the people whom Washington should be working for that somehow great debates are going on, when all we are doing is getting ready for the next election, I am tired of that. I think most citizens of our country are tired of it.

For those who want to defend the Constitution, count me on their side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

SCHOOL CERTIFICATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on Thursday this country will commemorate the 13th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

We learned many lessons from that day. One key lesson was that terrorists can and will exploit our immigration system and policies to enter and remain in the United States and now and into the future potentially harm Americans.

The 9/11 attacks were carried out by 19 hijackers, some of whom entered on student visas and trained in flight schools in the United States. The 19 individuals applied for 23 visas. They lied on their applications. They failed to abide by the terms of their visas. This was a wake-up call that we needed better oversight of our visa programs, especially student visas. But this wasn't our first wake-up call.

In 1993 the American people were confronted with the first terrorist attack on the World Trade Center. One of the instigators of that attack was on an expired student visa.

Since 1993 we have mandated the tracking of foreign students and gave schools and universities a responsibility to help us monitor these programs while these students are on U.S. soil. Unfortunately, while this tracking system is up and running today, it is still antiquated and the Federal Government remains incapable of ensuring that those students who enter the country are truly attending our educational institutions.

Today nearly 10,000 schools across the country accept foreign students, and those schools are responsible for communicating with our government about the whereabouts of these students. Enrollment of foreign students is increasing.

According to the Brookings Institution, the number of foreign students on F–1 visas in U.S. colleges and universities grew from 110,000 in 2001 to 524,000 in 2012. Despite this overwhelming increase, the technology and oversight of the student visa program has insufficiently improved.

Now, 13 years after 9/11, we have sham schools setting up in strip malls with no real classrooms. We have foreign nationals entering the United States with the intent to study but then disappear and never attend a class. I will give just two examples of sham schools.

In 2011, Tri-Valley University reported that they would bring in less than 100 students but actually brought in over 1,500. Tri-Valley University officials were caught giving F–1 visas to undercover agents posing as foreign nationals who explicitly professed no intention of ever attending classes. Students paid $5,400 per semester in tuition to the school to obtain those student visas until that school was shut down.

On May 29 this year, the Micropower Career Institute in New York was raided by Federal officials. Its top officials were arrested on student visa fraud. Allegedly, school officials did not report foreign nationals when they didn't attend classes, and they falsified those student records so the school could continue to collect Federal education dollars for those students. But despite the indictment of officials at this so-called school, it still remains open for business.

The Government Accountability Office reported to Congress in 2012 that sham schools posed a problem. We put a lot of faith in the work of the Government Accountability Office. The GAO said the Immigration and Customs Enforcement does not have a process to identify and analyze risks across schools. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has overlooked

major indicators of fraud, and they cannot follow trends or predict abuse. Two years later the problems continue to exist and the Obama administration just fiddles while the problem burns.

ABC News investigated the student visa program and made it public last week. They said 6,000 foreign nationals on student visas have disappeared. An ICE official acknowledged that they had ''blended into the landscape somewhere.'' Yet this number of 6,000 is not the total number of student visa overstays. This is the number of students that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement is trying to locate. That ought to be alarming news that it is only 6,000.

It is time to close the loopholes and clamp down on schools that have a poor track record with regard to foreign students. So this week I am introducing legislation that requires schools to be certified in order to bring in foreign students, and it would suspend schools if there are noncompliance issues. My bill would increase penalties for those who perpetrate fraud and require background checks and training for school officials. It would also put an immediate end to a flight school's participation in the foreign student program if they are not FAA approved.

Finally, it would require the Department of Homeland Security to deploy an upgrade to the existing tracking system. This upgrade can be paid for by using fees from student visas and the schools that participate.

What I just said aren't new ideas. These are provisions that were taken from a 2012 bipartisan bill led by the senior Senator from New York. That bill never passed the Senate. When the Gang of 8 wrote their misguided immigration bill, they failed to include these reforms. So I offered an amendment during committee consideration of the immigration bill last summer and it was included in the bill that passed the Senate.

The bill I am introducing today is the exact same language. It has been debated. It was accepted by unanimous consent in the Judiciary Committee.

I hope my colleagues will seriously consider the bill I am introducing. It is well past time that we close loopholes and be more vigilant in the foreign student visa program, especially with the growing terrorist threat we face.

REMEMBERING JAMES M. JEFFORDS

Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to Senator Jeffords of Vermont, who passed away last month.

Senator Jeffords died this last August while the Senate was in recess. Yesterday, the Senate appropriately adopted a resolution commemorating the former Senator.

Senator Jeffords is probably best known for switching parties, from being a Republican to an Independent and caucusing with the Democrats back in 2001. As much as that switch hurt at the time, I always held Jim in very high regard and I knew him to be a very honorable man.

Jim and I were both so-called Watergate babies—two of the very few new Republican House Members who survived the 1974 election after Nixon's resignation and subsequent pardon. So we joined the House of Representatives together and became friends then.

It wasn't only a tough political environment back then, it was also a physical challenge for us. During that campaign year I had surgery on my leg and was walking on crutches. Jim had been in a car accident and had a neck brace as a result of that accident.

An amusing story has been reported about the two of us. I didn't hear it myself, but it had been brought up in a report on the funeral. The amusing story is about the two of us walking down the aisle of the House to be sworn in as freshmen after that devastating election for Republicans—this Senator on crutches and Jim with his neck brace.

Somewhere in the Chamber, a Democratic Member yelled out, ''There's two more that we almost got!''

The two of us laughed for years about that because of course we had the last laugh, serving for many years and being elected to the Senate and both becoming chairmen of committees in this body.

One of the most honorable things Jim did for me and, I believe, for the country was in regard to the 2001 tax relief bill that was by some measures the largest tax cut in history. Not many know the history of that bill. I was chairman of the Finance Committee and so was in charge of putting the bill together and getting it passed in the Senate. The process started with a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions to our Finance Committee.

The Bush administration pressed that year for a $1.6 trillion tax cut. Senator Jeffords and others insisted that the number had to be cut by $300 billion because they feared the money wouldn't be there in the end. Of course, as we now know from history, they ended up being right on that point a few years later when we sank into years of deficit spending, but we needed their votes. I made it clear to President Bush and our leadership that if we wanted to get something done and have a historic tax cut, we had to lower our sights some and still get most of what we wanted.

Unfortunately, I took a lot of criticism from my side for supporting Senator Jeffords and others, but I knew where the votes were and where the votes weren't. I remember a bunch of House Members even had a press conference saying some not-so-nice things about me and the idea of only accepting a $1.3 trillion tax package. But our Senate Republican leadership wanted a good result, and they agreed to compromise in order to get it. That is not something you see nowadays around here on very big bills. If the majority cannot have their way, they just file cloture and let the bill die, which is why we don't get much done around here anymore.

But the pivotal point on the 2001 tax bill came right before the time Senator Jeffords switched political parties. I could never really blame Jim for his decision. I didn't agree with that decision, but I know he felt he had been mistreated by some in our party and had strong disagreements with some of us on issues.

During floor consideration of the tax bill that year, we were near the end, and the Democratic minority at that time was offering amendment after amendment to stall the bill. We had gotten to the point where they were just changing a few words in an amendment and offering the same amendment again.

At that point I walked over to then-minority whip—who happens to be the current majority leader—Senator REID and asked what was going on. He said: Well, we think things may be changing around here very soon. Of course, I didn't know what he was talking about and I assumed that some votes were going to change. But of course he was talking about the impending party switch that none of us knew anything about involving Senator Jeffords. Remember, at that time we were split 50/50. Of course, what that meant was the Senate leadership would change and presumably the new Democratic leadership would pull the tax bill from the floor and kill it. So it was important for the Democrats to stall as long as they could on the bill, anticipating the Jeffords switch. But to his great credit, Senator Jeffords came to me and told me that out of respect for me and the way I worked with him on this tax bill, he would not officially change parties until after the tax bill was passed. So we were able to finish that historic bill and get it signed into law.

This little-known episode demonstrates what an honorable man and true friend Jim Jeffords was. He didn't let politics dictate whatever he was determined to do, and he stood by his word. I only wish we could see more of that now in today's Senate. If we did, we would all certainly be better off, it would be a better place, our policies would be a lot better, and we would be more productive.

I commemorate Senator Jeffords in his death. My sympathies are with his family. I will miss him, and I wish him Godspeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you, Madam President.

FACING GREAT CHALLENGES

As I come to the floor today, the Senate is debating a plan by which Washington Democrats seek to restrict the First Amendment rights of American citizens—part of the Constitution. Under this proposal certain people would no longer enjoy the same right to free speech and the same right to express themselves.

I believe this amendment is a terrible idea, and it really has no chance of becoming law. Majority Leader REID wants the vote anyway. He thinks this outrageous amendment that he dreamed up will somehow help Democrats win elections this November. The majority leader has come to the floor repeatedly to criticize and to demonize American citizens who don't share his views. It is nothing but political grandstanding and showboating.

President Obama was on ''Meet the Press'' last Sunday. The President talked about what is going on in Washington. The President said that ''people want to get stuff done.'' That is what he says the American people want from their representatives in Congress. So if the American people want us to get stuff done, why are the Democrats in the Senate so determined to do nothing? Why are they wasting time on political show votes? Why are they not allowing amendments and debate on important bills? Why are they blocking legislation that has passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support and is right now sitting on Senator REID's desk waiting for a vote?

Our Nation faces great challenges, and many Americans are hurting. Republicans have solutions that will create jobs while strengthening our energy security, improving our health care, and cutting government redtape. New numbers came out just last week that show America's labor force participation rate is at about the lowest level it has been in decades. The House of Representatives—where Republicans are in charge of the schedule—has passed more than 40 bills to help get Americans back to work. Those bills are sitting in the Senate waiting for a vote. Is that what the President means when he says people want to get stuff done?

There was a headline in Politico on Tuesday morning that read ''Majority say that President Obama a failure.'' A new poll found that 52 percent of Americans think the Obama Presidency has been a failure. So what do Washington Democrats do in response? Absolutely nothing.

People want Washington to deal with the challenges that matter most in their individual lives. We could start by doing something about the President's health care law that is causing so much harm to people across the country.

A bipartisan plan has already passed the House that would stop the employer mandate that businesses provide expensive Washington-mandated health insurance. That part of the President's health care law forces small businesses to cut hours—therefore cutting paychecks—for the workers and is also holding back hiring. We should take up that legislation here in the Senate.

We should restore people's freedom to buy health insurance that actually works for them and their families because people know what works best for them. They don't need Washington to tell them. We should replace the President's health care law with reforms that actually get people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

The people I talk with back at home in Wyoming are also worried about energy costs—especially since it is starting to get colder in much of the country. Washington should be looking for ways to help Americans produce more affordable, reliable, and efficient energy right here at home. The opportunity is there. That would mean jobs for American families, and it would also mean energy security for our Nation.

We could start right now by approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. For 6 years the application has been sitting waiting for action. A bill to do that passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support. Why aren't we voting on that today in the Senate? The Obama administration admits the pipeline would actually support thousands of good American jobs. The application to build the Keystone Pipeline has been stalled for 6 years. The administration should demand action today. If the President won't do it, Congress still could and should.

Congress should pass legislation to speed up exports of liquefied natural gas. Our Nation has abundant supplies of natural gas, and producers want to export it to customers around the world who are seeking it. The Obama administration has delayed the permits to let them do it. Democrats right here in the Senate have delayed the bipartisan solution that has already passed the House. We should take a vote on that bill today and pass it.

We should pass a bill that would reform the regulations blocking energy production on Federal lands.

We should end the Obama administration's pointless and destructive war on coal and let the men and women across this country who work in that industry get their jobs and their lives back.

American businesses are waiting to create jobs. The only thing standing in the way is the Senate majority leader. Senate Democrats don't want to vote. They don't want to vote to help the millions of Americans who are out of the labor force. They would rather protect the Washington bureaucracy—a bureaucracy that slows down and stifles economic growth.

Cutting through the redtape to help Americans get back to work is one of the top priorities of Republicans, and it should be the top priority of every Senator in this body. We could do it by passing a bill—one that has already passed the House—that would rein in excessive regulations that make it tougher for small businesses to invest, to grow, and to hire.

We could pass another bill from the House that helps businesses defend themselves against abusive patent lawsuits. That is going to help small businesses hire more people and help them grow. There were 130 Democrats in the House who voted in favor of it. Why aren't we voting on that today? We cannot get a simple up-or-down vote in the Senate. The majority leader will not bring it to the floor. Why won't he allow it?

There is one bill after another that Republicans have offered, Republicans have passed in the House of Representatives—bipartisan bills—and the Senate Democrats don't want to talk about them. They don't want to talk about Republican ideas for tax reform that would lower tax rates and make the whole tax system simpler, more fair. They don't want to talk about Republican ideas to strengthen and stabilize the entitlement programs—such as Social Security and Medicare—to make sure they are there for future generations. They certainly don't want to talk about Republican ideas to address Washington's out-of-control debt.

Those are the kinds of measures we should be talking about today on the floor of the Senate. That is the legislation which Republicans have introduced and which we are going to keep fighting for in the Senate. That is what the American people are talking about when they say they want Washington to get stuff done. They don't mean more terrible ideas like the President's health care law and its multiple damaging side effects. They don't mean job-killing redtape and Washington mandates. They don't mean political show votes that would restrict Americans' free speech.

President Obama and Democrats in the Senate have turned their backs on middle-class families who are desperately in need of jobs. Democrats want to waste time while they are trying to salvage their political careers. Republicans want to help get Americans back to work.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor, 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. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO PRISCILLA A. ROSS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, one of the joys of being an elected member of Congress is getting to hire and know and work with dedicated public servants who toil behind the scenes—our staffs. One of those individuals is my policy director Priscilla Ross, who first joined my staff over 16 years ago when I was serving in the House of Representatives.

I rise this afternoon in a bittersweet moment to thank Priscilla for her service to me, the citizens of Maryland, and all Americans on the occasion of her departure from the Senate.

Starting next week she will be the senior associate director for Federal

relations at the American Hospital Association, AHA, which is the national organization that represents and serves all types of hospitals, health care networks, and their patients and communities. The AHA is comprised of nearly 5,000 hospitals, health care systems, networks, other care providers, and has over 43,000 individual members.

Priscilla Ross is a consummate Senate staffer. She is extremely intelligent. She has mastered her subject areas, which include health care and budget. She works hard. She is both a pragmatist and an original creative thinker. She works well with her colleagues across the aisle and across the Hill. She is a problem solver. She sees the big picture but pays attention to detail.

Her political acumen and sense of timing are first rate. She tells me what I need to know and, more importantly, what I need to hear—even when I don't want to hear it. Above all, Priscilla has been driven by a passion to help people and make things better for Americans, especially the disadvantaged and vulnerable among us. The disparity of health outcomes between different communities and racial groups in this Nation—I know—continues to concern Priscilla, who has made me more aware of the problem.

Members of Congress, especially Senators, depend on their senior staff to sort through the innumerable demands on our time and to help us concentrate our time on the most important opportunities and priorities. To do that as well as Priscilla has done for 16 years requires not only deep policy expertise but a shrewd understanding of the Senate and a comprehensive familiarity with the people and the institutions of Maryland. It also demands a willingness to bring a seasoned, respectful skepticism to the scores of requests every Senate office receives every week to support this or that legislative initiative and to have the judgment to sort out the strong policy cases from the powerful interests. In that, Priscilla has excelled. I am grateful for the high standard she has met.

Priscilla came to Capitol Hill to improve people's lives. She has succeeded in that regard—far beyond what most of us are able to accomplish. She has had an extraordinary career.

While I am sad that she is leaving the Senate, I take solace in the fact that she is not leaving ''the arena.'' She will continue to find ways to make health care better, more accessible, and more affordable for all Americans in her new post at the AHA.

Priscilla is a proud native of the District of Columbia—born and raised in the shadow of the Capitol building, so to speak. She likes to reminisce about taking the number 30 bus along Independence Avenue to her school at Tenley Circle every day. She said that as a child she never imagined she would some day work in the Capitol building she passed on her way to and from school.

Fortunately, at some point, she did get that idea and pursued it. Fortunately for me, I was the one who hired her. Before that happened, Priscilla went to Boston University before finishing her college career at American University, where she received a B.A. in political science. She held a summer internship in the office of Yvonne Braithwaite in California.

She was an outstanding student. She was inducted into Pi Sigma Alpha, which is a national political science honor society, and the Golden Key National Honor Society. She is also a member of the Zeta Phi Beta sorority, a national sorority founded nearly 95 years ago at Howard University here in the District.

Before Priscilla joined my staff, she was the political affairs manager for the American Association of Health Plans, the trade association for more than 1,000 managed care plans across the country. Priscilla also represented the investor-owned hospital industry as an assistant vice president for legislation at the Federation of American Health Systems where she lobbied Congress on issues important to 1,400 hospitals and health care systems with a specific focus on Medicaid and Medicare reimbursement.

In that position she also represented the association in various Washington-based health care coalitions, prepared congressional testimony for association members, designed and coordinated the FAHA grassroots program, staffed the legislative steering and PPS-exempt hospital committees, and drafted comments to proposed Health Care Financing Administration regulations affecting hospital reimbursement.

Priscilla has also worked in health care delivery settings as a new member representative for the Harvard Community Health Plan in Boston, as administrative services coordinator at the Psychiatric Institute of Washington, a private 201-bed acute-care facility, and as an information assistant with Blue Cross Blue Shield of the national capital area. She came to me with some experience, and she used that to help people.

With regard to Priscilla's accomplishments while working on my staff, the list is so long and comprehensive, I will only be able to comment on a few items.

Priscilla has staffed my efforts to repeal arbitrary and unfair outpatient physical, occupational, speech-language therapy caps for Medicare beneficiaries since they were enacted in 1997—first in the House and now in the Senate. Because of Priscilla's efforts we have been able to prevent the caps from being implemented.

With Priscilla's help, the legislation I authored to expand Medicare to include preventive benefits, such as colorectal, prostate, mammogram, and osteoporosis screening was enacted into law.

Thanks to Priscilla's persistence, Congress finally passed the Patients' Bill of Rights, which means that individuals with private health care plans will have the right to choose their primary health care provider, that women will have direct access to obstetrics and gynecology services and be able to pick their own providers, and that patients with medical emergencies will be guaranteed coverage for necessary emergency room visits in accordance with the ''prudent lay person's standard.'' Because of Priscilla's work, we were able to move forward in these areas.

Because of the work of Priscilla Ross, tens of thousands of retired veterans and their spouses have access to the health care benefits to which they are entitled, including Medicare Part B, without being penalized for signing up too late. So let me explain.

Under current law, people who do not enroll in Medicare Part B when they are first eligible, to do so must pay a 10-percent penalty for every year they have not participated. But 10 years ago, military retirees could not have anticipated the rules changes that have occurred in military health systems since 1996 when the Department of Defense replaced CHAMPUS with TRICARE, nor could they have known that participation in TRICARE after 1965 would eventually require Medicare enrollment. In some cases, the military advised retirees that Medicare coverage was duplicative, recommending that they do not enroll. We fixed that. I would note that a couple from Oklahoma—not Maryland—brought this problem to Priscilla's attention and the result was we were able to get it done.

While Priscilla has spent most of her time working on health care, she has aptly demonstrated her ability to get things done on other issues. Let me speak for a moment about the fiscal year 2012 consolidated appropriations bill that contained $919 million for the Small Business Administration—$189 million more than previous years. This was the first time in many years that the SBA got a bump-up in their appropriation. I was on the Budget Committee at the time.

The Disaster Loan Program received an increase of $72 million. With Priscilla's help, I authored an amendment to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that increased the surety bond limits from $2 million to $5 million to help small businesses. Each of these initiatives was started by Priscilla Ross. She marshaled them carefully through the committee and through the process, and the end result is they became law.

A moment ago, I mentioned that my and Priscilla's concern is about health disparities. The United States spends nearly $1 trillion in excess health care costs due to racial and ethnic health disparities. Priscilla has taken the lead in fashioning policies to close the gap. It is not just about economics; it is a social justice that strikes at the heart

of who we are as a nation. At Priscilla's suggestion, I authored provisions that establish in statute Offices of Minority Health in the key agencies in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, including the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Without the basic research needed to discover the causes of disparities and develop new treatments, we will not be able to make significant progress in closing the gaps, so Priscilla successfully advocated to elevate the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities to the newest institute at the National Institutes of Health. We now have a National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities, thanks to Priscilla Ross.

In 2007, shortly after I became a Senator, 12-year-old Marylander Deamonte Driver died of a toothache just a few miles from this building. As the Washington Post recounted:

> A routine, $80 tooth extraction may have saved him. If his mother had been insured. If this family had not lost Medicaid. If Medicaid dentists weren't so hard to find . . . By the time his aching tooth got any attention, the bacteria from the abscess had spread to his brain, doctors said. After two operations and more than six weeks in the hospital, the Prince George's County boy died.

Priscilla was determined to turn this terrible tragedy into something positive. She immediately began working to expand access to health care for all Americans, regardless of their income. Thanks to Priscilla we were able to secure guaranteed dental benefits for children in the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, along with a dental education program for parents of newborns, and a new HHS Web site and toll-free number with information about the State's dental coverage, and a list of participating providers. We were able to secure funding for a mobile dental health care lab dedicated in 2010 that now carries Deamonte's name. To encourage public service activities that promote oral health, the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act includes the provision ensuring that activities assisting individuals in obtaining dental services can qualify for funding.

Each of these accomplishments was initiated by Priscilla Ross.

These are just a few of Priscilla's accomplishments. Suffice it to say that young children across America too numerous to count now have access to dental care, thanks to Priscilla Ross, although they will never know her name. Suffice it to say that seniors across America will be saved from premature death by preventive health screenings, thanks to Priscilla Ross, although they will never know her name. Because of Priscilla, we are closer to a more perfect union, which is the birthright of each and every American, regardless of race, color, creed, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or economic status.

When Thomas Jefferson followed Benjamin Franklin to Paris as Minister of America, he remarked that no one could replace Franklin. He, Jefferson, was merely a successor. I feel the same way about Priscilla: There may be a successor, but no one will be able to replace her.

I thank her for her wise counsel, indomitable spirit, outstanding public service, and enduring friendship, and I wish her the best of luck in her new career.

Thank you, Madam President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today to support the Paycheck Fairness Act. Equal pay for equal work is the law of the land. It has been for over 50 years. Yet the law is one thing and the reality is quite another. Women still get paid far less than men for the same work.

Last year Hawaii News Now, a TV station in Hawaii, shared the story of a woman in Honolulu. She had been asking for a raise for over a year, to no avail. Her employers acknowledged that she was underpaid, but they didn't do anything about it. Then she found out a new male hire with less experience would be paid $5,000 more to do the same job.

She is not alone. In Hawaii a woman makes, on average, 83 cents for every dollar a man makes. While that is better than the national average, it is still not equal pay for equal work.

Research shows that the gender gap in pay begins with a woman's first job and widens from there. So when a young woman graduates and takes her place in the workplace, her starting line is already behind that of her male colleagues. That makes it harder for her to catch up, no matter how hard she works.

The women I know work incredibly hard. Many of them are heads of households and sole breadwinners, which makes the pay inequality that much tougher for them.

The gender pay gap persists even for workers with the same level of experience and education. The gap is even wider for older women.

Congress passed the Equal Pay Act over 50 years ago. As I said earlier, this is the law of the land. Yet the pay gap persists. While the gap has shrunk—not by much—women only earn 77 cents on the dollar nationally. As Senator MIKULSKI often says, in 50 years, women have only gained a few cents.

In 2009, I was proud to support and vote for the Lilly Ledbetter Act which President Obama signed into law. It was the very first bill he signed into law after his election. Without this law, women had only 180 days after their first discriminatory paycheck to challenge it, even if they only found out about it years and years later. After all, Lilly's employer did not announce they were discriminating against her in pay. So in her case it took many years, and she was far beyond the 180 days the Supreme Court said would be the timeframe in which she could try and get redress.

While the Lilly Ledbetter Act addressed one part of the equal pay problem, if we are going to make sure all women get a fair shot, we need to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. This bill would require employers to prove that pay gaps between men and women are based only on a business reason and not on gender.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will make it easier for workers to compare their salaries and figure out whether they are victims of discrimination. Right now, without this act, employers can still fire workers for sharing the basic information about how much they are getting paid. This bill strengthens penalties for companies that discriminate against women. It would bring class action protection for women in line with other civil rights laws.

The bill includes an exemption for small businesses and a phased-in time for businesses to learn what they are required to do.

In addition, the Paycheck Fairness Act would help prevent pay discrimination in the first place by providing training for both management and workers. This past April 8 was Equal Pay Day. That is the day when women's earnings in this country caught up with men's earnings from the previous year. In other words, it took women 16 months to catch up with what their male counterparts were making in 12 months.

The very next day, here on the Senate floor, every single Republican Senator voted to filibuster the Paycheck Fairness Act, which failed on a procedural vote. I hope our Republican friends will reconsider their position on this important issue this time around.

This year President Obama signed an Executive order to implement parts of the Paycheck Fairness Act for Federal contractors. That is a major step forward for thousands of women. But there are millions more who are not covered by this executive action. Today in the Senate we have another chance to give the women of our country a fair shot, another chance for us to live up to a law that we passed 50 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without delay. Fifty years is long enough to wait.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative 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.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19 is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 19) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, as follows:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

''ARTICLE—

''SECTION 1. To advance democratic self-government and political equality, and to protect the integrity of government and the electoral process, Congress and the States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

''SECTION 2. Congress and the States shall have power to implement and enforce this article by appropriate legislation, and may distinguish between natural persons and corporations or other artificial entities created by law, including by prohibiting such entities from spending money to influence elections.

''SECTION 3. Nothing in this article shall be construed to grant Congress or the States the power to abridge the freedom of the press.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3791

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to the committee-reported substitute, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3791 to the committee-reported substitute.

The amendment is as follows:

In Section 1, strike ''and the electoral process'' and insert '' the electoral process and to prevent corruption''

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3792 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3791

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3792 to amendment numbered 3791.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

'', which shall not be limited to bribery or quid pro quo corruption''

AMENDMENT NO. 3793

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the underlying joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3793 to S.J. Res. 19.

The amendment is as follows:

In Section 1, strike ''electoral processes'' and insert ''the electoral processes and to prevent corruption in government''

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3794 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3793

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3794 to amendment numbered 3793.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

'', which shall not be defined solely as bribery or quid pro quo corruption''

MOTION TO RECOMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3795

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to recommit S.J. Res. 19 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith the following amendment numbered 3795.

The amendment is as follows:

In Section 1, strike ''and electoral processes'' and insert ''process and prevent corruption in the electoral system''

Mr. REID. 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 yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3796

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3796 to the instructions to the motion to recommit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''system'' and insert ''process''.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3797 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3796

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3797 to amendment numbered 3796.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

'', which shall not be constrained to bribery or quid pro quo corruption''

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 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.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Mark Begich, Joe Manchin III, Amy Klobuchar, Tammy Baldwin, Mazie K. Hirono, Sherrod Brown, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Al Franken, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum to rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 345, S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Richard J. Durbin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Brian Schatz, Heidi Heitkamp, Martin Heinrich, Tammy Baldwin, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, Mazie K. Hirono, Kay R. Hagan, Mary Landrieu, Claire McCaskill, Jeanne Shaheen, Dianne Feinstein, Amy Klobuchar.

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 motion to proceed to S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, 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 Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Ayotte	Grassley	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Isakson	Roberts
Brown	Johanns	Rockefeller
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Scott
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Markey	Walsh
Cornyn	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	
Graham	Murphy	

NAYS—25

Alexander	Cruz	Johnson (WI)
Barrasso	Enzi	Lee
Blunt	Fischer	Moran
Boozman	Flake	Paul
Coats	Hatch	Risch
Coburn	Hoeven	
Crapo	Inhofe	
Rubio	Shelby	Toomey
Sessions	Thune	Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 73, the nays are 25. Upon reconsideration, three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Americans across the country have been riveted by the crisis occurring on our southern border.

President Obama is correct with one regard: What we are seeing is a humanitarian crisis. But it is a crisis, sadly, of the President's own creation, and it is the direct consequence of President Obama's laws. To understand why, one merely has to look at the numbers.

Three years ago, in 2011, there were roughly 6,000 unaccompanied children entering the country illegally. Then in June of 2012, just before the election, the President unilaterally granted amnesty to some 800,000 people here illegally who entered as children.

As a direct foreseeable consequence of that—the predicted consequence of that is: If you grant amnesty to people who enter as children, you create an enormous incentive for more and more children to enter the country illegally. That is exactly what we have seen happening.

As a result of the President's amnesty, we have seen the numbers go from 6,000 kids 3 years ago to this year, it is expected, when there will be 90,000 unaccompanied children entering the country illegally, and next year the Department of Homeland Security predicts it will be 145,000.

I have traveled down to the border of Texas many times. As recently as the last couple of months I have been down to McAllen. I visited with the Border Patrol chief in McAllen. I visited with the Border Patrol agents and line agents down there. I have been to Lackland Air Force Base where there are roughly 1200 children being housed. I am sorry to say that President Obama, when he visited Texas, had time to do neither. He had time to go to Democratic Party fundraisers, to pal around with the fat cats in the Democratic Party and to raise money but no time to travel to the border and see the human suffering his failed immigration policies have produced.

It is worth underscoring, these are little boys and little girls who are not being brought into this country by well-meaning social workers with beards and Birkenstocks trying to help the kids. They are being brought in by hardened, drug-tough coyotes, cartels. And these little boys and little girls are being physically victimized, physically abused, sexually abused.

When I was at Lackland Air Force Base, a senior official there described to me how the cartels, when they have control of these kids and are smuggling them illegally into this country, sometimes will hold the kids hostage and try to extract more money from the families. In order to do so, horrifyingly, they will sever body parts from these kids. This senior official at Lackland described to me how these coyotes will put a gun to the back of the head of the little boy or little girl and order that child to cut off the fingers or ears of another little boy or little girl, and if they don't do it they will shoot that child and move on to the next one. They describe how on this end we are getting, No. 1, some children who have been horribly maimed by these vicious coyotes and, No. 2, we are getting children who have enormous psychological trauma from being forced to participate in such horrors.

The crisis at the border cannot be solved without ending the promise of amnesty. The data demonstrates that, compellingly, it was when the President granted amnesty that the numbers spiked, but more recent data demonstrates that as well. A few months ago the Border Patrol conducted a survey of over 200 people who entered illegally, many of them children, and asked the obvious question: Why are you coming? What has changed? Just 3 years ago it was only 6,000 kids and now it is 90,000. What has changed? Ninety-five percent of them told the Border Patrol they were coming because they believe they will get amnesty. They believed they will get a permiso, a slip of paper that lets them stay once they get there.

When I was in McAllen, I took the time not just to meet with the chief but to meet with a number of Border Patrol agents who spend every day out on the river, up in the air, on horseback, working to secure the borders. I asked the line agents the obvious question: Why are they coming? What has changed? What has caused this humanitarian crisis? Every single Border Patrol agent gave me the exact same answer: They said they are coming because they believe they will get amnesty.

In fact, they explained to me, they said: Right now the Border Patrol is not apprehending these kids. When they cross the river, they often have nothing, sometimes just rags on their back after a long, arduous journey where they have been subjected to horrible physical and sexual abuse, but the one thing they almost inevitably have is their documents. And these children immediately look for the first person in uniform they can find. The Border Patrol isn't apprehending them; they

are looking for the Border Patrol, because they come to the Border Patrol and hand them their documents because they believe they will get amnesty; they will get a permiso; they will be allowed to stay.

If we want to solve this crisis, if we want to stop these children from coming and from being abused, the only way to do so is to end the promise of amnesty.

Before the August recess, I introduced legislation in this body to do exactly that. It was very simple legislation. It was directed to the source of the problem. It provided in black-and-white law that the President of the United States prospectively has no authority to grant amnesty to anyone. The legislation doesn't address the 800,000 who were the subject of the 2012 order. It simply says going forward the President cannot grant amnesty to anyone else, and the reason for that is the cause of this crisis is these children coming believing they will get amnesty.

The White House, in their talking points, routinely said that children coming today are not eligible for amnesty.

I see my colleague from Illinois nodding in agreement with that statement. If that is the case, then my colleague from Illinois should join me in sponsoring this measure because the legislation I have introduced would simply put into law what the White House talking point is, which is that——

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. Can the Senator tell me what the cutoff date is for eligibility for DACA?

Mr. CRUZ. I don't have the precise cutoff date in my mind, but the point that is being raised is these children don't fall under the precise terms of DACA, but they believe they will get amnesty.

I would respond to my friend from Illinois, does my friend from Illinois believe these children who are coming today should get amnesty, yes or no?

Mr. DURBIN. No. I would say, if I might, through the Chair, it is not the argument that anyone is making that these children should receive amnesty. What we are saying is they should be treated humanely——

Mr. CRUZ. Absolutely.

Mr. DURBIN. And go through an orderly process returning to their countries. But what the Senator from Texas is asking us to do is to disqualify up to 2 million young people who are here in the United States and can qualify for DACA as DREAMers—people who were here long before these unaccompanied children showed up at the border. That was the proposal that came from the House which the Senator inspired them to vote for. They stood for a standing ovation because they denied an opportunity to 2 million young people in this country to be able to stay here without fear of deportation. That is what the Senator is asking for today.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Illinois, but I would note that the comments he made are not connected to the facts of the proposal. The proposal is explicitly post-DACA.

Some 800,000 people have already received amnesty. Let's be clear. The President had no legal authority to grant amnesty at the time. He did so unilaterally, contrary to the rule of law.

Now we are in a broader context where the President has quite publicly promised to grant amnesty—again unilaterally and illegally—to some 5 or 6 million people. Yet at the behest of our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, he announced this weekend he is delaying the decision until after the election, because apparently Senate Democrats up for election have noticed their constituents don't support the President in illegally and unilaterally granting amnesty.

I would suggest that Members of this body cannot have it both ways.

My friend from Illinois stated he doesn't think we should be granting amnesty to these children, and yet the legislation I introduced, the legislation the House of Representatives passed, does not act retroactively, does not address anyone who has fallen within the previous DACA. It simply says going forward the President doesn't have the authority to grant amnesty. Instead it is Congress that has the authority to pass or not pass immigration.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to ask the Senator this question: If amnesty means the person has a right to citizenship or legal status on a permanent basis, is the Senator from Texas suggesting the deferral of deportation under DACA—is that a kind of amnesty?

Mr. CRUZ. The deferral of deportation under DACA is a written determination from the President that the individuals who receive this, No. 1, will be immune from the black-letter text of the immigration law that subjects them to removal; and No. 2, the administration has created an authorization-to-work document as a component of DACA that has no basis or authority in existing Federal law.

Let us be clear. The President has been absolutely explicit. He intends to expand that to another 5 or 6 million people who are here illegally.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for a question in a moment.

The President intends to expand this to 5 or 6 million people who are here illegally to give them presumably the same authorization to work unilaterally and with no authorization in law to transfer their status from being illegally here to legally here on executive dispensation. I understand my friend from Illinois and other Members of the Democratic Party support that decision. I believe—and I would allow him in his question to clarify that. If I mischaracterized it, I would welcome his clarification. But there certainly are some members of the Democratic Caucus who do support that. But the American people powerfully don't, profoundly don't. They recognize it is inconsistent with the rule of law, is bad policy, and is creating this crisis at the border.

I have to say the President's decision to delay the amnesty until right after the election reflects a cynicism that even in Washington, DC, is unusual. Because what it is saying is: I understand the policies that I, President Obama, am trying to force that are completely unpopular with the American people, so I am going to jam them through right after the election. Because what it reflects is that President Obama and unfortunately many of the Senate Democrats hold their constituents in very low regard. It reflects the view that if we do this after the election, even if the people don't like it, they will forget about it in 2 years.

If my friends in the Democratic Party believe the right policy solution is amnesty for 5 or 6 million more people and the President acting unilaterally, then we have a very simple solution. Let's bring this up for a vote before the October recess.

The House of Representatives took the legislation I introduced in this body and they stayed over an extra day, they voted on it, and they stood up and led, acting to solve the crisis at the border. And what happened in the Senate? The majority leader of the Senate refused to allow a vote on the proposal and sent every Senator home for August while having done nothing to address this crisis.

If my friend, the Senator from Illinois, believes amnesty is the right policy decision, then let's have a debate, let's bring it up for a vote, and let's have every Senator in this body go on record.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Most people believe amnesty means a free pass. Whatever you have done, you stay in the United States and you stay in the United States and you become a citizen.

Let me say to the Senator from Texas that DACA is a temporary suspension of deportation. It is temporary. It has to be renewed. And in order to qualify for it, you must have been in the United States as of June 15, 2007.

What we have now are 600,000—my number is 600, you say 800—600,000 who have come forward. They have paid the fee—a substantial fee—and they are allowed to stay here, without being subjected to deportation, on a temporary basis that needs to be renewed. There are another 2 million who may be eligible.

What the Senator is doing is not addressing the unaccompanied children at the border. The Senator is saying to the remaining 2 million: You don't have a chance. You have got to leave. You are illegal. You are going to be deported.

This isn't about amnesty. It is about whether those who are qualified under the DREAM Act, which incidentally was endorsed by the House Republican Caucus when they put out their statement of principles—whether those under the DREAM Act are going to have a chance to stay.

And to think that the Senator's colleagues in the House stood and applauded themselves for denying 2 million young people a chance to stay in the only country they have ever called home to me doesn't speak well of that caucus or their sensitivity to the reality of their lives.

These children who are brought here by their parents—some as infants—didn't vote on it. They were brought here. They have been raised in our schools. They have been taken care of in our hospitals. They pledge allegiance to the flag, as Senator MENENDEZ says, every day. They pledge allegiance in the classroom to the only country they have ever known. And you are glorying in the possibility that you can deport these children.

Is that what you consider to be—and in your own background—I am a first-generation American. I believe you have similar claims to make. Do you believe this is what this country is all about?

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate my friend from Illinois impugning the integrity of our friends in the House and also describing the plight of innocents.

As you rightly noted, 67 years ago my father came here. He came from Cuba and spoke no English. He had $100 sewn into his underwear. He came here legally on a student visa to study. He followed the rule of law. And I would note—my friend from Illinois knows full well—there is no stronger advocate of legal immigration in the Senate than I am. Indeed, on the Senate Judiciary Committee I introduced two amendments, one for high-skilled workers, H–1B workers, to increase that fivefold from 65,000 to 325,000 because temporary, high-skilled workers are progrowth. Every one of those who comes along produces 1.7 American jobs. I am sorry to say my friend from Illinois and every Senate Democrat on the Judiciary Committee voted against that proposal—voted against increasing legal immigration for temporary, high-skilled workers.

My friend from Illinois is also aware—since we are both members of the Senate Judiciary Committee—that I introduced another amendment that would take our current failed legal immigration system and dramatically simplify it by reducing the barriers and costs and eliminate the per-country caps which have the effect of discriminating against nations such as Mexico, China, and India and take the legal cap from 675,000 and double it to 1.35 million so we can have a legal system we can continue that welcomes legal immigrants who come here to celebrate the American dream.

Again, I was sorry to see every single Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee vote against increasing legal immigration, streamlining it, making the system work better, and eliminating the discriminatory per-country caps on nations such as Mexico, India, and China.

I understand the Senator from Illinois just gave a passionate speech in defense of granting amnesty to people who are here illegally. He is certainly entitled to those views. We should indeed have a full and robust debate, but I will note that the Democratic Senator from Arkansas, the Democratic Senator from Louisiana, the Democratic Senator from North Carolina, and the Democratic Senator from Alaska are all busily telling their constituents they disagree with what my friend from Illinois just said. They are at home telling their constituents: No, no, no, no. We don't want amnesty. No, no, no, no. We don't want the President to unilaterally grant amnesty.

If that is indeed their position, I welcome them to come to the floor right now. If that is indeed their position, there is an easy action. For centuries this body has been called the world's greatest deliberative body. Unfortunately, that label is no longer accurately applied because this body, sadly, under Majority Leader REID and the Democratic majority, neither deliberates nor votes on much of anything.

There are over 350 bills the House of Representatives has passed to address the great challenges in this country—mostly with substantial bipartisan support—and over 350 pieces of legislation are sitting on HARRY REID's desk and he will not allow a vote on them.

When it comes to solving the crisis at the border, the only way to do so is to end the promise of amnesty. The 90,000 children who are coming believe when they get here they will get amnesty. The position, sadly, of President Obama and the majority leader and the Senate Democrats is that they will do nothing—zero—to fix that problem.

Let me say it is not compassionate, it is not humane to continue a system where tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of little boys and little girls are being victimized and assaulted physically and sexually by violent coyotes. Under the Democratic plan that will continue. It will continue this year. It will continue next year. In response, they do nothing—zero, nada—to fix the problem. That is a hard-hearted approach to this challenge.

We have a demonstration, a study in contrast. Looking at a humanitarian crisis, the House of Representatives stood and voted on legislation to lawfully make it clear that the President of the United States has no authority to grant amnesty to people who are here illegally. The Senate had a chance to do the same.

President Obama has promised the American people that right after the election he intends to unilaterally and illegally grant amnesty to another 5 or 6 million people. Every Senate Democrat has an opportunity to make clear where he or she stands.

In a moment I am going to ask for this body to take up the bill the House has passed to make clear in law that the President has no authority to grant amnesty prospectively. I understand my Democratic friends are going to object to this. That should surprise no one because my Democratic friends for the last 2 years have objected to considering almost every major piece of legislation to address the challenges in this country.

What this means is that the 55 Democrats in this body who are standing united in blocking this legislation that the House of Representatives has passed—all 55 Democrats bear responsibility for President Obama's amnesty, for the amnesty of 5 or 6 million people.

I understand the President thinks it is politically clever to delay the amnesty until after the election, but I have real faith in the American people, that it is too clever by half, that all 55 Senate Democrats who are standing together, standing united with President Obama and saying we want the President to have the ability to illegally grant amnesty, every Senate Democrat in this body bears responsibility for that choice. If they did not, any Senate Democrat is welcome to come to the floor. I will note that other than the Democratic Senator from New Jersey, who is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I expect will object to my unanimous consent momentarily—there is not a single Democrat in this Chamber speaking out on eliminating the President's authority to grant amnesty.

Clarity in elections, enabling the American people to hold all of us accountable is a very good thing. One body, the House of Representatives, is leading. The other body, the Senate, under Democratic control, refuses to even allow a vote on solving the crisis at the border or stopping the President's illegal amnesty.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5272

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 551, H.R. 5272. I further ask consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that 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. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will first respond to the unanimous consent request made by the Senator from Texas, the son of immigrants himself, to prohibit certain actions with respect to

deferred action for students in the United States whom we call DREAMers. For these young people, as Senator DURBIN said, the only flag they have ever pledged allegiance to is that of the United States. The only national anthem they have every sung is the ''Star-Spangled Banner.''

They came to this country not because they made a decision to do so but because their parents came here, just as Senator CRUZ's parents came here. He now ultimately enjoys the benefit of being an American, even though it was a different time and under a different set of circumstances. Nonetheless, he didn't have a choice in that decision and neither did these children.

We have learned and we have often heard in this Chamber that you never subscribe to the child whatever errors exist of the parent, but that is exactly what the Senator from Texas would do.

My friend from Texas is entitled to his views and his opinions, but he is not entitled to his own set of facts. The reality is that he continuously refers to the deferred action on deportation for these young people as amnesty. Amnesty suggests that someone is forgiven for something they did wrong and they have a clear pathway to permanent residency and ultimately to U.S. citizenship. That is not what the President did for these young people who know no other country than the United States. Any action that would be taken on these young people will be deferred until after Congress has acted on the pressing question of immigration reform.

The Senator from Texas suggested that the Senate has failed in leadership. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that the Senate exerted leadership over 1 year ago, when in broad bipartisan votes—notwithstanding the Senator from Texas—a group of eight Senators, four Republicans and four Democrats, joined together and got two-thirds of the Senate to send comprehensive immigration reform to the House of Representatives. We sent over commonsense immigration reform that was the toughest on border protection that has existed in the history of the country, that was in the national security interests of the United States, that provided for the economic imperative as described by the Congressional Budget Office of the opportunities that immigration reform would provide for the country by raising the gross domestic product of the United States, raising the wages of all Americans, and reducing the national debt, all by virtue of immigration reform.

Two-thirds of the Senate voted on that at a time when it was rare to see two-thirds of the Senate come together on controversial or significant issues of the day. It was sent to the House of Representatives over 1 year ago, and they did not once cast a vote on that legislation or their own vision of what immigration reform should be.

Mr. CRUZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I will be happy to do so a little later.

At the end of the day, the Senator from Texas argues that this measure is necessary to deal with the humanitarian crisis at the border. I will say that has gone dramatically in a downward slope.

He may argue that immigration policy is driving these children to make a dangerous and deadly journey. While I agree we need a long-term solution to the humanitarian crisis on the southern border, saying that this opportunity for DREAMers to stay in the United States is the cause is simply not true.

DACA, which is the law we refer to that the President did by administrative order, was announced in June of 2012. The influx of unaccompanied minors was reported months before that announcement. As a matter of fact, we can ask Senator CRUZ's own Governor, Rick Perry, who sent a letter warning about the influx of children months before the President's DACA announcement.

The fact is that all of this talk about ending deferred action for children who have been here sometimes well over a decade or more ignores the elephant in the room; that is, that DACA does not cover these children. It only covers children who were brought here before the announcement was made. Eliminating DACA, as the Senator from Texas wishes to do, would not make any of these children less likely to come here. These children are fleeing extreme violence in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, which have some of the highest murder rates per capita in the world.

If I saw my father killed and my sister raped, it is likely I would think about trying to flee that set of circumstances regardless of what the promise might or might not be, and that is in fact what drove this humanitarian crisis.

We should solve the roots of the crisis and not try to create some connection to something that has absolutely nothing to do with it.

I know we are in the season in which—even if 10 angels came swearing from above that DACA is not the cause of the unaccompanied minor circumstances or that it is not amnesty, there will be those who will say, no, those angels are wrong. The reality is that one is entitled to their own views but not their facts.

Finally, the undeniable consequence of the Senator's attempt to dismantle these deferred actions for DREAMers would serve only to further separate families. I have listened time and time again to my Republican colleagues say they are the heart of family values. Well, tearing apart families is not my sense of a family value. Tearing children away from their mothers and fathers is not my sense of family values. Destroying any hope of a better life and a chance at success is not the doctrine of family values.

There is a reason the Senate hasn't voted on this bill—and it won't. I think the Senate Democratic leadership understands it would be a disservice to our country, a disservice to hundreds of thousands of these young people who we have already invested in through our public schools. Now is the time to take advantage of their service, whether in the military of the United States or whether through their intellect. Some of them are the valedictorians and salutatorians of our schools and colleges and universities. It is an opportunity to ensure they can be productive members of our society, with no guarantee—with no guarantee—as it relates to their ultimate status.

I hope the immigrant community in this country—I hope the Hispanic community in this country, I hope the Asian and Indian communities in this country, I hope the Eastern European community in this country, all who are rightly concerned about comprehensive immigration reform—are listening to this debate, because as disappointed as some may be about the President saying: Well, we cannot move forward at this time until we get it right because of the politics that have been generated by the undocumented children along the border—as disappointed as some may be with the President—listen to what we will get if, in fact, this November there is a change of who ultimately has the majority in this Chamber. This is what we will get: We will get what we got in the House of Representatives, which is over a year of not casting one vote for their own vision of immigration reform. And every vote they have cast has been anti-immigrant at the end of the day.

For all of those reasons, I have to object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator from New Jersey talked about legislation that was debated and voted on a year ago—legislation that I believe, if passed into law, would only make the problem worse, would only increase illegal immigration, would only exacerbate the problem.

I, as do most Americans, want to see commonsense immigration reform, but not reform that fails to secure the border, that grants a pathway to citizenship for those here illegally, and that incentivizes further and further illegal immigration.

But that legislation was a year ago. The President of the United States tells us we have a humanitarian crisis on the border today—right now, not a year ago, today—with little boys and little girls being subjected to physical and sexual violence and being victimized.

The question I would ask my friend from New Jersey is: Why is it that neither President Obama nor the Senate Democrats have introduced any legislation or allowed a vote on any legislation whatsoever that would actually solve the problems?

Now, the President did introduce a $3.7 billion social services spending bill, less than 5 percent of which went to securing the border and none of which went to the underlying amnesty that is causing this crisis. That was a bill designed to deal with the symptoms to care for the kids once they come, but that bill assumed that tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of kids would continue to come, continue to be victimized.

So the question I ask of my friend from New Jersey is: Why have the Democrats not allowed a vote on anything to solve the problem and prevent these little boys and little girls from being victimized this year and next year and the year after that?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, first of all, I would say to my friend from Texas that he totally mischaracterizes the comprehensive, bipartisan immigration reform that was passed in the Senate. Do we know who voted for that? A whole host of Senators on the Republican side of the aisle who represent border States and who said: This is the most significant border protection and security effort we have had in a long time. They believed the national security of the United States was better preserved by virtue of that legislation. Our colleague JOHN MCCAIN worked assiduously on that question, as well as others.

So the bottom line is, that reform was going to end the process of those coming in an undocumented fashion; it controlled the border, moved the economy, and would bring out of the darkness those who are here to pursue the American dream, which is the only way we can secure America, to differentiate from those who might be here to do harm to the United States. I can't know that if people who are in the dark don't come and register with the government, pay their taxes, go for a criminal background check, and earn their way over the course of a decade to the possibility of becoming a permanent resident. That is what the Senate did.

So failure in this regard rests in the House of Representatives—failure on the border, failure on national security, failure on the economy, and failure to reunite millions of people with their families.

Now, with reference to the second part of the question, the President acted. It is the President who brought the Central American presidents here and said: You have to work with us to stop your young children from coming to our country and you have to create better conditions in your country, and we want to work with you to do that. We want to work with Mexico to ensure that what they call the Beast—the train of death—ultimately Mexican authorities interceded to stop immigrants from getting on that train to the United States. It is the President who ultimately took the resources that existed in the Department of Homeland Security and reauthorized them to send them to the border and deal with the challenge. All of that, among other efforts, ultimately has found us with a dramatic reduction.

So I understand the politics of this. I appreciate everybody in this Chamber has the right to pursue that. But the bottom line is the President acted and the reality is we have dramatically reduced it, and the core challenge here is to have comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I wish to make two final comments to conclude this exchange. My friend from New Jersey admitted that Senate Democrats introduced nothing—zero, nada—to do anything to fix this humanitarian crisis. Indeed, the majority leader dismissed the Senate and sent the Senators home for the month of August, perfectly content to let the crisis continue, to let tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of children be victimized. He suggested instead the solution was Presidential action, unilateral action.

There was a time when the Senate believed we had a responsibility to legislate, to actually pass laws to address challenges. Yet under the Senate Democrats, we have a do-nothing Senate. That is why over 350 bills passed by the House of Representatives are sitting on HARRY REID's desk, because this body no longer votes on meaningful legislation to address the challenges facing this country.

My friend from New Jersey suggested that the reason the legislation the House of Representatives passed prohibiting the President from illegally granting amnesty—the reason it is not going to come up for a vote is because he said it is a bad idea. Well, I recognize the Senator from New Jersey may well think that. Indeed, the Senator from Illinois may well think that. But no one who is paying attention to the Senate thinks that is the reason it is not coming up for a vote.

If it were objectively a bad idea—if it were a bad idea and the Democrats agreed on that, bringing it up for a vote would be very simple. We would bring it up for a vote. The Democrats have 55 Democrats in this body. They could all vote it down and it would be defeated. If the point were on the merits it is a bad idea, bringing it up for a vote would be very straightforward.

The reason the majority leader is fighting so hard to prevent a vote is that a great many of the Members in his caucus are doing everything in their power to convince their constituents back home they don't support amnesty.

As we travel the country, the most frequent thing we hear all throughout the country is that the men and women in Washington aren't listening to us. Something happens. I don't know if it is the water or what it is, but they get to Washington, they stop listening to us, and they don't tell us the truth. They are lying to us. We hear this from Republicans, from Democrats, Independents, Libertarians, all across this country. There is a reason why the popularity of Congress rivals that of Ebola, because the American people recognize the people in this body aren't telling them the truth. There is one reason and one reason only that Majority Leader REID does not want to vote on this legislation: because he wants to allow Senators in red States—the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from North Carolina, the Senator from Alaska, even the Senator from Colorado, even the Senator from New Mexico—he wants to allow them to tell their constituents, No, I don't support amnesty. And the reality is, of the 55 Members of this Senate who are Democrats, who caucus with the Democratic Party, today it has been conclusively demonstrated that all 55 support President Obama's illegal amnesty and are responsible for his promised amnesty of 5 million to 6 million more people right after the election. If that were not the case, we would have seen one Democrat show up and speak out to the contrary. Not a single Democrat showed up.

There is a reason we don't have a vote, because if we had a vote, it would force Members of this body to be on record.

The Senator from New Jersey is entitled to make the case on the merits why he thinks amnesty for 5 million or 6 million or 12 million is a good idea. He is entitled to make that case, and if his constituents agree with him, he will keep getting reelected. But far too many Senate Democrats want to pretend they disagree, and a vote makes that impossible because if we had a vote, we would see all 55 Senate democrats vote in favor of amnesty. They are right now hiding behind their leadership because they don't want that vote. They don't want their constituents to understand they support amnesty. So, instead, they shut this body down.

The American people are frustrated. They are disgusted with the Senate that won't do its job, that won't allow votes, that won't consider legislation to address the problems in this country, and that consistently lies to the voters.

I will tell my colleagues on my side of the aisle, I am happy to have as many votes as we like. It is interesting. The Senate majority leader today seems to view as his principal obligation protecting his Members from hard votes. I wish to point out the concept of a hard vote only makes sense if there is a disconnect between what a Senator says at home and what he or she does in Washington. Votes are hard if we have Democratic Senators who go home to their States and tell their constituents: I am really conservative and I don't agree with that crazy stuff President Obama is doing. Then they come here and vote lockstep

with the majority leader and the President. Then votes are hard.

I will tell my colleagues from my perspective, I don't consider votes hard. In 2 years, what I have tried to do in the Senate is very simple—2 things: Do what I said I would do, and tell the truth. The 26 million Texans I represent, I believe, understood the principles I am defending when they elected me. And whether we have 1 vote or 10 or 100 or 1,000, it doesn't surprise the men and women back home, because what I say in Texas is exactly the same as what I say on the floor of the Senate, and it is the way I have tried to vote since I arrived here. The reason the majority leader has 350-plus bills sitting on his desk is because a substantial number of Senate Democrats tell their constituents one thing and vote a different way. This is all predicated on deception.

So I am glad for this exchange because this exchange has shined light and made clear to the voters that, No. 1, amnesty is coming and President Obama intends to grant amnesty to 5 million to 6 million people right after the election; and No. 2, all 55 Senate Democrats bear direct responsibility for President Obama's illegal amnesty because all 55 Senate Democrats are standing in lockstep, preventing legislation that would stop that amnesty. That clarity is good. It allows accountability. It allows decisionmaking to be made by we the people.

The one thing I would encourage of my Democratic friends is, given that reality, go home and be honest with your constituents. All 55 of you go home and say: Yes, I stand with President Obama. I stand with majority leader HARRY REID in support of amnesty.

Those are not the views of the American people, but they are the views of every Democratic Senator in this body. We have a natural check when elected officials ignore the views and values of the people for whom we work in the place where sovereignty resides in our system: We the people.

I yield the floor, and I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to talk about an important piece of the Democrats' ''fair shot'' agenda: ensuring that women across America have access to the basic and often lifesaving health care benefits guaranteed under the Affordable Care Act.

Just a few months ago five men on the Supreme Court decided that there should be a group of woman across America who are required to ask their bosses for permission to access basic health care and that a corporation should have more rights then the women it employs. Just a few months ago those five men rolled back the clock on millions of women across America.

As the ink was still drying on Justice Alito's misguided opinion in the Hobby Lobby case, I made an unwavering commitment to do everything I could to protect women's access to health care since the five male Justices on the Supreme Court decided they would not. That is why I worked with my partner, the senior Senator from Colorado, to introduce the Not My Boss's Business Act to restore those lost benefits and protect women's health care. I am proud that in the months since we have received strong support from men and women across the country.

Our straightforward and simple legislation would ensure that no CEO or corporation can come between you and your guaranteed access to health care, period. This should not be a controversial issue. In fact, nearly 7 in 10 people say health plans should cover birth control. The only controversy about birth control today is the fact that it is 2014 and we are still fighting for this basic health care that is used by 99 person of sexually active women in this country.

Despite the resounding outrage we have heard from women and men across America, Senate Republicans stood with this misguided Supreme Court decision and blocked our efforts to right this wrong. If our colleagues on the other side of the aisle thought their obstruction of the Not My Boss's Business Act in July would end this conversation, they were dead wrong. Since then, millions of Americans have taken action. They have voiced their outrage on social media. They have organized action in their communities. They will continue to speak out until our Congress in turn takes action.

Unfortunately, it appears this message has fallen on deaf ears among some Senate Republicans. It has become increasingly clear on that side that some of the Members have decided to put the tea party ahead of women and have no intention of even allowing a debate on the Not My Boss's Business Act in the near future. I am extremely disappointed by that. I would have hoped our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have maybe—just maybe—spent a little time at home in August listening to women in their States. If they had, they would have heard the women across America asking Congress to fix this horrible decision that resulted from Hobby Lobby.

By the way, it is not just women who want Congress to act. People across the country understand that if bosses can deny birth control, they can deny vaccines or HIV treatments or other basic health care services for employees and their covered dependents. I think what men across America understand is that it is not just the female employees at businesses who are affected, it is their wives and their daughters as well who share that health care plan.

The data is clear. Ensuring access to contraception coverage is not just the right thing to do, it is also a critical part of making sure women and their families have a fair shot in the 21st century. Women and their family members should not be held back by outdated policies and unfair practices. As I said yesterday on the Senate floor, it is not just about access to contraception, it includes pay equity, access to childcare, a higher minimum wage, and it absolutely includes the right to make their own medical and religious decisions without being dictated or limited by their employer.

The bottom line is this: Women use birth control for a host of reasons, none of which should require a permission slip from their boss.

Unfortunately, Americans are most likely not surprised at what they are seeing. This obstruction is coming from Members of the same party that has been threatening to subject women to invasive and degrading ultrasounds; the same party that had candidates making outrageous statements, as we all remember, about legitimate rape and then defending those comments during their disastrous book tour; the exact same party that on Capitol Hill, in State houses across America, and in courtrooms at all levels is actively attempting to block women's ability to make their own decisions about their own health. They have shown they will go to just about any length to limit access to care.

Just in the past few weeks we have seen last-ditch efforts from Republicans to distract from their embarrassing record on women's health by claiming to support ''cheaper and easier access to contraception'' by simply making it over the counter. Well, the reality is that these proposals would actually cost women more by forcing them to pay out of pocket for the birth control they are getting now at no cost thanks to the Affordable Care Act. This is a basic piece of women's health care. It should not be available only to those who can afford it.

The American people are not fooled. In fact, just yesterday PolitiFact rated one Republican birth control claim as ''Mostly False'' given that it was ''lacking in concrete detail.''

Time and again Republican leadership has put politics between women and their health care. Now, with their continued obstruction, they have put employers between women and their access to free or low-cost basic health care under the Affordable Care Act. They have shown us they are not focused on what is best for women; they are focused on political calculations, appeasing the far right, and their continued efforts to do whatever it takes

to pitch their extreme agenda even when it burdens working women and their families.

Despite this disappointing turn of events, I stand here today to say the deck is stacked against them because millions of women who benefit from this basic and often lifesaving health care will not be silenced. They are still watching.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, how much time am I allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has up to 1 hour postcloture.

Mr. CORKER. Well I assure you that will not be the case. I will speak for possibly 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

ISIS

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, tonight the President is going to address an issue on which I know almost every American has been focused; that is, the rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria and the beginning of that in many other places around the world. This is obviously a big speech. It is one that I know all of us will be paying attention to and watching.

I am hopeful that what the President will do tonight is, first of all, explain to the American people from his perspective what our national interest is in ISIS. I think that should be very easy to do. I also hope that what he will do is lay out a general strategy. Obviously, in a speech such as this you never want to give every detail of what it is you want to do, but I hope he lays out the objectives he wishes to accomplish as he talks to the Nation and really the world about how he plans to deal with ISIS.

So I wanted to say at the onset that I look forward to listening. I hope this is a speech that is meaty. I hope it is a speech that speaks to the essence of why we as a nation need to deal with the threat ISIS poses not only in the Middle East but, over time, in the West, with us being the greatest symbol.

I know there have been many conversations with the administration about ISIS. I know that obviously their concern about ISIS has risen over time. Again, I look forward to very clearly listening to the speech.

Most of us here in the Senate, if we were in the White House, might choose to guard the authorities we have. Many Presidents have said—most Presidents have said they themselves have the authority to conduct operations of this nature. While that is debatable, that is not a topic I wish to debate. I know the President has said he has the ability to go about these actions, to take these actions without any additional authority from Congress. What they have said is they plan to not come to Congress. I think that is absolutely preposterous.

If you think back in history, back in 1991 President Bush 41, in getting ready to undertake the activities in Desert Storm, felt as though he had the authority to move ahead with those activities. Yet they realized within the administration that the best thing they could do was to get the American people behind what they were doing, and the best way to do that was to seek an authorization from Congress, to have that debate, to have Members of the Senate be able to ask questions about how this operation was going to take place, to get people comfortable with what the objectives were going to be, and to finally win over the Senate. As a matter of fact, as I understand it, Sam Nunn, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee at the time, was opposed to this effort. Yet, with Bush 41 coming up with his Cabinet members to talk to Members of Congress, they were able to pass it over the objection of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. But what that meant was there had to be interaction, there had to be questions and answers, and there had to be a feeling by Members of this body that what was getting ready to happen was something that was going to make a difference. So they came and did that. They were successful, and the operation itself was successful.

President Bush 43 did the same. In 2001, after what happened with the Twin Towers and other activities around 9/11, the country was outraged. He actually sent forth his own AUFM, the Authorization for Use of Military Force. Action was taken. It was 60 words, it was broad, but action was taken. The same thing occurred in 2002, which led us to what happened in Iraq. So President Bush 43 did those same things even though he felt as if he himself had the authority to take on those activities without Congress approving them. But they felt it was much better for the American people to see what was going to happen and for Congress to be fully informed, to understand what the objectives were, and then to have Congress authorize it.

This President, President Obama, came before us last year—almost 1 year ago exactly—and asked for an authorization on Syria.

I find it truly preposterous and hugely lacking in judgment that this President is discussing—and hopefully he will change his mind in the next few days—undertaking activities in Iraq. Remember, the President declared that in 2011 the war in Iraq was over, that we had won, that it was a stable country. Yet this new enemy—I do not want to get into the past too much, but because of policies of this administration in both Iraq and Syria, things have changed. So now we have a new enemy—ISIS—that has arisen. They are incredibly well funded, well equipped, well energized, and savvy to social media.

We have seen the detestable things that this group is doing to people of all kinds of ethnic persuasions in Iraq. We understand the threat this is to Iraq and to the Middle East.

What we also know is this is something that is affecting directly today not only Iraq but Syria. There is really no border there. It is porous.

We actually know the ISIS headquarters are in Syria. So this is an operation that can in no way be confined just to Iraq. We have to deal with this in Syria.

The President hopefully tonight—while laying out what our national interest is, while laying out what his general strategy is, while laying out what his objective is—certainly will talk about the fact that we have to deal with this in Syria.

I will say to the Presiding Officer of the Senate that it seems to me, even if the President feels that he has the authority to do this with his own constitutional powers under article 2—even if he feels that—it is totally preposterous that he would not seek our authorization to take on a different enemy. Certainly, to take this into another country that we have not been involved with in this way in the past—Syria—to take on operations in that country with a different enemy and not come to Congress, to not seek the approval of the people whom the people of this country have elected to weigh in on these matters to me, again, is tremendously lacking in judgment.

One of the benefits of the President coming to seek our approval is that he has stated over the weekend that he believes this could take 3 years. Let me say this one more time. This is a conflict that he believes could take 3 years in duration and take us into another country where we are now not involved in this matter anyway. He is talking about not coming to us.

Again, bad things happen in conflict. Our Presiding Officer has a distinguished career in serving our country—and I honor that—a distinguished public service in the military, and he knows that things don't always go the way we intend.

For the President to undertake something of 3 years in duration—by his own words, in another country and an enemy that is one of the most well-funded terrorist operations that we have dealt with, knowing that he has to pull together a coalition of people with very different interests but with like interests relative to this particularly detestable group of folks—to think that this President would undertake that without Congress being behind him and having 535 Monday morning quarterbacks because there was never any buy-in by Congress to me is foolish.

But because of what happened 1 year ago where our allies in the region who were going to help us deal with Assad were waiting by the telephone to respond because they, with us, were going to conduct activities against Assad about 1 year ago today—they watched on CNN as the President had changed his mind without even notifying them, without notifying their leaders or their armed services—there is a credibility issue.

The President has talked about building a coalition, and he says that there are 12 countries that are already interested.

I would say to him that coming to Congress would show that there is durability, that he has sought our support, that he has answered our questions, that his Cabinet members have laid out their plan, both in public and in private—talking about details that have no business in the public sphere—and that he has the buy-in of the Congress.

I would say to the other members of the coalition, the people in the region who question our durability, question, candidly—I hate to say it—his credibility. They would say that after he had done this that they believe this Nation is unified in dealing with this issue.

I just want to say again I hope the President is good tonight. I hope he delivers to the American people why this is in our national interest. I hope he lays out a strategy that makes sense. I hope he deals with the objectives that he wants to come forth with.

Importantly, to me, I understand how we are going to deal with the ground in Iraq. I understand we have an Iraqi military—as weak as they are—that we can build off of. I understand that we have the Peshmerga—the Kurds—who we can build off of in support.

What I don't understand in Syria, especially since year after year we have done nothing to support the moderate opposition like we have said we would do—or very little—let me not say nothing, but really very little. Since we have nothing of substance on the ground in Syria, how are we going to deal with that?

Our Presiding Officer knows more about military officers than I do by far. But how do we deal with a country with nothing on the ground. I want him to explain that. But I think all of us would like to understand that.

But, again, I think if he were to come to the Senate to seek our support overtly and to explain to the Presiding Officer, myself, and many others in this body how he has a strategy that could be effective, I believe that he would receive overwhelming support, and I believe he would have the durability necessary to deal with an enemy of this sort.

I do hope, again, the President is on target tonight. I hope the President will seek our authorization for the use of military force—now.

I hear people say: Well, gosh, CORKER, it is right before an election.

So our President is going to talk to the Nation about what we are going to be doing with this enemy in Iraq, in Syria—candidly—and in other places. Because there is an election coming up, maybe he is not going to—I don't know that this is his reason, but I know there are a lot of people in Congress who say they don't want to deal with it before the election.

Are you kidding me—the most significant decision that is made; that is, sending men and women in harm's way—because it is 2 months before an election. If there are people in this body who don't want to be put to the task by the President of asking for an amount, whether it is 2 hours, 2 days, 2 weeks, 2 months or 2 years before an election. Someone shouldn't serve in the Senate if they don't want to take up these issues and deal with them.

I hope the President will change his mind. I hope the President will come to the Senate and seek our input and say that he wants an authorization and send us that authorization.

That is what he did with Syria. Let's look at it. Let's deal with his Cabinet Members, both in public and private. Let's deal with him. Let us see his commitment. Let's understand the coalition that is being put forth and let's deal with this in the manner that people in the Senate should deal with it, but it should come only after the President seeks that authorization. That is an important thing for him to do. I hope he will do it tomorrow after giving his speech.

I stand by ready to work with him in that regard, and I close with those comments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Vermont.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, later this week, one of the most important Senate votes in the modern history of this country will take place, and that vote will be about whether the Senate begins the process to move forward on a constitutional amendment which overturns the disastrous 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision on Citizens United.

What the Citizens United Supreme Court decision was about 4 years ago is to say to the billionaires in this country, to say to the largest corporations in this country: OK, you already own much of the economy of the United States of America, but now by a 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision we are going to allow the billionaires and the large corporations of this country to own the U.S. Government because they will now be allowed to spend unlimited sums of money on political campaigns.

Poll after poll tells us that whether you are a progressive, as I am, a moderate, or a conservative, all over this country people are profoundly disgusted by the ability of big money to buy elections. What democracy means, what people fought and died for is the right of you, her, and him to have one vote.

What democracy is not about is allowing the Koch brothers—a family worth $80 billion, the second wealthiest family in this country—to spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to elect candidates whose job it is to make the wealthiest people in this country even wealthier while they continue to attack the needs of the middle class and working families of this country.

There was a piece the other day in the Washington Post talking about how the Koch brothers alone—just one family—has already in this election cycle put 44,000 ads on television and radio, and we have 2 months left before this election.

Does anybody believe that is what democracy is about?

In this country today we are suffering a major economic crisis. What that crisis is about is the disappearance of the middle class, the fact that since 1999 the typical middle-class family has seen its income go down by more than $5,000 after adjusting for inflation. The crisis is that all over America, working people are not working 40 hours a week, they are working 50, 60 hours a week. They are not working at one job—they are working at two jobs, they are working at three jobs, trying to cobble together an income and maybe some health care to take care of their family.

The crisis in America today is that unemployment is not the official rate of 6.1 percent, it is the real rate of 12 percent if we include those people who have given up looking for work and are working part-time.

The crisis is that youth unemployment today is 20 percent; African-American youth unemployment is 35 percent. The American people are calling out. They are saying to the Congress: Why doesn't Congress create the millions of jobs our people need. Why don't you rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. Why don't you transform our energy system so we can address the crisis of climate change and move away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency, wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, and create huge numbers of jobs. Why don't you rebuild our crumbling bridges, roads, water systems, and wastewater plants. Why don't you raise the minimum wage to a living wage.

That is what people tell me in Vermont and that is what people are saying all over this country.

People ask that today, despite the modest gains of the Affordable Care Act, how does it happen that the United States is the only major country on Earth that doesn't guarantee health care to all people as a right?

We have 40 million people uninsured, even more paying large copayments and premiums.

Why don't we join the rest of the world and guarantee health care to all of our people?

The answer is very simple. The answer is that Members elected to the House and the Senate increasingly are dependent upon big money campaign contributions in order to win their seats. That is not what democracy is about; that is what oligarchy is about. Oligarchy is when you have a nation owned and controlled by a handful of wealthy families. That is where we are moving today.

On issue after issue, the American people are very clear about where they

want to be going. On this issue of Citizens United, the American people are very clear that we need real campaign finance reform to prevent billionaires from buying elections. That is what the American people want. That is what they say in poll after poll. Yet it remains to be seen whether, in a few days when we vote on this issue, we will get one Republican vote. And I can understand that because the Republicans today are the beneficiaries in a very big-time way of all of this billionaire money.

A couple months ago a constituent of mine in Vermont made a very interesting suggestion. He said: Bernie, do you ever see these guys in NASCAR, the racing car drivers, and they wear their jackets, and their jackets have all of the sponsors on them? They are sponsored by Goodyear Tire Company, and they are sponsored by this oil company, and they are sponsored by this brake company. Maybe we should have the Members of the U.S. Senate wear jackets which tell us who is sponsoring them. So somebody can come forward in their nice blue blazer and say: Hey, I am owned and sponsored by the Koch brothers. Somebody else can come forward and say: No, I am not owned by the Koch brothers, I am owned by the oil industry or I am owned by Big Energy or I am owned by Wall Street. It would be very instructive, when you see people get up and vote, about why they do not want to raise the minimum wage, to find out they are controlled by significant contributions coming from large corporations.

I think it would be very interesting to see Members of the Congress wear those types of coats.

The men and women of our country know there is something profoundly wrong when 95 percent of all new income generated in this country goes to the top 1 percent. They know there is something profoundly wrong when one out of four profitable corporations pays nothing in Federal taxes in any given year. Yet the reason we are unable to come up with real tax reform—so we can find the money to help our kids go to college, so we can deal with the fact that we have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world—has everything to do with large corporations not paying their fair share, and that has everything to do with the types of campaign contributions these institutions make.

There was a poll that came out just the other day. They asked the American people: Should we cut Social Security? Do you know what the American people say, whether they are progressives, moderates, or conservatives? They say: You have to be nuts. We can't make it on Social Security benefits today, and you want to cut Social Security? You want to cut Medicare? But that is exactly what the Business Roundtable from corporate America wants us to do.

So we are living in two separate worlds. On the one hand you have an agenda here in the House and among many of my Republican colleagues that says: What we need to do is give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people and the largest corporations. Is that what the American people want? Overwhelmingly, they do not want that.

You have an agenda among many who say: We have to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Is that what the American people want? No, they do not.

There is an agenda among some Republicans that says: Not only should we not raise the minimum wage, we should do away with the concept of the minimum wage so that in high-unemployment areas people could work for $4 or $5 an hour. Is that what the American people want? Quite the contrary. They want to raise the minimum wage to at least $10.10 an hour.

So you have an amazing dynamic right now in American society. On the one hand in the real world outside of the beltway, ordinary people are hurting. They are struggling. They are worried about their kids. They are worried about their grandchildren. They are worried about their parents. They want the U.S. Government to do something to create jobs, to raise the minimum wage, to change our disastrous trade policies. They want us to do something to make college affordable, to lower interest rates on student debt. They want us to create jobs by rebuilding the infrastructure. They want everybody in this country to have health care as a right. They want us to address the crisis of global warming. But we do not do that. Why not? Because increasingly the Congress is not responsive to the needs of ordinary Americans. They are responsive to the big-money campaign contributors, and that has everything to do with this constitutional amendment beginning the process to overturn Citizens United.

So of all of the issues out there—whether you are concerned about education, health care, the environment, the economy—the most important issue underlying all of those issues is the need to end this disastrous Supreme Court decision which allows billionaires to buy elections. That is not what people fought and died for in the name of democracy. That is called oligarchy. Abraham Lincoln talked about a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, not a government of the billionaires, by the billionaires, and for the billionaires, and that is where we are today.

I hope the American people are watching. The media has not paid, for interesting reasons, a lot of attention to this issue, but there is no domestic issue that I can think of more important for the future of this country.

Do we elect Members of Congress who are beholden to the constituents back home, to the middle class, to working families, or do we elect Members of Congress who are beholden to corporate America and the billionaire class? Do we fight to sustain the democratic foundation of this country or do we move toward an oligarchic form of society controlled by a handful of billionaire families? That is the issue. That is what this debate is all about, and that is what this vote in a few days will be about. I hope very much the American people will demand that every Member of this Senate vote for this piece of legislation which begins the process of overturning this disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to follow up on the Presiding Officer's comments a moment ago about the crux of this issue—why this big money in campaigns is so bad for our country.

The public does not really care who has an advantage, who has a disadvantage. They do not really care if a Republican wins or a Democrat wins. They care about what we do here and how we can help people's lives.

The Presiding Officer talked about the minimum wage. In my first year in the Senate, 2007—my first speech on the Senate floor, four or five desks over from here, was about the minimum wage. It passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote. It was signed by a Republican President, increasing the minimum wage. That was then. Today we cannot even get a minimum wage out of the Senate because of a Republican filibuster.

The minimum wage is worth one-third less in real dollars, in purchasing power, than it was in 1968. The subminimum wage—the tipped wage—has been stuck at $2.13 an hour for 20 years. People who push wheelchairs at airports, valets, and waiters in downtown diners can make as little as $2 or $3 an hour, and they hope to get up to $7 or $8 or $9 on tips.

If it were not for the political pressure, the money that just rolls across the political landscape, that washes across the candidates for the Senate, the candidates for the House, we could pass the minimum wage. But Members of the Senate, when they think about voting on this, they think about the big money that might come in against them if they vote for the minimum wage.

I am convinced that if we could pass this constitutional amendment, we could begin to address the issues of Wall Street and oil companies and Big Tobacco buying elections, spending not millions, not even tens of millions, but hundreds of millions of dollars. We could pass the minimum wage. We

could pass a real jobs bill. We could reform Wall Street. We could pass consumer protection bills. We could invest in education and community colleges and federally qualified health centers and veterans' benefits the way we should. That is why this constitutional amendment is so important on campaign spending. That is why it matters.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as we all know, we are discussing a constitutional amendment sponsored by 45 members of the Democratic Party to restrict free speech.

This constitutional amendment pending before the Senate is a real threat to one of the two most vital developments in our Nation's legal and constitutional history.

One of those legal successes was the development of a body of civil rights laws to protect the basic freedoms of all Americans. That took a long time and required massive effort and even bloodshed as well as judicial rulings. The second development was the enhancement of free speech as protected by the First Amendment. That process also required massive time and effort and judicial rulings.

Both of these struggles were made necessary because the Supreme Court failed to give effort to the intent of the authors of the First and 14th Amendments in guaranteeing liberty and equality. It took President Jefferson assuming office—not the courts interpreting the First Amendment—to address the criminalization of free speech under the Alien and Sedition Acts.

When Congress in the 1830s and 1840s denied the right to petition for redress of grievances to those who opposed slavery, it took John Quincy Adams and Congress—not a court relying on the First Amendment—to change those rules.

The reality is the First Amendment had a very limited scope until well into the 20th century. After a judicial sea change, the courts now give broad protection to free speech.

Political speech is now constitutionally protected unless the government has a compelling interest, and the restriction is narrowly tailored to further that compelling interest. Those free speech battles took many years to win. If the arguments that proponents of this constitutional amendment are making were adopted, we would be turning the clock back on 100 years of progress of protecting free speech. The constitutional amendment before us is a content-based restriction on free speech.

Speech influencing campaigns for elective office would be restricted. No other speech content, however, would be restricted. Some of that speech by corporations and other entities could be prohibited entirely, and those who engage in such speech could be criminally prosecuted.

The Supreme Court has allowed content-based restrictions on speech in only a very few cases, such as obscenity, defamation, child pornography, and threats.

The proposed constitutional amendment would restrict the most important speech the First Amendment protects—and that happens to be core political speech. It would treat that speech as if it were like child pornography.

In the Judiciary Committee, one Democrat actually compared core political speech to child pornography. It is incredible that would be said. Comparing the core political speech the Bill of Rights protects to the video recording of an unspeakable crime against a child doesn't make any sense.

That same Senator and the sponsor of the amendment on the floor both argued that campaign-related speech can be restricted because free speech doesn't include the right to falsely shout fire in a crowded theater. This is the argument that would reduce free speech protection in this country to the minimal level that it enjoyed 100 years ago, before there was expansion of protection under the First Amendment.

When Justice Holmes made that famous fire statement in that case, the Supreme Court wasn't being asked to rule on the legality of a conviction of someone who had falsely yelled fire in a crowded theater. Rather, the case involved a man who was convicted of distributing leaflets urging young men not to comply with the draft laws during World War I.

Justice Holmes compared that peaceful protest to a shout that would immediately lead to serious bodily injury and perhaps loss of life for larger numbers of people. That is obviously a false analogy.

Those who speak in support or opposition to candidates are comparable then to those who pass out leaflets in opposition to government policy. It is obviously false analogy to compare that speech designed to persuade fellow citizens in their voting to falsely yelling fire in a crowded theater.

It is easy for the government to determine whether a cry of fire is true or false, but a campaign ad isn't often clearly false. Even a false ad doesn't create the risk of death. When a government prosecutes those who falsely cry fire in a crowded theater, that prosecution will have the beneficial effect of deterring others from engaging in that same conduct. But when government criminalizes ads that it determines are false or limits how much can be spent on those ads, backed up by criminal penalties, that in fact will produce the harm of reducing the likelihood that others will speak about important public subjects—hence, weakening our democracy.

Justice Holmes quickly came to realize the errors of his ways. In subsequent Supreme Court decisions, he and Justice Brandeis dissented when the majority applied the clear and present danger test that the fire-in-the-theater analogy supported. They voted to protect peaceable free speech. They understood that in a free country, the way to address controversial speech was through speech by others with different views—not by shutting up people with the threat of jail.

It took a long 50 years for the Court to adopt the protections for free speech that Justice Holmes and Judge Learned Hand had advocated to no avail. And if this constitutional amendment passes, that glorious history of the understanding of the importance of free speech in a democracy will be undone.

It was only a few years after its 1969 ruling providing strong constitutional protections of free political speech that the Supreme Court ruled on its first campaign speech case; that is, Buckley v. Valeo. In that case the Court ruled that the independent expenditures could be limited. The decision wasn't the work of supposed conservative judicial activists. Wealthy individuals have been able to spend unlimited amounts on campaign-related speech since then. That isn't a novel development that dates only to Citizens United. Buckley also permitted nonprofit corporations to engage in independent expenditures designed to influence campaigns. Corporations and others could contribute to these nonprofit entities.

In context, Citizens United represents an advance over the prior law, especially in promoting transparency. Floyd Abrams, the Nation's foremost First Amendment litigator, wrote to the Judiciary Committee in questions for the record:

> What Citizens United did do, however, is permit corporations to contribute to PACs that are required to disclose all donors and engage only in independent expenditures.
>
> If anything, Citizens United is a pro-disclosure ruling which brought corporate money further into the light.

So I don't think my colleagues are correct in saying this amendment is about so-called ''dark money.'' And limiting speech is totally separate from disclosure of speech. This amendment says nothing about disclosure.

It is the constitutional amendment, not Citizens United, that fails to respect precedent. It doesn't simply overturn one case. The Supreme Court has repeatedly found that engaging in campaign speech is fully protected by the Bill of Rights. Time after time it has ruled correctly that because effective speech can only occur through the expenditure of money, government cannot restrict campaign expenditures by candidates or others. Repeatedly, the Court has recognized that effective campaign speech requires that individuals have the right to form groups that

will spend money on campaign speech. Those Supreme Court decisions were joined and sometimes written by great liberal Justices.

This proposal represents a radical departure from long-established free speech protections. It is at war with an entire body of jurisprudence. It extends well beyond corporations.

Despite the sponsors of this amendment limiting their criticism to one or two cases, the amendment would overturn not just those few cases but 12 Supreme Court decisions, according to that expert, Mr. Abrams. As the amendment has been redrafted, it may be only 11.5 cases now, depending upon what the word ''reasonable'' means. And why the word ''reasonable'' was left out in the first place and why it was included now, I don't know, but it is included now because people realize the extremities to which this constitutional amendment would take it. But even with the word ''reasonable,'' that extreme position would take us down a slippery slope, amending the Bill of Rights, and I don't think we want to go down that slope.

Justice Stevens, whom the committee Democrats relied on at length in support of the amendment, voted with the majority in three of the cases the amendment would overturn.

It is hard to imagine what would be more radical than the Congress passing a constitutional amendment to overturn a dozen Supreme Court decisions that have protected individual rights. Free speech would be dramatically curtailed. That is why the arguments made here on the Senate floor that matters were fine before Citizens United 4 years ago are beside the point.

Also off-point is the argument by another Democrat that the debate here concerns only whether Citizens United was correctly decided under the First Amendment and that the overall protection of free speech is not at issue whatsoever. The amendment before us doesn't just reverse Citizens United. It doesn't just take us back 4 years. It reverses decades of precedent that gave broad protection to free speech. That is why the stakes are so high and why we are spending so much time debating this constitutional amendment.

Yet another argument was raised on the floor that overturning Citizens United through a constitutional amendment is comparable to overturning earlier Supreme Court decisions on women's suffrage or poll taxes. In response to a written question from the Judiciary Committee, the same scholar, Mr. Abrams, forcefully rejected any such comparison. He wrote this back to us Senators:

> The notion that a Supreme Court opinion protecting First Amendment rights should be viewed as comparable to one depriving slaves or women of their rights is both intellectually flawed and morally repugnant.
>
> How can constitutional amendments assuring freedom of slaves or equality for women possibly be viewed as analogous to taking away—

Emphasis on ''taking away''—citizens' First Amendment rights?

This morning the lead sponsor of the amendment contended that the amendment wouldn't lead to banning books or putting people in jail. He also claimed that Congress had not provided for such results in earlier years and would not do so now. He said that even if Congress tried, it would be very unlikely that both Houses would pass such a measure. He maintained that even if such extreme measures were enacted, the Supreme Court would strike down them as unreasonable. It reminds you that the alien and sedition laws never put anybody in prison. But this sponsor did not deny that Congress could, in fact, pass legislation that would have the effect the opponents have raised. What does he think would happen if someone violated the reasonable spending limits? Some government agency would have to enforce them with criminal penalties. Violating them would subject people to jail for speaking. The Obama Justice Department, which would enforce those criminal laws, told the Supreme Court that if Citizens United had been decided as the sponsors of the amendment desire, it would prosecute book publishers.

In this country constitutional rights do not depend on the kindness of politicians not infringing them. Otherwise, we wouldn't have had the Alien and Sedition Acts. Those limits prevent Congress from violating rights in the first place.

The Bill of Rights was adopted precisely because the citizens rejected the argument that the Constitution's difficult passage to legislative enactment by itself was adequate to protect fundamental liberties such as free speech. And it is cold comfort that after the election is over and they have been barred from speaking, citizens can spend money to ask the Supreme Court to reverse their convictions.

I have made clear that this amendment abridges fundamental freedoms that are the birthright of Americans. The arguments made to support it are very unconvincing. The amendment will weaken, not strengthen, democracy. It will not reduce corruption but will open the door for elected officials to bend democracy rules to benefit themselves, and that is benefiting incumbency.

The fact that the Senate is considering such a dreadful amendment is a great testament to the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in insisting upon and adopting the Bill of Rights in the first place, a necessary forerunner to whether the Colonies would approve the Constitution in the first place.

Justice Jackson famously wrote:

> The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts.
>
> One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.

We must preserve our Bill of Rights, including our right to free speech. We must not allow officials to diminish or ration that right. We must not let this proposal become part of the supreme law of the land.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to discuss legislation pending before the Senate which wages an unprecedented attack on a fundamental American freedom. The Framers of our Constitution were clear when they stated in the Bill of Rights . . . ''Congress shall make no law . . . prohibiting the free exercise of speech.'' However, this week, the Senate majority has sought to undermine this fundamental freedom by offering a constitutional amendment to give Congress more control over the free speech rights of Americans.

I opposed moving forward with this amendment because political speech is essential to the American way of life. Our Nation was founded on those who openly criticized the king and argued for a better form of government. All branches of our government rely on the ability for Americans to passionately defend their interests. Additionally, when we elect candidates for office we the electorate rely on open dialog about why he or she ought to serve a particular community or State. The Constitution would have never been adopted without the Bill of Rights. Political speech is exactly the type of expression the Founders sought to protect when they adopted the Bill of Rights—however, this proposal completely forgets about that freedom.

Giving the Federal Government the ability to regulate what we say is flat out dangerous. What is a reasonable limitation on political speech? The sponsors of this proposal can't answer that and it is reckless to assume that Federal courts will determine the correct answer. What concerns me the most is where does this regulation stop? The answer is not clear and at the very end of the day this constitutional amendment limits the way in which Americans can voice their concerns about their elected officials.

With all that the Senate needs to accomplish it is an embarrassment that the majority leader would bring this up now, not allow amendments and expect this institution to forget about the very freedoms our Founders sought to protect when they drafted our Federal Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAMEST LAMEDUCK SESSION

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I became a practicing physician over 30 years ago. I delivered well in excess of 4,000 babies. And right now in my Senate career and where the Senate is, I

feel as if I am the father in the waiting room. I keep wondering when we are going to make any progress, when we are actually going to have the delivery of something positive for the country.

What we are seeing this week is really disappointing to me because if you read just the headlines in the last 4 days, here are the headlines about Congress.

Here is today's Politico: ''The Lamest Lame Duck Looms Over Congress.''

''Lame Ducks Will Roost in a Do-Nothing December.''

''December will be the lamest lame-duck session in a long time.''

The Economist: ''Congress is useless.''

America's legislature has become something of a joke in recent years, a place where good policy ideas go to die and where decent policy ideas go to be twisted into something incomprehensible.

It is enough to make one lose faith in representative democracy, I tell you.

CNN:

Congress has taken off the whole year. But here's the current math: What is less than nothing? And if you do less than nothing, at what point does it become completely counterproductive and silly?

That is our debate. The sum total of our big ideas right now is not wanting to start any fights within our own party and unity above all else as we head into the midterm election.

What is the political solution? No substance, no ideas, no serious debate that might actually engage voters. Instead, each side suits up, armed with its slogans and its bromides.

This is a quote from CNN: ''Congress defined: 'Useless,' 'worthless,' a 'joke.'" That is according to the most recent response of the popular responses on CNN's Web site from 5,000 respondents on social media.

Also:

Still trying to get a pulse on the most common feelings toward Congress? The other words on the top 10 list are ''corrupt,'' ''incompetent,'' ''lazy,'' ''inept,'' ''idiots,'' ''selfish'' and ''dysfunctional.''

The article goes on to say: ''I'll describe Congress with two words,'' he said. ''Term limits!!''

The CNN article also had a Washington Post poll that said a majority of Americans feel their representatives in Congress are part of the problem.

From the Washington Post: ''Congress is making a lot of history by being so unpopular.''

The real topic of today is what is not happening in the Congress. I will describe where we are. This year we are going to have borrowed an excess of $500 billion that we won't pay for. We have a continuing resolution coming up with $49 billion worth of fake dollars in it. That way everybody can say they stayed within the requirements of the Ryan-Murray agreement. So there is no integrity in that.

We have done nothing to markedly increase the opportunity for jobs in America. What is not happening is a reversal of the decline in the median family income in this country, which is now at 1988 levels.

The big story is what is not happening. The big story is that Congress is not addressing the needs of the Nation. The big story is that Congress has not passed its first appropriations bill. The big story is what is not happening. It is not what is happening. What is happening is a political farce. Everybody knows it. It is all about the election, it is all about reemphasizing where we are, and the country suffers for it.

We know that there is no opportunity to actually amend the bill on the floor, but I have filed an amendment which would place term limits on Members of Congress. The No. 1 requirement—right now in this body—for most politicians on both sides is to get reelected. That is why we are not addressing the real issues; that is why we are not addressing the fraud in the Social Security disability system; that is why we threw $30 billion at the VA system rather than effectively rearrange and totally rewrite the VA health care system.

Cyber security is important for this country. Bills have passed out of the Homeland Security Committee. Bills have—these are all bipartisan bills—passed out of the Senate Select Intelligence Committee. What is not happening is that they are not coming to the floor even though that is a great threat to our country right now because what is important is what is important to the politicians and not what is important for the long run, the best for our country.

If we are going to amend the Bill of Rights and take free speech away from people in this country, we should at least do something to secure the future—so our own worst tendencies won't be exaggerated in the future—and put term limits on Members of Congress. This system is rigged for incumbents. It is totally rigged for incumbents.

At one point last year the approval rating for Congress got down to 8 percent. That means only 1 in 12 people in this country thought Congress—and it is a little better than that now. I think it is 12 or 14 percent; 1 in 6 or 7 people have confidence that we have their back and that our motivations are pure in terms of wanting to fix the problems with our country. They see the lack of leadership. They see the political posturing, and they don't like what they see because what they see is selfishness. They see politicians putting themselves first and the country second. That is where we are. It is the dirty little secret that people won't talk about but Americans outside of Washington innately know is true.

So we have a bill on the floor to amend—for the first time in history—the Bill of Rights to limit First Amendment speech. Why? Because the Supreme Court rulings have maybe changed the dynamics in terms of elections. Well, if you didn't care if you got reelected, you would not care about that.

So we are only going to be here in session—actively in Congress before the election in early November—for 7 or 8 more days so that everybody who is up for reelection, and those who are not, can go out and campaign and raise money so we can continue the progress of career politicians and the rigged incumbent advantage can stay in process.

So I know it is not in order to offer my amendment. It has been filed. One way to fix this is to put term limits on Members of the Senate. Oklahoma has term limits for its Members of Congress. Oklahomans believe in it. It is a 72-to-80 percent issue all across the country. Americans believe in it, but the politicians in Washington are never going to vote for it because it puts them second and the country first.

We have a Defense authorization bill that needs to be passed. It is critical for the future of our country. We are not talking about it, and we are not doing anything on it.

As I have mentioned, we have several cyber bills that need to be passed that have gone through committee—bipartisan bills—and they are not on the floor. We have significant appropriation bills that need to have the attention of the Members of Congress—and this is not the committee's fault.

The committee is a bipartisan committee and has done good work. This is a leadership problem within the Senate. They have done their work, but the bills can't come to the floor because we don't want to have to take up and defend those votes back home. So when you read what the press says about Congress, they are actually pretty nice to us given where we are today. We are lame ducks. We have taken the year off. We are worthless. We are a joke. We are useless, incompetent, corrupt, lazy, and inept. I don't think those words are too harsh. We are repeating votes that we have already voted on that are political votes that are designed to enhance turnout in certain groups.

So this place is a show place, and the downside is that the country suffers for it—our country. Whether you are a conservative male who is 66 years old like me or you are a liberal Latino female at 18, our country suffers because our eye is off the ball. Our eye is off the oath that we took. Our eye is off our commitment and the historical lineage that has been here before us as Members of Congress willing to do what was necessary to solve the problems for the country. What is not happening in the Senate is that there is no leadership. We say leader, but there is no leadership in the Senate.

The leadership of the Senate is now totally disconnected from what is needed by the country. So instead of the greatest deliberative body in the world, what we have in the Senate today is the greatest political body in the world that doesn't care about deliberation

and only cares about winning the next election. There are a lot of ways to cure that, and when you read and see the poll about Congress and read the words and look at it, the majority of Americans today believe that their Member of Congress is part of the problem. The average Member of Congress has a lower reelect than nonreelect.

The American people get it. The question is: What can they do about it? What you have to do is you have to eventually have term limits so that we take the inherent bias of the career politician out of the mix, and we make it not about the politicians but we return the Senate to its original intention; and that is, what is in the best interest of the country.

Quite frankly, for the last 3½ years, that is not what has been happening in this body. It is a soulful, shameful period in the history of our country. The thoughts and creative power of our Founders as they instituted a body that was meant to consider very straightforward, very solemnly, every issue that came—that was meant to drive consensus, to force consensus. We have no consensus when the whole goal is not to solve problems for the country but to win elections.

I would love to be able to take a poll of Democrats, Republicans, Whigs, Independents, and everybody else who has ever been in this body—it is less than 2,500, although I don't know the exact number—and see what they would say about how the Senate operates today and how it is not doing its job and what is not happening at a time when our country's economic growth is anemic at best, when job creation doesn't come anywhere close to what we need, where deficit spending is kind of a yawn, and the moral fact that every day we have mortgaged the future of the next two generations. I would love to hear what the other Senators who stood in this building would say about what we are doing today. I think there would be a rousing round of condemnation.

So I think it is important for the American people right now to look at the Senate and say: What are we doing? I mean, it is true that Social Security disability will go bankrupt next year. It is true that in less than 15 years Medicare will be bankrupt. It is true that in less than 18 years Social Security will be gone. Those are all true things. It is true that we are going to have a $500 billion deficit—at least $500 billion—which is about $1,400 a person. We are spending more than we are taking in this year, and we are charging it to the 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6-year-olds in this country today. Those are true statements.

Is that anywhere close to integrity? Is there any moral value in mortgaging the future of the next generation? Probably not.

I have listened to a lot of speeches on the floor this week. I hardly ever come down and talk except for maybe once every 2 weeks now since we have no opportunity to offer or debate our amendments.

I wonder what the American people must be thinking about what we are not doing, what we are not addressing, the problems that are unfixed that need a fix, that need a bipartisan solution, that need compromise, that need the power of the original Senate, with the rights of the minority and the majority running toward a compromise that gives us the best we can get based on where we are as a country. There is no opportunity for that anymore in this body. We don't pass muster, and we don't pass muster not because there are a lot of those on both sides of the aisle who don't want to pass muster but because the leadership isn't there.

The Senate has been run into the ground as far as its intended function and its intended working. I think that is highly unfortunate for our country. I think it is highly unfortunate for our children. In this time of world morass and trouble all around the world—conflict, complications, difficulty—and in this time when we are having trouble ourselves staying above water, in almost every aspect of what we are doing, we need a vigorous, alive, functioning Senate that is full of riveting debate about the issues of today that are presented to our country. Instead, we have political games, and we are going to have political games the rest of the week.

I wonder what our future holds when we have this kind of leadership. What does it portend for the country when the U.S. Senate no longer debates the current topics and issues before the country and spends all its times trying to get its Members reelected. That is a sad commentary, and it is a Senate that is very far away from the Senate I joined 10 years ago.

I yield the floor. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I first wanted to acknowledge the severity of the challenges we face as a country right now, whether it is military action to stop the threat of ISIS or the crisis in Ukraine. Colorado is waiting to hear from the President tonight. We are all concerned with that, as we should be.

Today on the floor of the Senate is a proposed constitutional amendment. While it is on the floor I wanted to take a minute to talk about it.

Tonight in Colorado, a swing State, families will endure an avalanche of political ads. Many of them will come from obscure interests with deceptive names such as America, Inc., the Government Integrity Fund Action Network, something called Citizens for a Working America, and so on and so forth. There will be no way to tell who these folks are, because under the laws of the United States many of these organizations do not have any obligation to disclose where their money comes from, a privileged status that individual Americans do not have when it comes to funding political campaigns. It is enough to make everyone in our State, in Colorado, hate their TV, much less American politics, and probably not in that order.

In Washington, on the other hand, which—I guess I should say only in Washington, which has become a Disneyland when it comes to any sense of reality, there are people defending the current system—the current campaign finance system—on the grounds that it is a great victory for free speech and a great victory for our democracy. It is the position—it is the position of the defenders of the current system that what we need in our politics is more money, not less, that more money is going to help our politics, not less.

I have never met a Coloradan who thinks what is wrong with our politics is that we do not have enough money. In fact, they believe the reverse. They believe the exact opposite. That is because they know our system of financing campaigns, far from being about elucidating the truth, is a system expressly designed to obscure the truth. From Colorado's perspective, it is a system that is really good for the special interests and the occupiers of the past, and really terrible for the American people and for our future.

Over the last several months, almost every one of us at some point has lamented the Senate's inability to address the big issues facing our Nation, whether it is reforming our broken immigration system, creating a more competitive Tax Code that encourages innovation and helps produce an economy that lifts middle-class family income again in the country. Energy, climate, education, and infrastructure are left unanswered as we barely summon the votes to approve another noncontroversial judge or nominee.

My colleagues, we share the pathetic distinction of being on target to becoming the least productive Congress ever. Ever. Close readers of American history will know this is a particularly ignominious achievement. How will it feel when the next history books are written to know that we managed to do even less than the do-nothing Congress? That is how you acquire a Congress that now has a 14-percent approval rating, below President Nixon even had during the height of Watergate.

This less-than-do-nothing Congress is not just failing the American people on the big issues. We have given up on those for now around here. We are struggling to pass basic appropriations bills, to keep the Highway Trust Fund solvent over the long term. Some of my colleagues in this Chamber, this land of flickering lights, have argued that the

tea party and obstruction are to blame. Others have argued that the majority's limits on debate and floor amendments are at the root of the problem. But I think it all starts with our broken campaign finance system, which has never been perfect but recently has become substantially worse.

First, let me say when I first studied the Court's most significant prior opinion on finance, the case of Buckley against Valeo, decided in the early 1970s, it seemed to me that if the Court had actually understood what had happened as a result of that decision, they might reconsider their holding that money is speech. But by then it was abundantly clear that the wealthier you are the louder your voice, an outcome that seemed to me at odds with a democracy grounded on the notion of one person, one vote. This is not to say we should expect to live in a country where everybody has equal speech. We could never succeed in ensuring that, and we would certainly fail if we tried. But we could address unfair practices and advantages. We could devise commonsense regulations of our campaign finance laws to make sure our government could actually function. We could hope to lift the voices in the town square and on every street corner in the country and reward the effort of each individual American, no matter what they believe, no matter who they were, who became involved in politics to help create the future of this country. We could do that. In fact, we did do that for decades. We could do it until Citizens United was decided, when the Court not only did not wince at its holding in Buckley, but doubled down, holding, among other things, that independent expenditures do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption, an absurd proposition on its face to anyone who serves in the Congress.

Also, in McCutcheon, another opinion, the Supreme Court held that there is ''only one legitimate governmental interest for restricting campaign finances: preventing corruption or the appearance of corruption.''

That is it. It can't be regulated to do anything else.

The Court went on to hold that ''spending large sums of money in connection with elections, but not in connection with an effort to control the exercise of an officeholder's official duties, does not give rise to quid pro quo corruption. Nor does the possibility that an individual who spends large sums may garner 'influence or access to' elected officials or political parties.''

Think about that for a minute. The majority in McCutcheon doesn't believe that an individual who spends large sums of money would garner influence or access to elected officials? The Court doesn't think they are trying to influence our official duties? Could anyone in this Chamber agree with this conclusion with a straight face?

In fact, some do agree, but there isn't a single soul in Colorado who does.

But to me the more significant point is that the Court failed to recognize how unlimited and undisclosed campaign spending corrupts the very act of government. This extends far beyond the traditional notion of quid pro quo corruption.

In search pretty much in vain—not entirely but pretty much in vain—for the pitiful politician hiding cash in his icebox or somewhere beneath the south 40, the Court missed the real corruption. In doing so these decisions and the looming threat of unchecked spending have led to almost complete paralysis—the end of principled compromise on behalf of the public interest.

In his dissent in Citizens United, Justice Stevens warned of this potential problem when he wrote:

> The influx of unlimited corporate money into the electoral realm also creates new opportunities for the mirror image of quid pro quo deals: threats, both explicit and implicit. Starting today, corporations with large war chests to deploy on electioneering may find democratically elected bodies becoming much more attuned to their interests.

That is precisely what we found. Inertia has become the new reality in the Senate and in the House. Congress is now frozen by its own fear of taking on incumbent interests, whether it is our failure to address long-term deficits or to create a coherent energy policy.

We can see this corruption in the difficult decisions we avoid. It is the tough vote that we will not take. It is the bill we can't pass even in the face of urgent need. It is the deal that can't be reached. It is the speech that is never made. It is the story of the do-less than the do-nothing Congress.

This corruption, by its nature, is difficult to prove because it is invisible, but it suits the incumbent interests just fine.

The Court imagined a world where people with bags of money are wandering around Capitol Hill—and only then could you regulate it—trying to get people to do something for them. Ninety percent of what happens around here is people coming and trying to keep you from doing something, trying to keep things the same, trying to keep the incumbent interests embedded in our Tax Code, in our regulatory code, and in our statute book.

The Supreme Court was silent completely on that corruption. I would argue that is at the core of our dysfunction as a Congress.

There is a reason the dysfunction that is so hated by the people I represent coincided with the era of these Supreme Court opinions.

This is why everybody in Colorado continue to scratch their heads and wonder how we can be so disconnected from their set of priorities, so decoupled from their set of priorities—what they care about, for the future of their families, the future of their business—and how we can come here all week and just vote on judges.

To my knowledge, there are no super PACs devoted to votes on judges one way or another, which is maybe why that is what we spend our time doing.

I have a lot of respect for the Supreme Court, as I know the Presiding Officer does, and the separation of powers, and I know how serious it is to consider a constitutional amendment, an amendment to the Constitution, which is why it should be a last, not a first resort.

But the Court got it wrong when it came to the practical day-to-day operations of this Congress and the way its campaigns work, and its decisions have unleashed a new torrent of spending that is corroding the vibrancy of our democracy.

I think it is useful for us to take a moment to think about or to consider the practical effect of these decisions.

During the entire 2010 election cycle—that is the year Citizens United was decided—super PACs spent a total of $63 million in this country.

So far, September 10, in this election cycle, super PACs have spent $116 million. That is almost twice what was spent in 2010, and it is only the beginning of September. There are States where you cannot buy TV time because so much TV time has been bought by these outside groups.

For the three election cycles before Citizens United, outside spending totaled about $113 million. In contrast, in the three election cycles since Citizens United was decided, outside spending has totaled about $530 million. This is almost a fivefold increase in spending.

There probably are people around the country who aren't beneficiaries of this incredible speech. Unfortunately, folks in Colorado are because we are a swing State, as I mentioned at the beginning. You can't actually at this point watch anything else on television.

In 2012 the top 100 individual donors to super PACs—the top 100 people, people along with their spouses—represented 1 percent of all individual donors to super PACs, but their donations totaled 67 percent of the funding and therefore 67 percent of the spending.

But the spending doesn't only affect how this place works, as I mentioned earlier, it affects what we work on in Congress.

That is why Congress has repeatedly enacted reasonable limits on campaign spending, which have largely been upheld until very recently, until 2010.

In fact, as recently as 2003, in FEC v. Beaumont, the Supreme Court found that ''any attack on the federal prohibition of direct corporate political contributions goes against the current of a century of congressional efforts to curb corporations' potentially 'deleterious influences on federal elections.' ''

The Court made the point that our current laws grew out of the late 19th century belief ''that aggregated capital unduly influenced politics, an influence not stopping short of corruption.''

It is an influence that stops the work of the Senate and the House dead in its tracks.

This concern about aggregated capital and its effect on our democracy actually goes back to the earliest days of our country.

In the Federalist Papers James Madison wrote:

> We may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people. . . . It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it.

So there is nothing unprecedented about seeking to regulate campaign spending. What is unprecedented is the ease by which the Supreme Court has undone decades of campaign finance laws, which has led to this dysfunction in Congress and the misery the folks in Colorado are suffering as they watch these ads.

What is unprecedented is the sheer volume of money that is flooding the Senate and congressional races. What is unprecedented is the corrupting influence this money is having on the institution of Congress.

Because of this new world of unlimited spending, Members of Congress are a lot less likely to seek compromise than they once were and work together if they know they may become the target of a super Pac from people who can write checks that are larger than my imagination.

Reasonable limits on campaign spending can help address this problem. We believed for decades and decades and decades that the Constitution allowed us to do that.

The Supreme Court has now decided that we can't, and we are looking at this choice.

I would say also on this point that notwithstanding my observations about the Court, it is also true that eight of nine Supreme Court Justices have said that disclosure requirements are constitutional, that disclosure does not require a change to the Constitution. I, for one, say at least let's pass that, Republicans and Democrats coming together and saying, You know what. We have always had an expectation about the First Amendment that we are going to be willing to stand and say who we are—or maybe we will not require people to say who they are, but we will just say at the end: Paid for people who are so embarrassed about what they are doing that they refuse to put their actual names on this advertisement.

But it seems to me that if we can be required to say: I am Senator so and so and I paid for this message, we ought to be able to say that about everybody who is advertising in political ads.

Changing these rules would bring more compromise and consensus building to this institution but, most important, above all else, it would help give individual families a greater say in the political process. We offer this amendment not as a one-size-fits-all solution but to allow Congress and the States to place reasonable limits on campaign spending to experiment with what works and put away what doesn't work, similar to the rules that had existed for decades, similar to the rules that existed when the Congress actually functioned, similar to the rules that existed when Democrats and Republicans didn't seem to have such difficulty working across the aisle.

I yield the floor and I 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST DEREK A. CALHOUN

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my honor to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SPC Derek A. Calhoun, of Oklahoma City, OK who died on June 23, 2007, of wounds suffered when his vehicle encountered an improvised explosive device while serving his Nation in Taji, Iraq.

Derek was born on September 8, 1983 in Oklahoma City, OK and attended Moore High School. After completing high school, he enrolled at Wright Business School where he received his associate degree. In 2005, he enlisted and was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, TX.

Derek had been in Iraq for 8 months and was on his first tour of duty when he was killed. He was injured several months earlier when a car bomb exploded outside a building he was in. He had shrapnel in his wrist, abdomen and shoulder and spent the several months in the hospital having two surgeries. Because of his injuries, Derek was unable to use his right hand and was going through physical therapy to get his hands back to normal.

A funeral service was held on July 3, 2007 at South Lindsey Baptist Church in Oklahoma City, OK with internment in Moore City Cemetery with full military honors.

Derek is survived by his parents Alan and Lou Calhoun of Oklahoma City; one sister Lanesha Morris of Oklahoma City; grandparents Jean and JoAnn Calhoun of Choctaw, OK; three nieces Sierra, Cheyenne and Autumn Morris; and one nephew Takoda Morris. Derek is preceded in death by his grandparents Brooks and Eula Choate.

Today we remember Army SPC Derek A. Calhoun, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST RYAN S. DALLAM

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army SPC Ryan S. Dallam, of Norman, OK who died with two other servicemembers on April 6, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

Ryan was born September 22, 1982 in Norman and lived in Midwest City, OK for a time after his parents divorced. When his mother Laura went to teach on an American Indian reservation in AZ, he accompanied her and graduated from Show Low High School in 2002. He later attended Oklahoma City Community College.

His father Scott Dallam retired in 2003 after 23 years in the Army. A third generation soldier, Ryan joined the military during the early spring of 2005 and reported to Fort Leonard Wood, MO for basic training. As a member of the Headquarters Company, 1st/18th Infantry, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division Schweinfurt, Germany, Ryan deployed to Iraq in September 2007 and he was scheduled to come home on leave the next week. His family was enjoying making plans to spend time with him when the chaplain arrived at their home with the unwelcome news.

A memorial service was held at First Christian Church in Norman on April 12, 2007 with interment at Fort Sill National Cemetery in Fort Sill, OK.

''He really liked what he was doing,'' Scott Dallam said. ''That makes us feel pretty good. He really enjoyed it and the camaraderie of being in the military and being around other soldiers.''

Ryan is survived by his mother Laura Dallam; father Scott Dallam; stepmother Leslie Dallam; and a younger brother and sister.

Today we remember Army SPC Ryan S. Dallam, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CORPORAL JARON D. HOLLIDAY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army CPL Jaron D. Holliday, of Tulsa, OK who died with two other servicemembers on August 4, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Hawr Rajab, Iraq.

Jaron always wanted to be in the Armed Forces and began researching which branch he wanted to go into when he was 11, his mother, Kelly Holliday, said. ''That was always his desire—to go into the military and serve,'' his mother said. ''When 9/11 happened, he was 15, and he said, 'If I were old enough to serve, I would.' ''

The oldest of eight siblings—seven boys and one girl—Jaron was home-

schooled and graduated through the Christian Home Education Fellowship of Oklahoma in 2004. He joined the Army in 2005 when he was 19 and was assigned to the 1st Squadron, 40th Cavalry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne), 25th Infantry Division, Fort Richardson, AK.

Funeral services were held August 16, 2010 at Tulsa Bible Church with interment at Memorial Park Cemetery, Tulsa, OK.

Jaron is survived by his parents John and Kelley Holliday and seven siblings.

''He was a people-watcher,'' his mother said. ''He loved people. He was the kind of person who, if he saw someone sitting by themselves looking depressed or upset, he made it his mission to make them smile before he left, and usually accomplished that goal.''

''We didn't want to waste time going to an amusement park or sitting in a movie theater because you can't look at each other and talk to each other in those places. We decided to make memories by just being together,'' said his mother.

Today we remember Army CPL Jaron D. Holliday, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST THOMAS R. LEEMHUIS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I also wish to remember Army SPC Thomas R. Leemhuis who died along with four other servicemembers on June 21, 2007 of wounds sustained when their vehicle struck an improvised explosive device in Baghdad, Iraq.

Tom was born in Lawton, OK on August 2, 1983 and attended Binger-Oney High School in Caddo County, OK before moving to nearby Anadarko after he graduated in 2002.

In 2005 he was inspired to join the Army after the death of his uncle Melvin Jody Stevens, a Vietnam veteran. Upon completing basic training he was assigned to 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, Schweinfurt, Germany.

About 500 friends, relatives and fellow soldiers attended a memorial service at Binger-Oney High School Auditorium with internment at Williams Family Cemetery in Binger. At the service, Tom was remembered as a fun-loving young man who enjoyed cracking jokes and playing video games. ''His No. 1 football team was the Nebraska Cornhuskers, and he loved to wear his Nebraska hat around the University of Oklahoma,'' said his mother. ''He loved to push it to the limit.''

Tom had first thought of becoming a teacher and basketball coach when he got out of the military, but then decided to become a police officer because he hated drugs. He had decided to return to Binger after he completed his commitment with the Army because he wanted to make a difference there. He was extremely proud of the military and being a Native American.

Tom is survived by his mother Patty Leemhuis; father Paul Whitehorn of Birmingham, AL; a brother Paul Whitehorn Jr. of Binger, OK; and three sisters, Stephanie Leemhuis of Dublin, CA; Renee Whitehorn of Anadarko, OK; and Dream Cox of Birmingham, AL.

Today we remember Army SPC Thomas R. Leemhuis, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

STAFF SERGEANT WILLIAM D. SCATES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would also like to honor the life and sacrifice of Army SSG William D. Scates, of Oklahoma City, OK who died with three other servicemembers on August 11, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Arab Jabour, Iraq.

Born March 8, 1976 in Oklahoma City, Dan was a graduate of Western Heights High School and had a lifelong passion to join the military. ''When he was a little boy, he was always drawing pictures of soldiers. That's all he ever wanted to be,'' said his mother. He had been in the Oklahoma Army National Guard before joining the Active Duty Army where he was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 30th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, based at Fort Stewart, GA.

A memorial service was held September 1, 2007 in Oklahoma City with interment in Fort Bliss National Cemetery in El Paso, TX. His mother Moreana Whitson said her son wanted to be buried there because it was in El Paso where he met his wife Raquel, while in training.

Dan is survived by his wife Raquel; daughters Jade 9, and 7-month-old Kendra; his mother Moreana Whitson; his stepfather Randy Whitson; and two sisters Courtney Champagne of Idaho and Shannon Scates of Oklahoma City. He was preceded in death by his father William Leon Scates, who died when Dan was a child.

At the memorial service, the Rev. Michael Jackson noted that Dan ''as a child protected kids in the neighborhood from the bullies'' and said he was doing the same thing in Iraq.

The minister read a poem that Dan's mother had written some time ago about her son, who was serving his third tour of duty in Iraq.

''A long time ago, when you were just a little bitty fellar,'' she wrote, ''little did I know the hero in you. We are not here today to mourn,'' Jackson said. ''We are here to celebrate a hero who is going home to receive his greatest award . . . his greatest honor.''

''I believe he was a hero before he was born,'' Jackson said. ''Then he lived up to that calling, not just as an adult, but through his whole life.''

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Dan's family. He lived a life of love for his family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JERIMIAH J. VEITCH

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army PFC Jerimiah J. Veitch, of Dibble, OK who died with four other servicemembers on June 21, 2007, of wounds suffered when his vehicle was struck by a rocket propelled grenade while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO.

Born in Moore, OK, Jerimiah moved to San Jose, CA and then back to Dibble, OK with his mother Valorie Sanchez and stepfather Tony Sanchez before high school. According to his sister Amanda Testerman, he gave his all at Dibble High School where he graduated in 2005 so that he could play football and use the weight room.

A memorial service was held at Union Hill Baptist Church with interment in Dibble Cemetery in Dibble, OK.

At the funeral, LTC Steven Michael said that Jerimiah was only 5 foot 4 inches, but was ''strong as an ox, tenacious.'' One year he took second place in a State weightlifting competition, lifting more than 1,000 pounds in three lifts in the 132-pound weight class. More than 400 pounds of the total he lifted with a single deadlift.

After returning home from the Army he planned to go to Dibble, buy some land and build a house. He wanted to go to work for his stepfather in the roofing business. ''He is more of a son than anyone could ask for,'' his father said. ''He was my partner. He was the heart of our family.''

Jerimiah is survived by his mother Valorie Sanchez; stepfather Tony Sanchez; his sister Amanda Testerman; and two brothers Caleb and Jacob Veitch.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Jerimiah's family. He lived a life of love for his family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

SERGEANT RYAN M. WOOD

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Ryan M. Wood, of Oklahoma City, OK who died with two other servicemembers on June 21, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

Born June 11, 1984 in Oklahoma City, OK, Ryan graduated from Putnam City North High School in 2002 and signed up for the Army after the September 11 terrorist attacks. ''The war gave Ryan a mission,'' said his sister, Candice Bunce. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, Schweinfurt, Germany. ''He accomplished his mission and left this world with dignity and honor.''

Ryan was an accomplished artist who had received an acceptance letter from the University of Central Oklahoma to study art and political science. On his second tour to Iraq, he had the names of two other soldiers who died in combat tattooed on his chest.

His stepfather Scott Vincent said he hoped Wood's death will remind others that American soldiers are dying for their country in Iraq. ''The majority of them are proud to be there,'' he said. ''They don't want to be forgotten. They want to have the tools to do their job.''

Funeral services were held at the Church of the Servant in northwest Oklahoma City, OK.

Speaking at the funeral, Ryan's uncle Army Maj. John Litchfield said his nephew had a noble spirit that his men could sense. He spent 607 days in combat, his uncle said. ''Even as a teenager, that noble spirit would not allow you to sit by and accept the injustices of the world,'' he said.

''Ryan felt Iraq was a job we had to finish. It wasn't something we could walk away from,'' Scott Vincent said. ''He was dedicated to being there, and he was extremely well-loved by all his men.''

Ryan is survived by his mother Renee Wood-Vincent; father Bonner Wood; stepfather Scott Vincent; sister Candice Bunce; and numerous other relatives and friends.

Today we remember Army SGT Ryan M. Wood, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:53 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 669. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 3670. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4067. An act to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014.

H.R. 4290. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

H.R. 4701. An act to provide for research with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5078. An act to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 669. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 3670. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4701. An act to provide for research with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4290. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 5078. An act to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6826. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9913–99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6827. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sweet Orange Peel Tincture; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9909–83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6828. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''C.I. Pigment Red 112; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9914–14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6829. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9914–37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6830. A communication from the Manager of the BioPreferred Program, Office of Procurement and Property Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement'' (RIN0599–AA18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6831. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment'' (AMS–LPS–13–0079) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6832. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0054; FV14–906–3 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6833. A communication from the Director of the Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection'' (RIN0583–AD32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6834. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of

Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cotton Transition Assistance Program and General Provisions for Agriculture Risk Coverage and Price Loss Coverage Programs'' ((RIN0560–AI22) (7 CFR Part 1412)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6835. 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 ''Animal Welfare; Importation of Live Dogs'' ((RIN0579–AD23) (Docket No. APHIS–2009–0053)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6836. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Existing Conservation Program Regulations'' ((RIN0578–AA60) (Docket No. NRCS–2014–0006)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6837. A communication from the Director of Congressional Activities (Intelligence), Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the results of a study of security measures on United States military installations by June 24, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6838. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Burton M. Field, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6839. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of one (1) officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6840. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report on Proposed Obligations for Cooperative Threat Reduction''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6841. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Environmental Compliance Recordkeeping Requirements'' (RIN2506–AC34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6842. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Handling Prepayments: Eliminating Post-Payment Interest Charges'' (RIN2502–AJ17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6843. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Adjustable Rate Mortgage Notification Requirements and Look-Back Period for FHA–Insured Single Family Mortgages'' (RIN2502–AJ20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6844. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Manufactured Housing Program Fee: Final Fee Increase'' (RIN2502–AJ19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6845. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary (Economic Policy), Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6846. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Russian Oil Industry Sanctions and Addition of Person to the Entity List'' (RIN0694–AG25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6847. A communication from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting, pursuant to law, the July 2014 Quarterly Report to Congress of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6848. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was originally declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6849. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6850. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6851. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6852. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of Understandings Reached at the 2005, 2012, and 2013 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) Plenary Meetings and a 2009 NSG Intersessional Decision; Additions to the List of NSG Participating Countries'' (RIN0694–AD58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6853. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6854. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6855. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Ethiopia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6856. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6857. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2014–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6858. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Asset-Backed Securities Disclosure and Registration'' (RIN3235–AK37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6859. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6860. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2014 Smart Grid System Report''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6861. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6862. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''National Air Toxics Program: The Second Integrated Urban Air Toxics Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6863. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Light Load Handling System and Refueling Cavity Design'' (NRC–2013–0148) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6864. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Maintenance Rule'' (NRC–2013–0179) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6865. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses that support the Administration's fiscal year 2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6866. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Sutter Basin Project in Sutter and Butte Counties, California, for the purpose of flood risk management; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6867. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The 2014 Radiation Source Protection and Security Task Force Report''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6868. 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; Revisions to Regulation Number 1; Correction'' (FRL No. 9914–08–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6869. 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; Washington: Kent, Seattle, and Tacoma Second 10-Year PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9915–40–Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6870. 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; State of Missouri; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 9915–28–Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6871. 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 Hampshire; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Nitrogen Oxides and Volatile Organic Compounds'' (FRL No. 9913–00–Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6872. 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; State of Missouri, Certain Coals to Be Washed'' (FRL No. 9915–30–Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6873. 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, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Negative Declarations'' (FRL No. 9914–75–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6874. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES): Use of Sufficiently Sensitive Test Methods for Permit Applications and Reporting'' ((RIN2040–AC84) (FRL No. 9915–18–OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6875. 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 State Implementation Plans; Hawaii; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone and the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9914–62–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6876. 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; Florida; Infrastructure Requirement (Visibility) for the 1997 and 2006 PM, and 2008 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9915–65–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6877. 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, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District And Shasta County Air Quality Management District'' (FRL No. 9913–13–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6878. 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; Wyoming; Revisions to the Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations; Ambient standards for Particulate Matter and for Lead.'' (FRL No. 9915–75–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6879. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Residual Risk and Technology Review for Flexible Polyurethane Foam Production'' (FRL No. 9914–30–OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6880. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of Compliance and Attest Engagement Reporting Deadlines for 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards'' ((RIN2060–AS29) (FRL No. 9914–88–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6881. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emergency Vehicle Rule—SCR Maintenance and Regulatory Flexibility for Nonroad Equipment'' ((RIN2060–AR46) (FRL No. 9914–63–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6882. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Commonwealth of Virginia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9914–70–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6883. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ocean Dumping: Cancellation and Modification of Final Site Designations'' (FRL No. 9914–59–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6884. 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; Indiana; Indiana PSD Increments'' (FRL No. 9914–94–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6885. 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; Idaho: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9914–90–Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6886. 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 to the Maintenance Plans for the Richmond 1990 1-Hour and Richmond-Petersburg 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Areas to Remove the State II Vapor Recovery Program'' (FRL No. 9914–49–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6887. 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; Revisions to the Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds'' (FRL No. 9914–54–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6888. 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; Finding of Failure to Submit a PSD State Implementation Plan Revision for PM2.5'' (FRL No. 9914–95–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6889. 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; Removal of Two Operating Permits and a Consent Agreement for the Potomac River Generating Station from the State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9915–06–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–320. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would limit corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas, Corporations are legal entities that governments create and the rights that they enjoy under the United States Constitution should be more narrowly defined than the rights afforded to natural persons; and

Whereas, Corporations do not vote in elections and should not be categorized as persons for purposes related to elections for public office and ballot measures; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court, in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010) 130 S.Ct. 876, held that the government may not, under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, suppress political speech on the basis of the speaker's corporate identity; and

Whereas, Article V of the United States Constitution requires the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention upon application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states for the purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California, speaking on behalf of the people of the State of California, hereby applies to the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would limit corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech and would further declare that money does not constitute speech and may be legislatively limited; and be it further

Resolved, That this constitutes a continuing application to call a constitutional convention pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states apply to the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would limit corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech and would further declare that money does not constitute speech and may be legislatively limited; and be it further

Resolved, That this application is for a limited constitutional convention and does not grant Congress the authority to call a constitutional convention for any purpose other than for the sole purpose set forth in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1275. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue a fishing capacity reduction loan to refinance the existing loan funding the Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction program (Rept. No. 113–251).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

H.R. 2052. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment (Rept. No. 113–252).

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. THUNE (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2783. A bill to establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2784. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out activities to improve rail safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2785. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent earnings stripping of domestic corporations which are members of a worldwide group of corporations which includes an inverted corporation and to require agreements with respect to certain related party transactions with those members; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2787. A bill to expand and clarify the prohibition on inaccurate caller ID information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2788. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2789. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to permit a prevailing party in an action or proceeding brought to enforce the Act to be awarded expert witness fees and certain other expenses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2791. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 540. A resolution recognizing September 15, 2014, as the International Day of Democracy, affirming the role of civil society as a cornerstone of democracy, and encouraging all governments to stand with civil society in the face of mounting restrictions on civil society organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 541. A resolution recognizing the severe threat that the Ebola outbreak in West Africa poses to populations, governments, and economies across Africa and, if not properly contained, to regions across the globe, and expressing support for those affected by this epidemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 132

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1535, a bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1690, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1955

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1955, a bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

S. 2199

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 2258

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2258, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2014, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support after-school and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2546

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2546, a bill to repeal a requirement that new employees of certain employers be automatically enrolled in the employer's health benefits.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2687

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2687, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2689

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2689, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 2707

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2707, a bill to provide for coordination between the TRICARE program and eligibility for making contributions to a health savings account.

S. 2758

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 2758, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to modernize C–130 aircraft using alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program kits and to ensure that such aircraft meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration.

S.J. RES. 41

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 41, a joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

S. RES. 466

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 466, a resolution designating the week of October 27 through November 2, 2014, as ''National Drug Take-Back Week'', and designating October 2014 as ''National Prescription Opioid and Heroin Abuse Awareness Month''.

S. RES. 538

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 538, a resolution expressing the condolences of the Senate to the families of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2788. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, the key to America's continued success lies in improving our Nation's educational system to meet the demands of the 21st century job market. Today, many students enter high school and college with little knowledge of the careers available to them outside of traditional pathways. With college costs continuing to rise, it is critical that students have exposure to the wide range of available work and career choices early in their academic careers so that, by the time they enter high school, they are more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them.

Career and technical education, CTE, are a proven way to help students explore their own strengths and preferences, as well as how they match up with potential future careers. However, limited funding for middle school CTE programming often means students have to wait until high school for this exposure.

Studies have found that middle school students greatly benefit from career and technical education development programs that promote career exploration skills, as well as increase knowledge of career options and career pathways. Middle school is an important time for students to explore their own strengths, likes, and dislikes, and career and technical education exploration programs are great tools to educate them about the type of course or training that goes into a career field that matches their interests.

This is why I am pleased to introduce the Middle School Technical Education Program Act, which establishes a pilot program for middle schools to partner with postsecondary institutions and local businesses to develop and implement career and technical exploration programs. This legislation will provide support for middle schools to create career and technical education programs that will provide students with introductory courses, hands-on learning, or afterschool programs. Career guidance and academic counseling is vital to ensuring that our students understand the educational requirements for high-growth, in-demand career fields. Many times students receive this information too late in their academic careers.

We need to make middle school more career-relevant and expose students to the career pathways they may choose. This legislation also requires that programs helps students draft a high school graduation plan that demonstrates what courses would prepare them for a given career field. If we give students at a younger age applied career and technical opportunities, they will be more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them. I hope this bill spurs discussion on how vital middle school is for exposing students to career choices.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2789. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, throughout my career in public service I have focused on ensuring that each and every child with a disability is ensured the right to a good education. To this end, I have fought tirelessly to safeguard the rights of children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, landmark legislation that has been improving the educational outcomes of millions of students across the nation since 1975 on the bedrock principles of inclusion and equality.

When Congress passed IDEA, we understood that our commitment to provide high-quality educational opportunities and serve the needs of students with disabilities in our classrooms entailed excess costs compared to others students, which would have a significant financial impact on States and school districts. That is why Congress committed to covering up to 40 percent of the excess cost of educating students with disabilities. However, we have failed to deliver on that promise, and the law has been consistently and grossly underfunded.

This is why I am pleased to introduce the IDEA Full Funding Act, which will allow us to make good on the full federal commitment. Given the current financial difficulties that many state and local governments are facing, this legislation is more essential than ever for ensuring that students with disabilities get the high-quality education and services they need in order to fulfill their potential.

Since enactment of IDEA, students with disabilities across the United States have made tremendous progress. Today, nearly 6.6 million students receive special education services designed to meet their individual needs. Ninety-five percent of students with disabilities attend a neighborhood school, and almost two-thirds of those students spend at least 80 percent of their day in the regular school environment. Nearly 350,000 infants and toddlers receive early intervention services. More than 6 out of 10 students with disabilities graduate high school with a regular diploma—twice the percentage of 25 years ago. Moreover, approximately half of students with disabilities enroll in postsecondary education. We must do our best to continue this progress and make good on our 39-year-old promise because there is still a long way to go. For instance, students with disabilities who graduate from high school have an employment rate that is less than half the employment rate of the general population.

Today, the Federal Government provides about 16 percent of the additional cost of educating a student with a disability, less than half the 40 percent that Congress committed to when we passed IDEA. In the current fiscal year, this means Federal funding for IDEA is almost $24 billion short, which forces states and school districts to make up the federal shortfall at a time when they are cash strapped.

The IDEA Full Funding Act will fully fund the federal commitment to IDEA by gradually increasing the federal government's share of the excess costs of educating students with disabilities to its committed level over 10 years. Specifically, this legislation will increase the Federal dollars appropriated from $11.5 billion in fiscal year 2014 to $35.6 billion in fiscal year 2023.

This bill is supported by 34 organizations including: ACCSES, the Association of Assistive Technology Act Programs, the Autism National Committee, the Autism Society of America, the Council of Parent Attorneys

and Advocates, the Collaboration to Promote Self-Determination, the Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf, the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, the Epilepsy Foundation, Easter Seals, the Kentucky Protection and Advocacy Division, the Jonathan Foundation for Children with Learning Disabilities, the National Association of School Psychologists, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, the National Center for Learning Disabilities, the National Center for Special Education in Charter Schools, the National Down Syndrome Congress, the National Down Syndrome Society, the National Disability Rights Network, Perkins School for the Blind, TASH, the School Superintendents Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Speech Language Hearing Association, the Association of Educational Service Agencies, the Council of Great City Schools, the Council for Exceptional Children, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, the National Education Association, the National School Boards Association, the National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, and the National Rural Education Association.

By making good on our 39-year-old promise, we will supply schools with the necessary funding to enhance the quality and range of services available to students with disabilities. The funding increase will help to raise salaries for teachers and related services personnel, thereby allowing districts to enhance recruitment and retention high-quality staff. It will support school districts in increasing graduation rates and postsecondary enrollment rates of students with disabilities.

In these difficult times, it is essential for Congress to provide these revenues without increasing the deficit. The IDEA Full Funding Act is fully paid for by increasing income taxes for those with an adjusted gross income greater than $1,000,000 per year. This increase in funding for schools will have a powerful impact on the lives of children with disabilities by improving their educational and future employment outcomes.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this long-overdue legislation.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to permit a prevailing party in an action or proceeding brought to enforce the Act to be awarded expert witness fees and certain other expenses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President: Ensuring that all students, regardless of background or ability, have access to an education that gives them the opportunity to live a successful and fulfilling life has always been a major focus of my career in public service. To achieve this goal, I have fought hard for students with disabilities to have access to the general education curriculum and the services and supports they need to succeed, and to safeguard their rights under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. That is why I am pleased to reintroduce the IDEA Fairness Restoration Act. This critical legislation will remove the financial barrier that families, especially low- and middle-income families, face when they pursue their children's rights to the free, appropriate public education they deserve and are entitled to under the Fourteenth Amendment.

When Congress originally passed IDEA, we recognized the vital importance of parent and school collaboration in special education and required they jointly develop an Individualized Education Plan, IEP, to identify goals to promote the academic achievement of students with disabilities. Usually, this partnership serves students well. There are, however, times when parents believe schools have not fulfilled their responsibilities to provide an appropriate education to their children. In these cases, IDEA provides parents the right to challenge the schools through mediation and due process. The educational needs of children with disabilities can be quite complex and when there is a disagreement between the family and the school it may be necessary for experts to lend their help in determining what interventions and supports are best for the child. For families asking for mediation or a due process hearing, the use of expert services can be costly, ranging on average from $100 to $300 per hour. In one case, a single mother whose son struggled with dyslexia and written expression disorders had to borrow $1,400 to pay an independent evaluator to testify at a hearing. She also had to pay for the expert's time spent being cross-examined by the school district for two days. Without access to expert witnesses, families may be unable to make an argument for the educational needs of their children.

When Congress amended IDEA in 1986, it recognized the financial barriers that parents face in pursuing due process to resolve disagreements with their school and specified in the Conference Committee Report that when the court finds in favor of the parents a judge could award attorney's fees, including ''reasonable expenses and fees of expert witnesses and the reasonable costs of any test or evaluation which is found to be necessary for the preparation of the parent or guardian's case.'' For years, parents who prevailed in judicial proceedings were awarded these fees, as Congress intended. But in 2006, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Arlington Central School District v. Murphy that courts could no longer award these fees because Congress made its intention explicit in the Conference Report rather than in statute. As a result, many parents are discouraged and even prevented from pursuing meritorious cases to secure the rights of their children. Low- and middle-income families are particularly put at a disadvantage by this ruling.

The IDEA Fairness Restoration Act clarifies Congress' express intent that parents should recover expert witness fees, as they currently can do with attorneys' fees, if they prove that the school system has wrongfully denied their child an appropriate education as defined by IDEA. By including ''reasonable expenses and fees of expert witnesses and the reasonable costs of any test or evaluation which is found to be necessary for the preparation of the parent or guardian's case'' and reestablishing the right of judges to award such fees to parents who prevail in IDEA cases, as Congress intended, this legislation will level the playing field and restore the ability of low- and middle-income parents to be effective advocates for their children's educational needs.

This bill is supported by 18 advocacy organizations including: ACCSES, the Autism National Committee, the Autism Society of America, the Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, the Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf, Collaboration to Promote Self-Determination, the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, the Epilepsy Foundation, Easter Seals, the Kentucky Protection and Advocacy Division, the Jonathan Foundation for Children with Learning Disabilities, Our Children Left Behind, the National Center for Learning Disabilities, the National Center for Special Education in Charter Schools, the National Down Syndrome Congress, the National Down Syndrome Society, the National Disability Rights Network, and TASH.

This legislation is an essential step for protecting the rights of students with disabilities and ensuring that all families, regardless of their financial resources, can advocate for and protect their children's rights through due process, consistent with Congressional intent and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 540—RECOGNIZING SEPTEMBER 15, 2014, AS THE INTERNATIONAL DAY OF DEMOCRACY, AFFIRMING THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY AS A CORNERSTONE OF DEMOCRACY, AND ENCOURAGING ALL GOVERNMENTS TO STAND WITH CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE FACE OF MOUNTING RESTRICTIONS ON CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 540

Whereas in 2007, September 15 of each year was established by the United Nations as the International Day of Democracy, a day set aside to review the state of democracy in the world;

Whereas democracy is a means of government that makes manifest the free exercise of certain inalienable rights, among them being the freedom of assembly, the freedom of association, the freedom of the press, and the freedom of speech;

Whereas democracy allows for participatory governance, mobilizing citizens to strive for their version of the good and instilling hope that the aspirations of the people may one day be realized;

Whereas an analysis of 84 independent studies shows that democracy has a favorable impact on the formation of human capital, the rate of inflation, the level of economic freedom, and the stability of political institutions;

Whereas democracy promotes tolerance and respect by recognizing the human dignity of all people and is necessary to the full realization of the values enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) defines ''civil society'' as associations around which society voluntarily organizes itself and which represent a wide range of interests and ties, including community-based organizations, indigenous peoples' organizations, and non-government organizations (NGOs);

Whereas a vibrant civil society is an essential element of democratic societies and plays a key role in providing transparency, ensuring the legitimacy of elections, advocating for marginalized groups, and making clear the will of the people;

Whereas, since 2012, the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law has identified 69 new restrictive measures in over 50 countries hindering the ability of civil society organizations (CSOs) to freely operate;

Whereas of the 98 countries for which data is available, research presented in a 2013 article for the Journal of Democracy explains that 12 prohibit and 39 restrict foreign funding of domestic NGOs;

Whereas in 2000, the Community of Democracies was founded ''to bring together governments, civil society, and the private sector in the pursuit of a common goal: supporting democratic rules and strengthening democratic norms and institutions around the world'';

Whereas in 2011, the United States joined other like-minded governments to establish the ''Lifeline: Embattled Civil Society Organizations Fund'' to provide small grants to CSOs for immediate needs and to support short-term advocacy projects;

Whereas, through the Open Government Partnership, 63 countries have committed to protecting the ability of CSOs to operate in a manner that is consistent with the rights to freedom of expression, association, and opinion;

Whereas in September 2013, on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States launched a coordinated multilateral effort encouraging countries to stand with civil society and push back against growing restrictions on CSOs;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association stands on the front lines of civil society protection, documenting extensive global threats to civil society and strengthening international norms; and

Whereas the United States remains committed to its stand with civil society by developing new mechanisms to combat restrictions on civil society and bolster civil society's efforts to support democracy around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the International Day of Democracy;

(2) recognizes the importance of civil society to the healthy development of nations;

(3) celebrates the invaluable contributions civil society has made to the creation, strength, and preservation of vibrant democracies and democratic institutions;

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the protection, advancement, health, and sustainability of democracy throughout the world;

(5) condemns the use of restrictions, coercion, threats, or force to impede the activities of civil society organizations;

(6) recognizes the important multilateral work of the Community of Democracies, the ''Lifeline: Embattled Civil Society Organizations Fund'', the Open Government Partnership, and the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association to protect global civil society;

(7) recognizes the important role diplomacy plays in defending global civil society and creating new openings for civic space;

(8) emphasizes the value of programs of the United States Government in protecting civil society and defending civic space, including the work by the Senior Advisor for Civil Society and Emerging Democracies and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the United States Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID);

(9) calls on private sector partners and other governments to develop new tools and leverage existing technologies to support the efforts of civil society; and

(10) encourages the people of the United States and the world to observe the International Day of Democracy, September 15, 2014, with appropriate programs and activities.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the important role civil society plays in the promotion of democracy as we observe International Day of Democracy this September 15.

Twenty-five years ago, I stood in Berlin as the wall was coming down. I will never forget that moment when the will of the people was finally recognized. It's true that we have seen extraordinary progress over the years. But in too many parts of the globe, basic rights continued to be denied to those fighting for democratic ideals.

Today, there is an unprecedented global crackdown on civil society organizations seeking to express their voice and exercise their rights. We've seen pervasive restrictions on civil society organizations enforced around the globe. Russia, in its worst political crackdown in post-Soviet history, has stamped the label of ''foreign agent'' on any civil society organization that receives support from other countries. Ethiopia's 2009 Charities and Societies Proclamation continues to hinder the work of human rights organizations and other civil society groups that receive more than 10 percent of their funding from foreign organizations. In 2012, Sudanese security forces violently attacked civil society representatives who were protesting against government restrictions. Egypt has prosecuted over 40 international aid implementers, sentencing them to prison for up to five years. In Laos, activist Sombath Somphone—a leader who dedicated his career to expanding civic space in Laos—has been missing for nearly two years after video footage documented his abduction at a police checkpoint. In 2013, government harassment in Sri Lanka forced the German Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Foundation to close its office.

The developments that we see today have several notable features. First, the pushback against democracy is a global phenomenon and countries like Russia have established antidemocratic practices that are being emulated elsewhere. Second, global democratic reversals are not merely temporary aberrations but are likely to pose challenges for years to come. Finally, the global response has thus far been inadequate to meet these threats.

Moreover, democratic achievements cannot be taken for granted. A few days ago, Hungary's National Investigative Office raided the offices of two organizations which help distribute civil society funds from the government of Norway. Thirteen NGOs are currently under investigation in Budapest, including the Hungarian Civil Liberties Union, HCLU, the local office of Transparency International, and the Roma Media Centre. These raids signal further deterioration of good governance, the rule of law, and human rights in Hungary.

I regret that the Hungarian government is pursuing practices at odds with the historic path to freedom Hungary pursued 25 years ago when that country opened the door for East German refugees and courageously helped pave the way for the end of communism. At a time when we need more democracy in Europe, not less, Hungary's actions are not only harmful for democracy in Hungary, they undermine efforts to build democratic institutions throughout the region.

To call attention to widespread infringements upon civil society, I, as Chair of the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, introduced the International Day of Democracy resolution. This resolution urges the recognition of the International Day of Democracy,

affirms the role of civil society as a cornerstone of democracy, and encourages all governments to stand with civil society in the face of mounting restrictions on civil society organizations.

We cannot take success for granted; every day we must work to protect democratic progress. As we observe the International Day of Democracy this September 15, the international community must push back on these grave threats to civil society as well as protect the efforts by these organizations to build strong democratic institutions.

I would like to thank my colleagues for joining me in support of the International Day of Democracy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 541—RECOGNIZING THE SEVERE THREAT THAT THE EBOLA OUTBREAK IN WEST AFRICA POSES TO POPULATIONS, GOVERNMENTS, AND ECONOMIES ACROSS AFRICA AND, IF NOT PROPERLY CONTAINED, TO REGIONS ACROSS THE GLOBE, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY THIS EPIDEMIC

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 541

Whereas Ebola hemorrhagic fever is an extremely infectious virus that causes severe illness with a fatality rate that can well exceed 50 percent;

Whereas Ebola is spread through contact with blood, secretions, or other bodily fluids of infected humans and animals and can have an incubation period of up to 21 days;

Whereas the Ebola virus first appeared in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 1976 and has afflicted communities in Africa at least 20 times since then;

Whereas the current Ebola outbreak first occurred in February 2014 in forested areas of southeastern Guinea and subsequently spread to Liberia, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, and Senegal, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo recently discovered the outbreak of a separate strain of the virus;

Whereas this is the first outbreak of Ebola in West Africa and the biggest and most complex to date, due to its emergence in populated, transient border areas, making containment a significant challenge;

Whereas, to date, Ebola had infected more than 3,600 people in West Africa and caused almost 2,000 deaths;

Whereas the current Ebola outbreak has occurred in countries with some of the weakest health systems in the world facing severe shortages of healthcare workers, laboratories essential for testing and diagnosis, clinics and hospitals required for treatment, and medical supplies and protective gear, such as latex gloves and face masks required to prevent contamination of health facilities;

Whereas these weak and inadequate healthcare facilities, a lack of health staff trained in Ebola response, and misconceptions about the virus have resulted in numerous infections of health workers and patients unable to receive appropriate response and care;

Whereas effective countermeasures for stemming the spread of Ebola, such as isolation, meticulous infection control practices, case investigation, and contact tracing require more trained personnel and resources than are currently available in West Africa;

Whereas, although Ebola can be contained with good public health and burial practices, it continues to spread due to a lack of accurate public information, insufficient treatment facilities, limited local language capacities required for health education, and an unwillingness to allow those infected to be isolated from family members;

Whereas governments are collaborating closely with international donors and taking strong measures to contain the virus, including announcing states of emergency and establishing emergency response centers;

Whereas the limitations on transportation and travel and closing of businesses have had a devastating economic impact throughout the region and may cause social instability and exacerbate the humanitarian crisis if not properly managed and offset;

Whereas the international community has committed to support solutions to the current limitations on air traffic and establish a common operational platform to address acute problems associated with food security, protection, water, sanitation and hygiene, primary and secondary health care, and education, as well as the longer-term recovery effort that will be needed in the face of the complex social consequences of this emergency;

Whereas the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda have sent experts familiar with such outbreaks to Liberia to assist with the outbreak response, and the Government of Ghana has agreed to serve as the international community's logistics and coordination center and is providing a vital corridor for supplies and personnel;

Whereas, after visiting affected communities in West Africa, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Director Tom Frieden said on September 2, 2014, ''There is a window of opportunity to tamp this down, but that window is closing . . . we need action now to scale up the response.'';

Whereas the United States Government has provided more than $101,400,000 in support through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the United States Agency for International Development, the World Health Organization, and the United States Armed Forces since February 2014;

Whereas the United States Government helped to fund the development of the Zmapp biopharmaceutical experimental drug that was given to 2 United States health workers afflicted with the virus and was recently donated to 3 Liberian doctors with encouraging effect and has prompted calls for further research and development of such vaccines;

Whereas, on August 5, 2014, the United States Government deployed a multi-agency Disaster Assistance Response Team composed of staff from Federal agencies, including the United States Agency for International Development, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Forest Service to coordinate the United States Government's response efforts;

Whereas the World Health Organization published on August 28, 2014, a roadmap for scaled-up response that aims to stop the virus in 6 to 9 months and calls for 750 international and 12,000 local health workers to contribute to the halt of the Ebola outbreak; and

Whereas, earlier this year, the United States Government joined with partner governments, the World Health Organization, other multilateral organizations, and nongovernmental actors to launch the Global Health Security Agenda, a 5-year commitment to prevent, detect, and effectively respond to infectious disease threats such as Ebola: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the severe immediate threat that Ebola poses to populations, governments, and economies in Africa;

(2) recognizes that the limited capacity of the initial outbreak countries of Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia to combat the epidemic has been exhausted and the potential threat to regions beyond Africa if this, the largest of all Ebola outbreaks, is not contained;

(3) expresses support for those affected by this epidemic and affirms its sympathy for victims of Ebola and their families;

(4) supports the Governments of Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Senegal, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo for their ongoing efforts to combat the Ebola virus in their countries and regionally;

(5) urges citizens of affected countries to respect preventative guidelines provided by their governments and medical professionals from Africa and around the world in order to stem the outbreak;

(6) supports the work of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of State, the Forest Service, and other United States Government agencies providing technical, logistical, and material support to address the Ebola crisis in West Africa;

(7) encourages deepened United States and international commitments to the global Ebola response;

(8) welcomes the delivery of assistance and increased engagement from donors such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union, the World Bank, the European Union, and the Government of Canada;

(9) expresses support for the promotion of investments in global health in order to ensure that governments can better prevent and detect, contain, and eventually eliminate outbreaks of disease while also providing other essential health services;

(10) supports the World Health Organization's Ebola Response Roadmap and a common operational platform in response to the crisis;

(11) encourages the Governments of Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Senegal, and Sierra Leone to work together and with other nations and regional and subregional organizations to establish institutional emergency response systems to more effectively respond to this and future outbreaks of Ebola and other highly infectious diseases;

(12) welcomes proactive measures taken by governments in West Africa to formulate national plans of action in response to the crisis; and

(13) recognizes the work of thousands of African, United States, and international officials and volunteers on the ground in West Africa, particularly healthcare workers, who are working diligently and at great risk to help address this multidimensional crisis, and encourages other healthcare workers and logisticians to volunteer.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3790. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3791. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3792. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3791 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3793. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3794. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3793 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3795. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3796. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3797. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3796 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3798. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3799. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3790. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

''ARTICLE—

''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.''.

SA 3791. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In Section 1, strike ''and the electoral process'' and insert ''the electoral process and to prevent corruption''

SA 3792. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3791 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

'', which shall not be limited to bribery or quid pro quo corruption''

SA 3793. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In Section 1, strike ''electoral processes'' and insert ''the electoral processes and to prevent corruption in government''

SA 3794. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3793 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

'', which shall not be defined solely as bribery or quid pro quo corruption''

SA 3795. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In Section 1, strike ''and electoral processes'' and insert ''process and prevent corruption in the electoral system''

SA 3796. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''system'' and insert ''process''.

SA 3797. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3796 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

'', which shall not be constrained to bribery or quid pro quo corruption''

SA 3798. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVI, add the following:

SEC. 2614. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4436), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2602 of that Act (124 Stat. 4453), and extended by section 2612 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1003), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Extension of 2011 National Guard and Reserve Project Authorization

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Virginia	Fort Story	Army Reserve Center	$11,000,000

SA 3799. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 3, add the following:

SEC. 3A. FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKING PARENTS.

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, an employee and an employer may voluntarily negotiate compensation and benefits to provide flexibility to best meet the needs of such employee and employer, consistent with the other provisions of this Act.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. WARNER. 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 September 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR–328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Freight Rail Service: Improving the Performance of America's Rail System.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorize to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity, Terrorism, and Beyond: Addressing Evolving Threats to the Homeland.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Irrigation Projects in Indian Country.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR–301 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, in room SD–562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Indebted for Life: Older Americans and Student Loan Debt.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Clinton Fuchs, a detailee on the Senate Judiciary Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the 113th Congress. This is a request on behalf of Senator LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 480, S. 2154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2154) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1910(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w–9(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and $30,387,656'' and inserting ''$30,387,656''; and

(2) by inserting before the period '', and $20,213,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2154), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GOLD STAR FATHERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 549, S. 2323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2323) to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2323) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2323

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gold Star Fathers Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE TREATMENT FOR FATHERS OF CERTAIN PERMANENTLY DISABLED OR DECEASED VETERANS.

Section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (F) and (G) and inserting the following:

''(F) the parent of an individual who lost his or her life under honorable conditions while serving in the armed forces during a period named by paragraph (1)(A) of this section, if—

''(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

''(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse;

''(G) the parent of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled veteran, if—

''(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

''(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse; and''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

PRESIDENTIAL AND FEDERAL RECORDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 487, H.R. 1233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1233) to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

H.R. 1233

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

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

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

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

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.

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

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

"§ 2208. Claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure

''(a)(1) When the Archivist determines under this chapter to make available to the public any Presidential record that has not previously been made available to the public, the Archivist shall—

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

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

''(ii) the incumbent President; and

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

''(2) The notice under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be in writing; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) in paragraph (1)—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, the Vice President, or a covered employee may not create

or send a Presidential or Vice Presidential record using a non-official electronic message account unless the President, Vice President, or covered employee—

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

''(2) forwards a complete copy of the Presidential or Vice Presidential record to an official electronic messaging account of the President, Vice President, or covered employee not later than 20 days after the original creation or transmission of the Presidential or Vice Presidential record.

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

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term 'covered employee' means—

''(A) the immediate staff of the President;

''(B) the immediate staff of the Vice President;

''(C) a unit or individual of the Executive Office of the President whose function is to advise and assist the President; and

''(D) a unit or individual of the Office of the Vice President whose function is to advise and assist the Vice President.

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 3. NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION.

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

''§ 2107. Acceptance of records for historical preservation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''§ 2111. Material accepted for deposit

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

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

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

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

(c) PRESERVATION OF AUDIO AND VISUAL RECORDS.—

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

''§ 2114. Preservation of audio and visual records

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

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

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

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

SEC. 4. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

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

''§ 3106. Unlawful removal, destruction of records

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

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

SEC. 5. DISPOSAL OF RECORDS.

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

''§ 3301. Definition of records

''(a) RECORDS DEFINED.—

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

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

''(B) does not include—

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

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

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

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

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

(c) LISTS AND SCHEDULES OF RECORDS TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE ARCHIVIST BY HEAD OF EACH GOVERNMENT AGENCY.—Section 3303(1)

of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''photographed or microphotographed'' and inserting ''photographed, microphotographed, or digitized''.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) An individual seeking access to review classified records, as a precondition to such access, must consent to a search of their belongings upon conclusion of their records review.

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

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

(B) who is either—

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 8. PRONOUN AMENDMENTS.

Title 44, United States Code, is amended—

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

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

(3) in section 2203—

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

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

(C) in subsection (c)—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) in section 2204—

(A) in subsection (a)—

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

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

(B) in subsection (b)—

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

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

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

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

(5) in section 2205—

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

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

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

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

(8) in section 2905(a)—

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

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

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

(10) in section 3104—

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

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

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

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

(13) in section 3303a—

(A) in subsection (a)—

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 9. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.

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

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

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

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

(b) RECORDS CENTERS AND CENTRALIZED MICROFILMING SERVICES.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) in subsection (c)—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

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

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

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

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

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

(B) in paragraph (2)—

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

(ii) by striking the second sentence; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

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

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

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

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

(2) in subsection (b)—

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

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

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

(1) in subsection (a)—

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

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

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

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''either'';

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

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

(f) RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.—.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(2) forwards a complete copy of the record to an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee [within five days] *not later than 20 days* after the original creation or transmission of the record.

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

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1233), as amended, was passed.

NATIONAL DRUG TAKE-BACK WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 466, and the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 466) designating the week of October 27 through November 2, 2014, as ''National Drug Take-Back Week'', and designating October 2014 as ''National Prescription Opioid and Heroin Abuse Awareness Month''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 466) was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 3, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPROVING THE LOCATION OF AN AMERICAN REVOLUTION MEMORIAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 120, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the House joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) was read the third time and passed.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 5078

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading but, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S.J. Res. 19, the Senate proceed to executive session and consider Calendar Nos. 544, 977, 685, 867, 976, 917, 914 and 758; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, without any intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of Senators, we expect the nominations considered in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30

a.m. tomorrow, September, 11, 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 the prayer and pledge, there be a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001; that following any Leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2199 postcloture; that all time during adjournment, recess or morning business count postcloture to the motion to proceed to S. 2199; and finally that the filing deadlines for first-degree amendments to S.J. Res. 19 be 12 noon tomorrow, and second-degree amendments be at 1 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, ultimately we hope to move forward on the paycheck fairness act and vote on cloture on the constitutional amendment early tomorrow afternoon.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of Senator SESSIONS, which will last for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer and appreciate the opportunity to share some thoughts on an important subject tonight.

Earlier this week I spoke about the President's promise that he would issue an Executive amnesty, a grant of amnesty to 5 or 6 million people by some form of Executive order with his own pen. The planned amnesty would include work permits, photo ID's, and Social Security numbers for millions of people who illegally entered the U.S., illegally overstayed their visas, or defrauded U.S. immigration authorities.

The Senate Democratic Conference has supported and enabled the President's actions and blocked—so far—every effort to stop it. Not even one of our Democratic colleagues has backed the House legislation that would stop this Executive amnesty or demanded that Senator REID bring it up for a vote at least. Every Senate Democrat is therefore the President's partner in his planned lawless acts. Plainly the President must execute the law that was passed by Congress, and the law does not allow for unlawful immigrants to work in the U.S. It doesn't allow for many other things they are suggesting the President may plan to do by Executive order.

Tonight I would like to talk about the influence of special interests on our nation's immigration laws and how it is creating unwise and unlawful policies. How did we get to the point where elected officials, activist groups, the ACLU, and global CEOs are openly working to deny American workers the immigration protections to which they are legally entitled?

How did we get to the point where the Democratic Party is prepared to nullify and wipe away the immigration laws of the United States of America? And we are at that point, colleagues.

Just yesterday Majority Leader REID wrote in a tweet something that was shocking. He said:

> Since House Republicans have failed to act on immigration, I know the President will. When he does, I hope he goes real big.

That is the majority leader of the Senate. He intends to do nothing in the Senate to stop the President's actions. But colleagues, we know better. This body is not run by one man. We don't have a dictator in the great Senate. Every Member has a vote. And the only way Senator REID could do such a thing to block this Senate from voting in a way that would stop the President's Executive actions is to not support him in his plan.

Every Senator needs to stand up and represent their constituents, not big business, not the ACLU, not activist groups, not political interests but the American interests, the workers' interests. That is what we need to expect from them, and we don't have but a few weeks, it looks like, to get it done.

Let this sink in for a moment. The majority leader of the Senate is bragging that he knows the President will circumvent Congress to issue Executive amnesty to millions, and he is encouraging the President to ensure this amnesty includes as many people as possible. And the White House has acknowledged that 5 to 6 million is the number they are looking at.

Has one Senate Democrat stepped forward to reject Mr. REID's statement? Has one Senate Democrat stepped forward to say: I support the legislation passed by the House of Representatives that would secure the border and block this Executive amnesty? Have they ever said they support that? Have they ever said: I will do everything in my power to see that the House legislation gets a vote in the Senate so the American people can know what is going on? No. All we hear is silence.

In effect, the entire Senate Democratic Congress has surrendered the jobs, wages, and livelihoods of their constituents to a group of special interests meeting in secret at the White House—what Congress has refused to pass and the American people have rejected. They are plotting at the White House—maybe even more so today—to move forward with Executive action anyway, no matter what the people think, no matter what Congress, the people's House, votes on.

Politico reports that ''White House officials conducted more than 20 meetings in July and August with legal experts, immigration advocates and business leaders to gather ideas on what should be included in the order.'' Now that is a quote from Politico. Twenty meetings with legal experts, immigration advocates, and business leaders to gather ideas on what should be included in the President's order. So who are these so-called expert advocates and business leaders? They are not the law enforcement officers; they are not our ICE officers; they are not our Border Patrol officers; they are not the American working man and woman; they are not unemployed Americans. They weren't in the room. You can be sure of that. Their opinions weren't sought.

No, White House officials are meeting with the world's most powerful corporate immigration lobbyists and activists who think Border Patrol is for the little people. We know better. The administration is meeting with the elite, the cosmopolitan set who scorn and mock the concerns of everyday Americans who are concerned about their schools, jobs, wages, communities, and hospitals. These great and powerful citizens of the world, we know, don't care much about old fashioned things like national boundaries, national sovereignty, immigration control, let alone the constitutional separation of powers or even the consistent and even-handed enforcement of plain law, passed by the elected representatives of the American people in due fashion.

Well, don't you get it? They believe they are always supposed to get whatever it is they want. They are used to that. They spend hundreds of millions of dollars. In fact, one report says they have spent $1.5 billion since 2007 trying to pass their desired immigration bill—$1.5 billion. They think whatever they want is good for America. They tried and tried and tried to pass the bill through Congress, but the American people said: No, no, no. So they decided to just go to the President. They decide to go to President Obama, and we will insist that he implement these measures through Executive fiat. And Senate Democrats have apparently said: Well, that is just a wonderful idea. We support that. Just do it. Go big. But, Mr. President, wait a little bit. Wait until after the election. We don't want the voters to hold us accountable for what you are doing. We want to pretend we in the Senate have nothing to do with it.

One of the groups that has joined the chorus of special interests demanding Executive action on immigration is FWD.us, run by Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg. He just turned 30, and I understand he is worth about $28 billion.

Mr. Zuckerberg has been very busy recently. One of his fellow billionaires,

Mr. Carlos Slim—maybe the world's richest man—invited Mr. Zuckerberg down to Mexico City to give a speech. What did Mr. Zuckerberg promote in his speech? Well, this is a report of it.

I guess I will first note that young Mr. Zuckerberg maybe doesn't know there is a deep American tradition—a tradition in most developed nations—that you don't go to a foreign capital to criticize your own government. I suppose he doesn't know about that. They probably didn't teach him about that when he was at one of the elite schools he attended.

This is what he said in Mexico City:

> We have a strange immigration policy for a nation of immigrants. And it's a policy unfit for today's world.

Well, the ''masters of the universe'' are very fond of open borders as long as these open borders don't extend to their gated compounds and fenced-off estates.

I have another article from late last fall that was printed in Business Insider about Mr. Zuckerberg's actions. The headline is ''Mark Zuckerberg Just Spent More Than $30 Million Buying 4 Neighboring Houses For Privacy.'' The article says:

> Mark Zuckerberg just made an unusual purchase.
>
> Well, four purchases.
>
> Facebook's billionaire founder bought four homes surrounding his current home near Palo Alto, Mercury News Reports. The houses cost him more than $30 million, including one 2,600 square-foot home that cost $14 million. (His own home is twice as large at 5,000 square-feet and cost half as much.)
>
> Larry Page made a similar move a few years ago so he could build a 6,000-square-foot mansion. But Zuckerberg's reason is different. He doesn't want to live in excess, he just wants a little privacy.

That is a world the average American doesn't live in.

So Mr. Zuckerberg, who has become the top spokesman for expanding the admission of foreign workers, championed the Senate immigration bill for which all of our Democratic colleagues voted. One of the things the bill did was double the supply of low-wage foreign workers brought into the United States for companies such as Facebook.

We have been told for a long time—and most of us have heard this repeatedly—that there is a shortage of STEM and IT workers. STEM stands for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. This has been the central selling point of these massive demands for increases in foreign worker programs across the board—programs that bring in workers for every sector in the U.S. economy. But we know otherwise from the nation's leading academics, people who studied this issue and are professionals in it. I have a recent op-ed here from USA TODAY which reports that there is actually not a shortage but a surplus of Americans who have been trained in the STEM and IT fields and that this is why wages have not increased since 1999.

If you have a shortage of workers in a field such as information technology or science and mathematics, wages go up, do they not? If wages are not up and are basically down since 1999, I think the case for our free-market friends is pretty clear—we don't have a shortage.

So rich high-tech companies are using the H–1B visa program to keep wages down and to hire less expensive workers from abroad. Indeed, the same companies demanding more guest workers are laying off American workers in droves.

I would like to read some excerpts from that op-ed published in USA TODAY. The article was recently co-authored by five of the nation's experts on labor markets and the guest worker program. I think it tells a story that has not been refuted. We have partisans and advocates who have been claiming there is a shortage in these fields, but the experts say no. And since they have been speaking out on this issue, we have seen no real data that would dispute what they say in this article dated July 27, 2014.

Headline: ''Bill Gates' tech worker fantasy.''

Subheadline: ''Silicon Valley has created an imaginary staffing shortage.''

> Business executives and politicians endlessly complain that there is a ''shortage'' of qualified Americans and that the U.S. must admit more high-skilled guest workers to fill jobs in STEM fields: science, technology, engineering and math. This claim is echoed by everyone from President Obama and Rupert Murdoch to Mark Zuckerberg and Bill Gates.
>
> Yet within the past month, two odd things occurred: Census reported that only one in four STEM degree holders is in a STEM job, and Microsoft announced plans to downsize its workforce by 18,000 jobs.

The five writers of this article—referring to themselves—go on to say:

> None of us have been able to find any credible efforts to support the IT industry's assertions of labor shortages.

The article was written by Ron Hira, Paula Stephan, Hal Salzman, Michael Teitelbaum, who has recently written a book on this subject, and Norm Matloff. These are labor economic experts who have studied these issues for years. Many of them have testified before Congress. They say:

> None of us have been able to find any credible evidence to support the IT industry's assertions of labor shortages.

What a statement that is.

They go on to write—they all signed this article together—that:

> If a shortage did exist, wages would be rising as companies try to attract scarce workers. Instead, legislation that expanded visas for IT personnel during the 1990s has kept average wages flat over the past 16 years. Indeed, guest workers have become the predominant source of new hires in these fields.

The 'predominate source of new hires' in information technology fields is coming through guest worker programs from abroad.

They go on to say:

> Those supporting even greater expansion seem to have forgotten about the hundreds and thousands of American high-tech workers who are being shortchanged—by wages stuck at 1998 levels, by diminished career prospects and by repeated rounds of layoffs.

They go on to say:

> There is an ample supply of American workers who are willing and qualified to fill high-skill jobs in this country. The only real disagreement is whether the supply is two or three times larger than the demand.

There is no doubt we have a surplus of IT workers. The question is whether the supply is two or three times as big as the number of job openings.

They go on to say:

> Unfortunately, companies are exploiting the large existing flow of guest workers to deny American workers access to STEM careers and middle-class security that should come with them. Imagine, then, how many more Americans would be frozen out of the middle class if politicians and tech moguls succeeded in doubling or tripling the flow of guest workers into STEM occupations.

That is exactly what the bill before this Senate—the bill the House of Representatives rejected—would have done. It would have doubled the number of guest workers coming into America just to take jobs—coming in for the very purpose of taking a job that we need Americans to be taking.

The article goes on:

> Another major, yet often overlooked, provision in the pending legislation—

That is the bill President Obama is pushing for, the Gang of 8 bill

> would grant automatic green cards to any foreign student who earns a graduate degree in a STEM field, based on assertions that foreign graduates of U.S. universities are routinely being forced to leave. Such claims are incompatible with the evidence that such graduates have many paths to stay and work, and indeed the ''stay rates'' for visiting international students are very high and have shown no sign of decline. The most recent study finds that 92 percent of Chinese Ph.D. students stay in America to work after graduation.

So that just meant we have thousands and thousands of students graduating from schools and being sent home. That is not accurate, according to the experts who study the data.

The article continues:

> The tech industry's promotion of expanded temporary visas (such as the H–1B) and green cards is driven by a desire for cheap, young and immobile labor. It is well documented that loopholes enable firms to legally pay H–1Bs below their market value and to continue the widespread age discrimination acknowledged by many in the tech industry.

I talked to a gentleman whom I knew a little bit who worked at a computer company. He is well into his forties, maybe close to 50. I asked him what kind of security there is. He said, Well, in the tech industry these companies go and fall. I said, What happens if you were to lose your job? He said, At my age, it would be very difficult.

That was a poignant moment for me. This man, with a family, raising children, doing the right thing, is worried at his age whether he can get a job, when the majority of people being hired in these fields are H–1B guest workers.

The USA Today op-ed concludes by saying:

IT industry leaders have spent lavishly on lobbying to promote their STEM shortage claims among legislators. The only problem is that the evidence contradicts their self-interested claims.

I think this is a dramatic article. It is an article by undisputed experts in their field. To my knowledge no one has disputed it. The false, tech world fantasy claims, the USA Today op-ed referred to, is an imaginary shortage, not a real shortage.

So I would pose a question to Mr. Zuckerberg, who is a brilliant man with so many fabulous qualities, and I respect that. But I read in the news that Facebook, his company, is now worth more than $200 billion. Is that not enough money to hire American workers for a change? Your company now employs roughly 7,000 people. Let's say you want to expand your workforce 10 percent or hire another 700 workers. Are you claiming you can't find 700 Americans who would take these jobs if you paid a good wage and decent benefits?

Let me just say one more thing: Facebook has 7,000 workers. Microsoft just laid off 18,000. Why doesn't Mr. Zuckerberg call his friend Mr. Gates and say: Look, I have to hire a few hundred people; do you have any resumes you can send over here? Maybe I will not have to take somebody from a foreign country for a job an unemployed U.S. citizen might take.

It is a serious matter. I want to continue to talk about this. There is this myth that we have surging employment in the high-tech industry. According to a recent Reuters report, U.S. employers announced 50,000 layoffs in August of 2013, up 34 percent from the previous month, then up 57 percent through August 2012.

As Byron York reported, Hewlett-Packard, a high-tech company, laid off 29,000 employees in 2012—29,000. In August of 2013, Cisco announced plans to lay off 4,000 workers in addition to the 8,000 cut in the last 2 years, and Cisco was right in the White House this summer with a group of other companies demanding more workers from abroad. Cisco was signing a letter with a bunch of other companies; United Technologies has announced 3,000 layoffs this year; American Express cut 5,400 jobs; Procter and Gamble announced 5,700 jobs cut in 2012; T-Mobile announced plans to lay off 2,250 employees in 2012.

The shortage is not there. The experts tell us and the plain facts, if we look around, indicate that.

But instead FWD.us and other immigration lobbyists are working with the White House to extract Executive orders from the President that provide them with the same financial benefits that were included in the Senate bill that was rejected by the House of Representatives. One proposal would increase by as much as 800,000 the number of foreign workers admitted for the explicit purpose of taking jobs in the United States.

This is an article that talks about that. It is a matter of importance. The Associated Press article, the title of it: ''Obama Weighs Broader Move on Legal Immigration.''

President Barack Obama is considering key changes in the nation's immigration system requested by tech, industry and powerful interest groups—

Not by the American people was he being requested to do this, not by the national interests but by powerful special interest groups that are referred to here.

It goes on to say:

After recent White House meetings, top officials have compiled specific recommendations from business groups and other advocates.

''Other advocates.'' Who are they? We know the ACLU has been there. We know La Raza has been meeting there on a regular basis. It goes on. The article says:

One of the more popular requests is a change in the way green cards are counted that would essentially free up some 800,000 additional visas the first year, advocates say.

Other requests would extend work permits to the spouses of all temporary H–1B skilled workers who have not been able to work. But how about the fact that a single mom might like that job? An unemployed single mom or a single mom who has a job prospect that would pay $3 more than the job she is now working while trying to raise a family? Or an unemployed father? Maybe they would like those jobs first.

So these actions fall on the heels of previous Executive action in which the President already acted unilaterally earlier this year to grant companies an additional 100,000 guest workers. He has already done that. In just the first year of this order, we added 100,000 guest workers by providing work authorizations to the foreign spouses of temporary guest workers. So he would increase the supply of guest workers by approximately 30,000 each year thereafter—this at a time when we have 58 million working-age Americans who are not working. Since 2009 the number of adults has increased by 13 million, while the number of people actually working has decreased by 7 million.

Median household income has dropped $2,300 since 2009. According to the National Employment Law Project, wages are down across all occupations. According to a CBS report titled ''Why American workers feel increasingly poor'':

Real median hourly wages have declined across low, middle and high income levels from 2009 to 2013, the study found. No matter if workers were in the lowest bracket ($8.84 to $10.85 an hour) or the highest ($31.40 to $86.34) median hourly wages declined when you take into account the impact of inflation.

It goes on:

Across all occupations, real median hourly wages slipped 3.4 percent since 2009. While even better-paid workers saw median hourly earnings erode, the worst hit segments were at the bottom—

The people who got hurt the most were at the bottom—

with declines in their wages of more than 4 percent.

We have business CEOs, lobbyists, activists, immigration groups, and clever politicians who are able to demand that we have to have more workers in America even when we have a decline in wages and a decline in jobs. But what does the President do? His administration issues an Executive order to provide foreign spouses—the citizens of other countries, not American citizens—with 100,000 jobs in the United States, precious jobs that many Americans would love to have. How many American spouses struggling to support their families would benefit from one of those jobs? How many single moms would benefit from a chance to earn a better paycheck?

Our Senate Democratic friends talk about paycheck fairness repeatedly. Yet they are supporting policies that take jobs and wages directly from American women by the millions.

Immigration policy is supposed to serve the national interest and the people of the United States, not the interests of a few activist CEOs and the politicians who are catering to them. We have had 40 years of mass immigration combined with falling wages, a shrinking workplace, and exploding welfare rolls. We know that, don't we, friends and colleagues? It is time for a shift in emphasis. It is time to get our own people back to work and our communities out of poverty and our schools back on their feet.

Harvard professor Dr. George Borjas—probably the leading academic in this entire area and has been for many years—estimates that our current immigration rate results in an annual loss of more than $400 billion in wages for Americans competing with immigrant labor. Between 2000 and today the government issued nearly 30 million visas to temporary foreign workers and permanent immigrants, largely lower skilled and lower wage.

A recent Reuters poll showed that Americans wish to see record immigration reduced, not increased, by a huge 3-to-1 margin, as the Gang of 8 bill would have done.

Another poll from pollster Kellyanne Conway recently showed that 80 percent of Americans think companies should hire from among the existing unemployed rather than bringing in new workers from abroad to fill these jobs. Yet Senate Democrats have unanimously supported legislation to double the annual supply of labor brought into the United States.

Some people think this is agricultural work. Not so. The increase in immigration under that bill would be more than 90 percent nonagricultural work. These jobs are going to be taken by anyone. So what about the good, decent and patriotic citizens of our country who fight our wars, who obey our laws, who follow our rules, and want a better future for their children? Should their needs not come first?

As the National Review explained, ''we are a nation with an economy—not an economy with a nation.'' We cannot put the parochial demands of a few powerful CEOs ahead of an entire nation's hopes, dreams, and aspirations.

The basic social contract is that citizens agree to follow the law, pay their taxes, devote their love and loyalty to their country, and in exchange the nation commits to preserve and protect and serve their interests, safeguard their freedom, and return to them in kind their first allegiance of loyalty.

The job of elected officials is to answer to the people who sent them to Washington, not to scorn them, not to demean them, not to mock them, not to sell their jobs and dreams to the highest bidder.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 11, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHELE THOREN BOND, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONSULAR AFFAIRS), VICE JANICE L. JACOBS, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

MICHAEL YOUNG, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE POLISH AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Polish American Chamber of Commerce (PACC) on the occasion of its Annual Golf Outing, hosted in Riverwoods, IL, in my district.

The PACC is a strong and clear voice for the Polish American business community in the Chicagoland area and an important advocate for the interests of its member companies and the working families they employ. The Chicagoland area is proudly home to one of the most prominent Polish American business communities in the country. Through a tightly-knit network of member organizations, the PACC strives to enhance the vitality of this community by facilitating cooperation, building partnerships and promoting mutually beneficial trade relations between Poland and the United States.

Our business community in the Tenth District is strong because it is just that: a community.

Working together and sharing strategies, being inspired by the innovation of fellow small businesses, companies in the Tenth District have fostered a community of mutual success and prosperity. It is this type of activity that the PACC promotes and is so important to our economic success in the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, business associations like PACC are integral to driving the success of small businesses throughout our nation, which in turn will lift the rest of our economy. I thank the PACC for its work, and I wish only great success for this year's golf outing and PACC's future.

CONGRATULATING STEVE PLUNKETT FOR RECEIVING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS' HERO OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Steve Plunkett of North Pekin, Illinois and celebrate his receipt of the National Association of Letter Carriers' Hero of the Year Award.

Mr. Plunkett, a local letter carrier, was finishing his shift as a troubling scene unfolded in the parking lot of the East Peoria Post Office. Employees witnessed a man forcibly lead a tearful young boy towards the back of the post office. Recognizing the child's distress, Plunkett and his colleagues sprang into action and confronted the man; little did the post office employees know that they had intercepted a registered sex offender.

The man fled the scene and Plunkett followed, using his cell phone to capture pictures as well as his license plate number; images which led to his arrest several hours later.

Plunkett's actions thwarted a kidnapping attempt and contributed to the conviction of a dangerous criminal, earning him one of the highest honors a letter carrier may receive. Sexual predators are every parent's nightmare and, as the mother of three sons, I commend Mr. Plunkett for his courage.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Plunkett demonstrated bravery and selflessness, much to the credit of his character, and I can think of no one more deserving of the National Association of Letter Carriers' Hero of the Year Award.

RECOGNIZING THE UMATILLA WOMAN'S CLUB

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Umatilla Woman's Club, a member organization of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The Umatilla Woman's Club was founded in 1920 by a group of civic-minded women who established the first library in Umatilla. The group first organized informally, but recognizing the need for formal organization to better promote civic events, the Umatilla Woman's Club became one of the original twelve Woman's Clubs.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs acts as a unifying force, bringing women together to strengthen their local communities through volunteer service. There are over 100,000 members worldwide who inspire change by supporting the arts, advancing education, encouraging civic involvement and promoting cooperation.

I thank the Umatilla Woman's Club for their ongoing commitment to bettering our Central Florida community. Their philanthropy and spirit of volunteerism is an inspiration to us all.

HONORING PARNICK JENNINGS

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Parnick Jennings and to recognize his steadfast commitment to the Cartersville and greater Bartow County community, and for his exemplary leadership.

Fifteen years ago, on September 11, 2000, Parnick Jennings sought to honor all of the wonderful men and women who serve not only Bartow County, but each of its seven cities. He did this by establishing an annual ''Public Servant's Luncheon'' to honor those that give so much to make Bartow County and each of its cities some of the best communities to live in all of America.

During his time in Bartow County, Parnick was one of the founders, and now chairs the Annual Bartow County ''Can-a-Thon,'' which helped in the creation of the Bartow County College & Career Academy. He served on the committee that helped build the Clarence Brown Conference Center, served as Chairman of the Cartersville-Bartow County Chamber of Commerce, and along with Ms. Jessica Fleetwood, founded the Bartow Business Connection in 2009 as a way to help local businesses network with the goal of making it through the recession together. Parnick and his wife, Tina, organize and host the annual Toyo Tire Community Christmas Luncheon which feeds up to 1500 people annually during the Christmas season. Parnick's public service started thirty seven years ago, when he founded the Parnick Jennings Funeral Home in Cartersville, Georgia. The firm came to be nationally recognized for outstanding customer service, and in 1995 was sold to Service Corporation International. For the next 5 years, under Parnick's leadership, the firm was ranked #1 in Customer Satisfaction among the top 1500 funeral homes in the United States. I have been honored to call Parnick Jennings a friend for well over a decade and his selfless guidance has played a major role in helping me represent the 11th District of Georgia with a servant's heart. Bartow County is blessed to have such a fine shepherd like Parnick Jennings looking out for our community. A native of Rome, Georgia, Parnick attended the University of Georgia and graduated from Gupton-Jones College. Parnick and Tina are active members of Tabernacle Baptist Church in Cartersville, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 11th District of Georgia, I offer my deepest thanks to Mr. Parnick Jennings for his unfailing commitment to the service to others; he is truly one of our country's ''points of light.''

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF FIREBAUGH, CALIFORNIA

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Firebaugh, California as they celebrate their Centennial on Friday, September 12, 2014.

The City of Firebaugh, located in Fresno County, was incorporated on December 17, 1914 and has seen enormous growth in the past 100 years. The city was named after Andrew D. Firebaugh who owned the local ferry that transported locals and visitors across the

San Joaquin River, many of whom were prospectors looking to strike it rich in gold country.

Although small, Firebaugh is home to a thriving community. Known as the ''Jewel of the San Joaquin,'' Firebaugh is home to a rich agricultural industry. The major crops grown in the region include tomato, garlic, cantaloupes, and cotton, as well as various other fruits, vegetables, and nuts. In addition to agriculture, Firebaugh has seen new growth in manufacturing, packing, and processing plants in recent years.

As one of the oldest historical towns on the Central Valley's Westside, Firebaugh has a rich history and certainly has a bright future ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate the City of Firebaugh, California on their centennial celebration.

HONORING MAGENIUM SOLUTIONS, LLC

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Magenium Solutions, LLC, an IT services firm based out of my hometown of Glen Ellyn, which has been recognized as being one of the best places to work in the State of Illinois. Magenium Solutions is a company dedicated to delivering technology based answers to hundreds of businesses nationwide. They are well known for improving the productivity of their clients, helping them to stay competitive and reducing costs through the use of technology.

For the second year in a row, Magenium Solutions has earned the distinction of being one of the ''Best Places to Work in Illinois'' by the Daily Herald Business Ledger, one of only sixty Illinois companies to receive this honor. With more than 60 employees, Magenium Solutions strives to provide a work life balance, career growth, professional development, training, and incentives aimed at helping employees move forward successfully on their career paths. In addition, Inc. Magazine has ranked Magenium Solutions as one of the nation's fastest growing private companies.

Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues in the House, please join me in honoring Magenium Solutions for their legacy of achievement and care not only for their clients, but also for their employees.

HONORING THE NAPA VALLEY VINTNERS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Napa Valley Vintners. In an outstanding display of generosity, Napa Valley Vintners donated $10 million to create a Napa Valley Community Disaster Relief Fund, which will be used to help residents and businesses recover from the recent earthquake in our Napa Valley.

In the aftermath of this devastating earthquake, the Napa Valley Vintners sprung into action. Propelled by a desire to help our community in its time of need, the Napa Valley Vintners devised a plan to help those impacted by the earthquake in a big way. The creation of this fund and the initial pledge of $10 million will provide immediate financial assistance for individuals and businesses as they work to get back on their feet. The Napa Valley Vintners hope that this fund will grow with additional donations and thereby be able to help even more people throughout our community. With the generosity of groups like the Napa Valley Vintners, our 5th Congressional District will be back up and running in no time.

I am proud to represent a district with kind-hearted, community-minded and generous people such as those with the Napa Valley Vintners. Mr. Speaker, the Napa Valley Vintners deserve to be recognized and honored here today.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 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 $17,757,884,048,448.05. We've added $7,131,006,999,534.97 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF DELBARTON SCHOOL

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Delbarton School in the Township of Morris, Morris County, as it celebrates its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary.

The Delbarton School is an independent, all male, Roman Catholic school led by the Benedictine Monks of St. Mary's Abbey. Founded in 1939, the school has graduated more than 4,000 students and has a current enrollment of about 540 students. The school's motto ''Succisa Virescit'' conveys the value of perseverance, a principle on which the school was founded. Delbarton's first graduating class consisted of only 8 students from grades sixth, seventh, and eighth. It was not until 1942 that an upper school was added by Headmaster Father Stephan Findlay.

In the late 1800s Luther Kountze, a wealthy stock broker from New York, began to purchase land in rural New Jersey and quickly accumulated over 4,000 acres. In 1883 he built a large mansion and decided to call it Delbarton. The name comes from taking a syllable from each of his first three children's names: Barclay Ward, William Delancey, and Helen Livingston. After Mr. Kountze's death in 1918, the property was put up for sale and in 1927 St. Mary's Abbey bought 400 acres of the property, including the mansion and farm. They planned to use the property as a place to start educating their younger members.

Situated on 200 acres in rural Morris County, Delbarton is home to rolling hills and picturesque landscapes as well as impressive facilities. The school boasts a 24,000 square foot science pavilion, 4 science labs, 6 computer labs, a 36,000 square foot Fine Arts Center, a language lab, and a 25,000 volume library. The Delbarton School offers a traditional liberal arts education serving grades 7–12. The school is founded on the 1,500 year old tradition of Benedictine learning which is based on the Judeo-Christian tradition and pursues development of the whole person, both in spirit and in mind. They believe that there is more to the education of men than just academics and strive to create an environment where both personal and religious confirmation can be acquired.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Delbarton School, its teachers and administration, trustees and many successful alumni and supporters, as it celebrates its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary.

SAFE AND SECURE DRINKING WATER ACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Safe and Secure Drinking Water Act, an important step to sustain America's clean drinking water.

On August 2, Microcystin-laced, toxic algae overtook the drinking water intake process for Toledo, Ohio during an explosion of algae growth in western Lake Erie. For three days, half a million Americans were without safe drinking water.

In Toledo, the taps are back on, but the crisis remains.

The growth of harmful algal blooms in Lake Erie will continue to threaten communities, local economies, and the 11 million people who depend on the lake for fresh water. Until the flow of algae-feeding nutrients into the lake is stopped, the risk of further water emergencies will persist.

This concern is not isolated to Lake Erie. Millions of Americans across the country rely on drinking water from natural sources that are similarly threatened by increasing levels of nutrient runoff, and the resulting toxic algal growth.

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recognizes harmful algal blooms as a major environmental problem in all 50 states, with severe impacts on human health.

Despite this realization, the U.S. EPA fails to take a most basic step to protect public safety—setting federal guidelines or standards for unsafe consumption levels, testing practices to determine the presence of Microcystin in water systems, or feasible treatment techniques. Without these basic protections, millions of Americans' health is at risk.

This necessary legislation will compel the EPA to take these important first steps within 90 days of its passage, and in the absence of regulatory action, to report on additional steps

to promote safer practices in areas affected by harmful algal blooms.

Mr. Speaker, our communities across this great nation need this guidance and cannot continue to wait. The Safe and Secure Drinking Water Act must be passed quickly to provide our communities the guidance and answers they need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 2014, I was off of the House floor for rollcall vote No. 480 on agreeing to the Senate Amendment to H.J. Res. 76—Emergency supplemental funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system. I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I missed one recorded vote on September 8. I would like to indicate at this point how I would have voted had I been present for that vote.

On rollcall No. 482, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the ''Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office,'' I would have voted ''aye.''

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MIYA FAMILY

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Miya Family for being named the 2014 Agriculturalist of the Year by the Kings County Farm Bureau. The Miya Family's history exemplifies the hard work and dedication of California's farmers.

The Miya Family, of Hanford, California, has been farming in Kings County since the early 1900s. The family farm was started by Katsunosuke Miya, a recent immigrant from Japan, who settled in Kings County in 1914 and first started working at Vierra Ranch in Hanford. By 1920, Katsunosuke began farming property for Lacey Milling Company. In 1932, Katsunosuke was ready to purchase his own property and began farming 40 acres independently. This was the first establishment of the Miya's farming operation in Kings County. By the late 1930s, the Miya family had expanded their operation to include over 200 acres of land, growing and drying apricots and peaches, as well as cultivating Muscat grapes and oats for horses on the farm.

Katsunosuke built a great foundation for his eight children, but with the start of World War II, the family, including Katsunosuke's two sons Harry and Kiyoshi, was forced to evacuate to the Fresno Assembly Center and was later moved to Jerome, Arkansas. By 1946, Harry and Kiyoshi had both returned to Hanford to join their parents growing walnuts, grapes, apricots, peaches, and cotton. Harry and Kiyoshi worked side by side with their father and later became partners, taking over the family business that their parents had worked hard to build.

In 1976, Miya Farms, Inc. was established by Harry and Kiyoshi, who worked together on the farm for almost 60 years. Today, Harry's children run the daily operations at Miya farms, growing walnuts and pistachios. The Miya family has persevered and thrived and truly embodies what it means to achieve the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker it is with great pride that I congratulate the Miya Family for being named the Kings County Farm Bureau's 2014 Agriculturalist of the Year.

REMEMBERING S. TRUETT CATHY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of distinguished entrepreneur and philanthropist S. Truett Cathy, who died early this week at the age of 93, and to honor him for the legacy he has left in Georgia and across the country.

A native Georgian from Eatonville, Cathy moved with his family to Atlanta when he was four. There, he attended Boys High, now known as Grady High. In 1946, Cathy built a tiny diner in Hapeville, which would eventually develop into Chick-fil-A—the nation's largest quick-service chicken restaurant chain based on annual system-wide sales and one of the nation's largest family-owned companies. Cathy created the sandwich that became the company's signature item—the original Chick-fil-A Chicken Sandwich.

Currently, Chick-fil-A has more than 1,800 locations operating in 40 states and Washington, D.C., and currently holds an unparalleled record of 47 consecutive years of annual sales increases. But Truett was much more than just a notable businessman: he was a devout Southern Baptist who was active in teaching the word of the Lord to youngsters. His devotion to his religion and ''principles before profits'' attitude showed in his ''closed on Sunday'' policy—giving employees time for family, worship, or rest.

In addition, Cathy took a keen interest in his local community by creating the WinShape Foundation in 1984, an organization aimed at helping young people succeed in life through scholarships and youth support programs. Also, through Cathy's Leadership Scholarship Program, Chick-fil-A has donated more than $32 million in financial assistance to their employees seeking higher education since 1973. Truett Cathy exemplified what it meant to give back to the community. In his own words, ''I'd like to be remembered as one who kept my priorities in the right order. We live in a changing world, but we need to be reminded that the important things have not changed. I have always encouraged my restaurant operators and team members to give back to the local community. We should be about more than just selling chicken; we should be a part of our customers' lives and the communities in which we serve.''

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest condolences to Truett Cathy's family and loved ones during these most difficult of times. It saddens me to know that the world is now missing such an honorable man, but I am humbled to know that he is in a better place—now that he's left our world a better one.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FREDERICK LEO WAHL

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate and celebrate the life and extraordinary contributions of Frederick Leo Wahl, one of the most knowledgeable and insightful government relations professionals many of us had the privilege of knowing.

Fred was a selfless patriot in support of our Great Nation since the late 1960s, beginning with his days as a Naval Intelligence Officer, then as special assistant to the Director of Naval Intelligence, and as staff for Senator Frank Church of Idaho.

Fred continued his service to our country and troops as Manager of Advanced Program Planning at E-Systems, and then Director of Strategic Planning for Raytheon Systems Company. When Raytheon acquired E-Systems, he continued his rise to the top of his field and was an active participant in the subsequent merger and acquisition of Hughes and Texas Instruments. Fred then joined a technology startup company, ComCept, which was acquired by L–3 Communications. For the past 14 years, Fred served as Vice President of Government Relations for L–3, assisting business units with congressional visits, interpreting legislative bills and representing the L–3 brand on Capitol Hill and throughout the Washington, DC, area.

Fred was selected to attend the Harvard JFK School of Government's Executive Course for National/International Security Executives and the Penn State Executive Development Forum. He attended Idaho State University, where he was Class President and Student Body President. Later he attended the University of Oklahoma, the National Law Center at George Washington University, the U.S. Navy Integrated Operational Intelligence Center and the Joint Air Intelligence Training Center.

Fred always made time for his family. His two daughters Camille Wahl and Stephanie Wahl, his grandchildren Fernando Daniel Gonzalez, Holden Khaira, Atticus Khaira, Ethan Taylor, and Sophie Taylor were the center of his personal life. Fred frequently took his grandchildren with him on vacations to exotic locations around the world. Travel and learning were a legacy Fred wanted to pass on to the next generations. He hoped to inspire curiosity and give his family a sense of perspective through their exposure to new places and people.

Fred Wahl was the kind of man who could make even a new acquaintance feel like an old and trusted friend. He always had an anecdote to keep the story interesting and remind us that we can do the crucial work of the

nation while not taking ourselves too seriously. His bright presence will be sorely missed. As we adjourn today, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying our last respects to this great American, Fred Wahl.

THE RETIREMENT OF SPEIGHT JENKINS FROM THE SEATTLE OPERA

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer special recognition to my constituent, the esteemed Speight Jenkins, on the occasion of his retirement from Seattle Opera. Throughout his 31 years as General Director, Mr. Jenkins' passion for the arts and energetic leadership style have been instrumental in the Opera's success. Under his steady guidance, Seattle Opera captured national and international attention and significantly raised the city's profile as an arts destination. Notably, Mr. Jenkins helped to intensify Seattle Opera's focus on Wagner, and presided over many superlative productions of the Wagner operas, which helped draw opera-lovers from all over the world. In fact, his captivating productions drew visitors to Seattle from all 50 states and over 60 countries, generating increased tourism and strengthening the local economy. Over the course of his career with Seattle Opera, Mr. Jenkins produced an incredible 1,227 performances of 92 operas, while missing only 6 performances.

Locally, The Seattle Times named Mr. Jenkins one of the 150 most influential people who have shaped the character of Seattle and King County. Additionally, both the City of Seattle and King County proclaimed August 9, 2014 "Speight Jenkins Day" in recognition of his work. Nationally, the National Endowment for the Arts gave him an Opera Honors Award in 2011, and Opera News has called him one of the 25 "most powerful" names in American opera. His knowledge of opera has tremendous depth, and is reflected in Seattle Opera's many innovative productions, significant publications, and comprehensive educational services.

An ardent lover of the arts, Speight Jenkins proudly served on the National Council on the Arts from 1996–2000 following his nomination by President Clinton, and has been a lifelong advocate for increased arts funding and opportunities on both a national and local level. He also played an important role in the creation of McCaw Hall, one of the nation's most beautiful and acoustically exceptional performance facilities.

Speight Jenkins has been an invaluable asset to the Seattle arts community. His dedication to excellence with Seattle Opera and commitment to making the arts accessible provide a model for us all. The people of Seattle are grateful for the guidance and leadership he has shown and I join them in thanking Mr. Jenkins for his service and in wishing him all the best in his future endeavors.

INTRODUCING THE MEDICARE HOME INFUSION SITE OF CARE ACT

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare fee-for-service program stands virtually alone among health care payers in the United States in not fully recognizing the clinical and cost benefits of providing infusion drug therapy to patients in their homes. Infusion therapy is fully covered by Medicare in hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, hospital outpatient departments, and physician offices, but not in patients' homes. As a result, Medicare beneficiaries in need of infusion therapy often must receive their treatments in health care facilities rather than in their homes, which is the setting that is the most desirable, convenient, and by far the most cost effective.

This is unfortunate and unnecessary. In the private sector, the accepted standard of care and practice for over 30 years is to provide infusion therapy at home where medically indicated and when requested by the attending physician. Ironically, patients who have access to this benefit under their private plans lose this coverage when they enroll in Medicare.

Medicare's lack of coverage of infusion therapy in the home setting can lead to substantial beneficiary lifestyle disruptions and costs. Because Medicare covers infusion services in institutional settings, the beneficiary either has to travel to a health care facility to receive infusion treatments, sometimes multiple times a day, or remain in a facility for the duration of the treatment episode.

Today, Representative ELIOT ENGEL and I are introducing The Medicare Home Infusion Site of Care Act so patients can receive the same infusion treatments in the comfort and convenience of their homes at a lower cost to Medicare. I look forward to working with Representative ENGEL and my other colleagues in Congress to see this commonsense bill move forward, and I urge all of my colleagues to support our bill to give patients better quality and better care at lower costs.

HONORING LAWRENCE BROOKS

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Lawrence Nathaniel Brooks, Sr. Mr. Brooks, a World War II veteran and Louisiana resident, will be celebrating his 105th birthday on September 12, 2014.

Mr. Brooks served his country in World War II with the United States Army's 91st Engineer Battalion. A father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and great-great grandfather to a large family, he is known and loved by even more. But perhaps Mr. Brooks' most enduring legacy is his engagement and involvement with his community in New Orleans, Louisiana. He is widely known as a pillar of his community and regularly volunteers at his church, St. Luke's. His positive attitude and dedication to family and friends are an inspiration to us all.

It is my honor to introduce Mr. Brooks to the country. I invite everyone to join me in congratulating Mr. Lawrence Brooks on a life well-lived, and wishing him the best.

JOHN ARTHUR JONES

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary leader and hero of the Tampa Bay community, Mr. John Arthur Jones. Mr. Jones had a distinguished career and has spent a lifetime serving this country with honor and valor. Today we salute his many contributions to our community.

John Arthur Jones was born in 1921 in San Antonio, Florida. During World War II, he served with distinction in the European Theater under the command of General Patton's 3rd Army and received a Bronze Star for his contributions in the Battle of Metz, France. The men of the 95th Infantry became known as the "Iron Men of Metz" for their capture and defense of the castle and river crossing in the city of Metz against several German SS Armored and Infantry Divisions. Mr. Jones finished his military career through the reserves and attained the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. He married Sally Johnson in 1949 and the couple enjoyed 64 happy years together. They also have four children Matthew, Lisa, Malcolm, and Darby.

After graduating from the University of Florida, College of Law, Mr. Jones began his legal career. In May 1949, Mr. Jones joined the Tampa law firm of Knight, Thompson and Turner which under his guidance resulted in the formation of Holland and Knight. Throughout his long career, Jones earned a national reputation in the field of trusts, estates and fiduciary law. Integrity was certainly one of Mr. Jones' hallmarks throughout his entire life. He frequently said, "You can't afford not to be honest and not do your best." He was one of the first recipients of the firm's highest individual accolade for a partner, the prestigious Chesterfield Smith Award. The Chesterfield Smith Award is given to lawyers who have demonstrated in extraordinary commitment to pro bono service. In 2009, he was honored by the firm for his six decades of contributions to the field of law.

On August 12th, 2014, Mr. Jones passed away at the age of 92. He will be remembered not only as an attorney and an expert in his field, but also as a man who bravely served this country as well as the legal profession with courage and dignity. Mr. Speaker, John Arthur Jones was a great American. I join the Tampa Bay community in recognizing Mr. John Arthur Jones for his lifelong service to the State of Florida, his high ethical standards, and his commitment to good causes.

HONORING LYNNE MOFENSON, M.D.

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lynne Mofenson, M.D., who is retiring after 26 years of service to the federal government, and is currently Chief of the Maternal and Pediatric Infectious Disease Branch at the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), National Institutes of Health.

Dr. Mofenson received the 2012 Federal Employee of the Year Award from the Partnership for Public Service. The award is one of nine Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals bestowed on public servants who make ''high-impact contributions to the health, safety and well-being of Americans.'' She was recognized for playing a pivotal role in preventing the AIDS epidemic among U.S. children through an effective means of preventing pregnant women from passing HIV on to their infants, and for dedicating her career to conducting research on HIV which has influenced and informed national HIV policy.

In 1989, when Dr. Mofenson, a pediatric infectious disease physician, came to the NICHD, 25 to 35 percent of all infants born to mothers with HIV infection were themselves infected with HIV. The landmark research study published by Dr. Mofenson and her colleagues in 1994 showed that use of the anti-HIV drug AZT reduced the rate of mother-to-child HIV transmission rate to 8.3 percent. Dr. Mofenson's further collaborations led to other successful strategies for blocking mother-to-child transmission, and currently, there are fewer than 100 new mother-to-child HIV cases in the U.S. each year—well under 1 percent. This is a true public health success story.

Dr. Mofenson has continued to work with colleagues in this country and around the world to reduce mother-to-child HIV transmission and to improve the treatments for children with HIV infection. She has played a critical role in the development and ongoing updates of evidence-based guidelines for the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), and the World Health Organization that provide blueprints for the timely conversion of research findings into real changes in medical care for women, children, and families affected by HIV worldwide. Please join me in honoring the lifelong work of this extraordinary scientist.

RECOGNIZING TOM HOWELLS OF WISCONSIN

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize the many contributions of Mr. Tom Howells, who retired last month after serving 35 years as the President of the Wisconsin Motor Carriers Association (WMCA).

All of us in the Wisconsin delegation know Tom well from events around our state and here in the nation's capital, including the annual Washington visit of WMCA members. We know Tom to be a man of great integrity and character. He has provided outstanding leadership over these past decades, with dedication, ingenuity and enthusiasm. Above all, Tom is simply a nice guy.

Under Tom's leadership, the WMCA established the first state trucking association ''Road Team'' in order to recognize safe truck drivers and promote highway safety. Similarly, he was involved in the creation of the President's Safe Driver Club in 1996 to recognize professional drivers with exemplary safety records employed by WMCA member companies. Eighteen years later, the club currently has over 1,350 drivers.

In 2004, Tom Howells was presented the Frank W. Babbitt Award for outstanding service to the local trucking industry, the association and the local community. Three years later in 2007, he was recognized by his peers and the American Trucking Associations when he was awarded the prestigious J. J. Keller President's Award. Tom was elected to serve as the National Chairman of the Trucking Association Executives Council from 1992–1993 and as the Chairman of the Wisconsin Highway Users Alliance from 2003–2013.

Tom Howells has been an institution in Madison and in the State of Wisconsin. He has provided stable and steady leadership in so many areas, and particularly in the area of highway safety. I will miss seeing him in his role as President of the WMCA, but I wish Tom and Muriel well in retirement and congratulate him for a job well done.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5078, a bill that would prevent the Army Corps of Engineers and Environmental Protection Agency from clarifying protections for drinking water under the Clean Water Act.

Today's legislation would prohibit the Army Corps and EPA from continuing proposed action to ensure that the streams and wetlands that feed our waterways and provide drinking water for millions of Americans are protected from pollution. In 2001 and 2006, Supreme Court decisions created confusion about precisely which upstream tributaries were covered by the law. Subsequent policy guidance only increased legal uncertainty and undermined efforts to protect drinking water for more than 117 million Americans, including more than 26 million residents in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

In response to this confusion, the Army Corps and EPA have proposed a rule that would clarify which waters must be protected in order to safeguard public health and resources, and are currently seeking comments from stakeholders. Their proposal protects waters that have historically been covered by the Clean Water Act while continuing exemptions for agriculture. The bill on the floor today would not only shortcut the public comment process and withdraw the proposed rule, but would also prohibit the Army Corps and EPA from clarifying the regulation in the future.

For too long, legal uncertainty around the Clean Water Act jurisdiction has jeopardized the health of drinking water and created confusing delays for industry as they struggle to determine their responsibility under the law. Congress should allow this rulemaking to go forward to develop a clear, practical standard that restores protections to our communities. I urge a no vote on the bill.

HONORING THE NAPA COUNTY LIBRARY LITERACY CENTER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Napa County Library Literacy Center as they celebrate their 30th Anniversary of offering literacy services for adults in Napa County.

Thirty years ago, the Napa County Library received a grant for library literacy programs. At the time, they were one of few public libraries to have received such a grant in California. Since then, Napa County Library has developed their literacy program into the robust, comprehensive and effective program that it is today. More than 2,500 adults have received private tutoring sessions in English language literacy free of charge. Of course, this staggering accomplishment would not have been possible without the wonderful tutors that over the past 30 years, have volunteered more than 900,000 hours to help their fellow community members achieve their English language literacy goals.

I firmly believe that every American deserves the opportunity to learn to read, write and speak English. I could not be more proud to represent a district that not only shares this belief, but that works every day to make this a reality in our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize the Napa County Library's Literacy Program for all they do to increase literacy in our community. On behalf of a grateful community, we honor and thank the Napa County Library today.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act. In Virginia and the larger Chesapeake Bay watershed we have already seen the Environmental Protection Agency micromanaging state and local water decisions. The EPA's Waters of the U.S. rule expands the regulatory over-reach we have seen in the Bay watershed to the entire United States while imposing even more harmful regulations on even more small streams, creeks, manmade ponds, and nearby wetlands under the agency's control.

Congress intended the states and federal government to implement the Clean Water Act as a federal-state partnership where the states and federal government act as co-regulators. This rule is just another example of EPA forgetting the Clean Water Act's goal of cooperative federalism. The EPA cannot re-write the Clean Water Act and expand their jurisdiction at a whim. Only Congress can grant that authority. Today's vote is an important step to rein in the EPA and protect the farmers, landowners, and local economies that stand to be harmed by this rule.

I urge passage of this important legislation. Protecting America's waterways is critical, but what we need are commonsense policies that will protect water quality without limiting economic growth and unfairly over-regulating local agricultural producers and economies—not more power grabs by the EPA.

H.R. 5078—WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act. I unfortunately missed the vote due to a conflict and had I been present, I would have voted "no." H.R. 5078 would prevent a proposed rule to protect clean water from taking effect and continue to give polluters a free pass.

Two Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 resulted in confusion and uncertainty about which bodies of water are subject to federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, creating a loophole. This led the Bush Administration to issue guidance for regulated communities, but instead created the currently inconsistent, patchwork system. The proposed rule replaces the Bush Administration era guidance documents to reduce regulatory uncertainty and establish a clear process for asserting Clean Water Act jurisdiction over waters.

The proposed rule closes the loophole by clarifying federal jurisdiction to protect America's waters and does not seek to regulate bodies of water which have not historically been regulated under the Clean Water Act. In fact, the rule proposes to exclude ephemeral and intermittent ditches while maintaining historical exclusions and exemptions for agriculture. The rule also provides clarity about which wetlands are covered by the Clean Water Act. The rule would also prevent the agencies from moving forward with any similar rule or guidance regarding the scope and enforcement of the Clean Water Act. According to a Tampa Bay Times editorial in support of the rule, "the EPA estimates that the marginal costs of implementing the rule would generate about double the return in benefits to public health, flood control and the economy."

Federal regulations to close the existing loophole and protect water quality are especially important to my home state of Florida which depends on a healthy environment for a prosperous economy. As the loophole stands, nearly 30 percent of Florida's streams and millions of wetlands are at risk of unchecked pollution and development and threatens the drinking water for 1.7 Floridians. More than 80 percent of the lakes and reservoirs that have been tested in Florida have failed basic water quality standards. Densely populated Hillsborough County, where my district is located, ranks first in Florida for miles of streams unprotected by the Clean Water Act. The rule would improve Florida's waters by closing the existing loophole. Unfortunately, this piece of legislation before us would prevent the government from cleaning our polluted waters. The President threatened to veto this legislation for good reason, noting that "this bill is not an act of good government."

Millions of Americans get their drinking water from rivers, lakes, and reservoirs that are at risk of pollution from upstream sources. In Florida, several rivers, including the Apalachicola, Choctawhatchee, Suwannee and Escambia Rivers have their headwaters in other states. Floridians are directly affected by upstream degradation to the quality of these rivers before they enter our state. Major pollution from the Mississippi River and other out of state factors have severely harmed the Apalachicola Bay and consequently the northwest Florida economy where the sponsor's district is located.

Florida's economy is inextricably linked to a healthy environment, particularly its bodies of water and the wetlands those waters rely on. Wetlands, rich in biodiversity, provide services that are critical for drinking water, water quality, water supply, groundwater recharge, flood control, recreation such as fishing, and habitat for threatened and endangered species. Florida, the state with the most wetlands in the continental United States, has already lost half its historic wetlands acreage due to degradation and continues to do so.

Florida's and the Gulf of Mexico's waters are poisoned every year by more than 4 billion gallons of oil, fertilizer ingredients and other hazardous materials. Tampa Bay, the largest open water estuary on the Gulf, is also fouled by other sources, with more than half of the nitrogen entering it coming from urban stormwater runoff that carries lawn fertilizer, pesticide residues, and trash. Pollution throughout Florida's waterways has led to record amounts of toxic red tide and algae blooms which are created by nutrients from farm fertilizers. Scientists theorize that algae and red tide have contributed to the record deaths of 10 percent of the Florida manatee population over the past year. Likely due to red tide, pollution has resulted in an unprecedented number of deaths of dolphins and pelicans.

Pollution costs Floridians billions of dollars each year. Sustainable water supplies are at risk in Florida due to the loss of natural systems. The rule is needed to restore protections for streams and wetlands across the country. Florida's economy and public health depend on clean water.

I would like to submit a list of the members of the Florida Conservation Coalition. The Coalition is composed of over 50 conservation organizations and thousands of individuals devoted to protecting and conserving Florida's land, fish and wildlife and water resources and it strongly opposes this piece of legislation.

FLORIDA CONSERVATION COALITION

Bob Graham, Fmr Governor of Florida and U.S. Senator; Nathaniel Pryor Reed, Fmr Assistant-Secretary of the Interior; Commissioner Lee Constantine—Seminole County Commissioner; Audubon Florida; Audubon of Southwest Florida; Conservancy of Southwest Florida; Florida Wildlife Federation; Friends of the Everglades; National Parks Conservation Association; Peace River Audubon Society; Sierra Club; South Florida Audubon Society.

League of Women Voters; 1000 Friends of Florida; St. Johns Riverkeeper; Trust for Public Land; Lester Abberger; John Finlayson—Former Chairman SRWMD; Bill Herr, Environmental Consultant, Former Chairman SJRWMD; Gary Kuhl, Former Exec Director, SWFWMD; Jay Landers, Fmr Secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection; Sonny Vergara, Fmr Executive Director SWFWMD and SJRWMD; Estus Whitfield, Fmr Principal Environmental Advisor to 5 FL Governors.

Affiliates:

Alliance of Florida Land Trust; Alliance to Protect Water Resources, Inc.; Back Ten Feet; Caloosahatchee River Citizens Association; Center for Earth Jurisprudence; Citrus County Audubon Society; Citrus County Council; Conservation Trust for America; Coral Gables Area Democratic Club; Current Problems; Dade City Garden Club.

Defenders of Wildlife; Duval Audubon Society; Estero Council of Community Leaders; EarthJustice; Florida Consumer Action Network; Florida Conservation Alliance; Florida's Eden; Florida Defenders of the Environment; Florida Native Plant Society; Florida Federation of Garden Clubs; Florida Trail Association; Florida Outdoor Recreation Coalition.

Friends of the Wekiva River; Florida Wildflower Foundation; Great Old Broads for Wilderness; Gulf Restoration Network; Ideas For Us; Lake Area Water Alliance; Homosassa River Alliance; Martin County Conservation Alliance; North Florida Land Trust; Paddle Florida; Rainbow River Conservation, Inc.

Santa Fe Lake Dwellers Association; Save Our Suwanee; Save the Manatee Club; Silver Springs Alliance; Suwanee River Garden Club; Southwest Florida Watershed Council; St. Johns River Alliance; The Conservation Fund; United Waterfowlers—Florida; Wildlands Conservation; Wakulla Springs Alliance; War, Inc.; Wildwood Preservation Society.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE AND HELPING WORKING AMERICANS

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the millions of hard-working men and women in America today who are barely making ends meet, living paycheck to paycheck, and how this chamber can

help our fellow Americans by raising the minimum wage.

Last year the Census Bureau reported that over 10 million Americans work full-time and are still below the poverty line, about $24,000 for a family of four.

In my home state of Texas, over 450,000 people are paid the minimum wage, more than any other state and account for nearly 8 percent of all working Texans.

African-Americans and Hispanics are the most likely in our country to be among the working poor. Nearly 1–in–7 black and Hispanic Americans work full-time and live below the poverty line.

Eight percent of all working women in our country, 5.5 million, are also among the working poor.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply not right. We cannot allow our country to become a place where hard work is not valued and allow millions of our fellow Americans to continue to live in poverty despite their great efforts.

This is why this chamber must bring H.R. 1010, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, for a floor vote before we go into recess.

This legislation would raise the federal minimum wage to $10.10 an hour and index it to inflation afterwards.

The House Majority has refused to bring this bill for a vote in spite of its overwhelming support among the American people. The current Congress' record of inaction and obstruction has undermined our economy's recovery and harmed American families.

This is why I urge my colleagues to demand a vote before we recess for the November elections.

HONORING THE COLORADO CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Greeley, Colorado chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (NSDAR) for their outstanding service to our state and nation.

Abiding by the motto ''God, Home and Country,'' the Centennial State chapter of NSDAR has worked tirelessly over its 110 year existence to provide assistance for members of our military serving oversees and those honorably discharged. This group of women has a commitment to the veteran's community of Greeley, but also to education and higher learning within the community at large. It is an inspiration to see an organization so committed to educating our children, serving those in need, and preserving American history.

I am honored that the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution serves Colorado's 4th district. Their service resonates throughout the community. I commend them for preserving their long and storied history, and wish them continued success in the years to come.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOHN C. GARGIULO

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Judge John C. Gargiulo for being appointed to serve as a Magistrate Judge for the United States District Court, Southern District of Mississippi.

John graduated from the University of Southern Mississippi as a U.S. Army ROTC Graduate and was ranked in the top 10% of candidates nationwide. Upon his graduation, John was commissioned into the active military as an Intelligence Officer in the 24th Infantry Division.

While serving during Operation Desert Storm, John was awarded the Army Commendation Medal for his participation in the first combat dismounted patrol into enemy territory, as well as receiving the Meritorious Service Medal by the Governor of the State of Mississippi for his voluntary service during Hurricane Katrina.

After serving on active duty, John graduated from the University of Mississippi School of Law, receiving his Juris Doctorate, and was the recipient of the James Alexander Scholastic Scholarship, as well as serving on the Moot Court Board.

Upon graduation, John began his legal practice at an insurance defense firm, serving the Gulfport and Mississippi Gulf Coast region.

In 2000, John was appointed as an Assistant District Attorney where he was lead prosecutor for all felonies with emphasis on cases involving high-profile sexual and violent crimes. While serving as an assistant DA, John successfully tried two of America's Most Wanted criminals, resulting in guilty verdicts.

In 2009, the Governor of the State of Mississippi appointed John as Circuit Court Judge for the Second Circuit Court District. He was reelected in 2010 and served in this position until his appointment as Magistrate Judge for the United States District Court, Southern District of Mississippi in August 2014.

I would like to send Magistrate Judge Gargiulo my best wishes in his future of continued service to our Nation.

CONGRATULATING THE MORRISSON-REEVES LIBRARY OF RICHMOND, INDIANA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Morrisson-Reeves Library on its 150th Anniversary.

The Morrisson-Reeves Library has been a landmark in Richmond, Indiana for a century and a half. The library provides invaluable resources and services and promotes a passion for learning and reading in the community. This exceptional institution has dedicated itself to service and education in Richmond and has been an asset to area residents of all ages.

The longevity of the library would not have been possible without the dedication, commitment and vision exhibited by the Morrisson-Reeves Library's members and staff throughout its history. I am extremely appreciative of the efforts these dedicated individuals have put forth to diligently serve for the good of the public and set an example for all Hoosiers to follow.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the Morrisson-Reeves Library on its 150th Anniversary and thanking its employees for their continued service. I have no doubt that the extraordinary individuals who make up this great institution will be serving the people of Richmond, Indiana for many more years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF TED RADKE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Ted Radke, a dynamic leader in the community, and congratulate him as he retires after more than thirteen-six years of service to the people of the East Bay.

From a young age, Ted understood the importance of environmental preservation. He grew up learning to hike, camp, fish and hunt, while hearing stories about Theodore Roosevelt's and John Muir's adventures as early conservationists. While studying at San Francisco State University, he founded Contra Costa Ecology Action. Through Ted's continued support, Ecology Action has blossomed into an award-winning organization committed to environmental and economic sustainability. Throughout Ted's tenure, he has served in a variety of positions, including educator and public official. As an elected member of the Martinez City Council, Ted was as an active leader on environmental issues and successfully opposed the development of the Martinez shoreline.

Ted's valued advice and input improved California's environmental policies and regulations. His ingenuity, brilliance, and breadth of knowledge shaped California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which now requires local and state agencies to identify and consider their impact on the environment.

In 1978, Ted was elected to the East Bay Regional Park District Board, where he served for more than thirty years. The organization attributes much of its success to Ted's experience, leadership, and enthusiasm. During his time as a Board Member, Ted more than doubled the District's landholdings, expanding regional parks and nature reserves. He was also instrumental in the passage of Measure AA, an essential source of funding for land acquisition and preservation. In 2008, he again secured this funding through Measure WW, ensuring the future protection of our beloved parks and reserves.

I ask my colleagues to join with me today in commending Ted Radke for his committed and diligent service to the people of the East Bay. I am pleased to congratulate Ted on an outstanding career and wish him the very best as he begins a well-deserved retirement.

CONGRATULATING THE 2014 RECIPIENTS OF THE COVETED ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2014 recipients of the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

Presented annually by the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations—NECO, the Ellis Island Medals of Honor pay tribute to our Nation's immigrant heritage, as well as individual achievement. The Medals are awarded to U.S. citizens from diverse ethnic backgrounds who exemplify outstanding qualities in both their personal and professional lives, while continuing to preserve the richness of their particular heritage and culture. We honor these outstanding individuals because the important work they do today, creates a better world for all of us tomorrow. Since the Medals' founding in 1986, more than 2,000 American citizens have received the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, including six American Presidents, United States Senators, Congressmen, Nobel Laureates, athletes, artists, clergy, and military leaders. This Medal is not about material success, nor is it about the politics of immigration; it is about the people who have committed themselves to this nation, embraced the opportunities America has to offer, and most importantly, who have used those opportunities to not only better their own lives but make a difference in our country and in the lives of its people.

Citizens of the United States hail from every nation known to man. The iconic metaphor of this nation as a veritable melting pot of cultures continues to ring true, and it is this diversity that adds to the unique richness of American life. It is the key to why America is the most innovative, progressive and forward thinking country in the world. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor not only celebrate select individuals but also the pluralism and democracy that enabled our forebearers to celebrate their cultural identities while still embracing the American way of life. This award serves to remind us all that with hard work and perseverance anyone can still achieve the American dream. In addition, by honoring these remarkable Americans, we honor all who share their origins and we acknowledge the contributions they have made to America.

I commend NECO and its Board of Directors headed by my good friend, Nasser J. Kazeminy, for honoring these truly outstanding individuals for their tireless efforts to foster dialogue and build bridges between different ethnic groups, as well as to promote unity and a sense of common purpose in our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the good works of NECO and in congratulating all of the 2014 recipients of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor. I also submit the names of this year's recipients.

2014 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Salpy Akaragian RN–BC, MN; Iran Davar Ardalan; Marina Arsenijevic; Sherry S. Bahrambeygui; Lily Ring Balian; Maria Bartiromo; Gerald A. Benjamin; Robert S. Bennett; Norbert R. Berg; Narpat Bhandari; Barbara J. Bowers, M.D., Ian Bremmer; Major General Mark A. Brilakis; Charles Ta-Peng Chang; Edwin M. Chang, M.D.; Hazem H. Chehabi, M.D.; Quyen D. Chu, M.D.; Vice Admiral Daniel L. Cooper; Brigadier General Ruben A. Cubero; Vice Admiral Philip Hart Cullom.

H.E. Archbishop Hovnan Derderian; Samir A. Desai; Paul J. DiMare; Captain Jeffrey F. Dixon; Diana L. Ecclestone; E. Llwyd Ecclestone; Salim F. Fadil, M.D.; Phillip Frost, M.D.; Chief Thomas P. Galati; Diana Xing Wu Gao; Jean-Pierre Garnier, PhD.; Colonel Michael J. Gould; General Frank J. Grass; Scott Green; Felix 'Phil' Grucci; Admiral Harry B. Harris, Jr.; Samuel R. Harris; Richard B. Herman, Esq.; Evander Holyfield; Joan B. Horning.

Professor David P.J. Hung, O.M.D., PhD.; Vahe Imasdounian; Jae Kung Jeung; Larry E. Jodsaas; Yue-Sai Kan; Shaygan Kheradpir; Minsun Kim; Gary Sze Kong; Gwen S. Korovin, M.D.; Dr. Alma Kunanbaeva; Kin Y. Lam, M.D.; Norma Lerner; Anita Bevacqua McBride; Douglas W. McCormick; Honorable Robert Carl McFarlane; Raffi Megerian; Dr. Aria Mehrabi; David C. Meltzer, Esq.; Ali Mojdehi; Darioush Nasseri, M.D.; Jerar Nishanian.

Herbert V. Nootbaar; Dattatreyudu Nori, M.D.; Pejman Nozad; Ivan Obolensky; Fatih Ozmen; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Peter Kihyo Park; Jorge M. Perez; Lauren Pizza; Rabbi Joseph Potasnik; Arun Kumar Pramanik, M.D.; Helen Psaras; Major General L. Scott Rice; U.S. Representative Edward R. Royce; Major General Jay Santee; Elizabeth Sarquis; Timothy R. Scully, CSC; Ketki Sharadkumar Shah, M.D.; Yash Paul Soi; Andrew Strzalkowski.

Abdul M. Suleman; Elie Tahari; Honorable David H. Thorne; Honorable Gaddi H. Vasquez; Elizabeth Lee Vliet, M.D.; Honorable John P. Walsh; Robert R. Weinstine, Esq.; Honorable Jesse White; Steven W. Wong; Yannis C. Yortsos, PhD; Lotfi Zadeh; Tim H. Zagat; Charles Zhang.

And receiving the International Ellis Island Medal of Honor, Ahmet Calik and Nigel Lythgoe.

MR. MONROE MACK

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated community leader and trailblazer, Monroe Mack of Tampa, Florida. Mr. Mack's boundless energy and constant civic engagement were an inspiration to all. Today, I am grateful to recognize his innumerable contributions and honor his legacy.

Monroe Mack was born in Campbellton, Florida, but later moved to Tampa where he spent the majority of his life. Mr. Mack's service to this country began when he joined the Army Reserves where he served as a 2nd Lieutenant and retired as a Lt. Colonel in 1985. Mr. Mack went on to graduate from Florida A&M University in 1956 with a degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences and later received an MBA from Nova University. He later married Laverne Griffin to whom he was married for 50 happy years.

Throughout Mr. Mack's career he was a pioneer for African American advancement in the Tampa Bay medical community. He created the pharmacy services at Clara Fry Memorial Hospital. Following the success of that program, he moved to Tampa General Hospital, where he broke down racial barriers by becoming its first African American professional staffer and later rose to become its Director of Pharmacy. His trailblazing continued as he became the first African American to be appointed and reappointed to the Florida Board of Pharmacy by both Governors Reubin Askew and Bob Graham. He then chaired the Examination and Negative Formulary Advisory Committees, and served as their first African American President.

Mr. Mack's service was not limited only to his work in the medical field. Throughout his life, he displayed a passion for civic engagement and for shaping young minds. He inspired the next generation of pharmacists by working as a professor at both the University of Florida and Florida A&M University Colleges of Pharmacy. He also diligently advocated for greater engagement in politics throughout the community. Mr. Mack could often be found educating people about candidates and encouraging them to vote.

Even after his retirement from Tampa General Hospital, Mr. Mack continued to give countless hours in service to his alma mater. He chaired the alumni funding campaign which raised funds and created a $100,000 Alumni Endowment for the FAMU College of Pharmacy. He was also inducted into the Gallery of Distinction in the FAMU College of Pharmacy.

Mr. Mack selflessly dedicated his life to our community. Countless students have benefited from his immeasurable philanthropic efforts and leadership in the medical industry. His commitment to civic engagement and education will always be remembered and appreciated. Mr. Speaker, I join the Tampa Bay community in recognizing Mr. Mack for a lifetime of exemplary service. Although Monroe Mack passed away on August 16, 2014, his life and legacy will live on.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION KINGS COUNTY AND BOB BEEDE

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE) Kings County and Bob Beede for being named the 2014 Agriculture Supporter of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

For 100 years, UCCE advisors and specialists have worked with communities across California to solve economic, agricultural, natural resource, youth development, and nutrition issues. UCCE has 64 offices in California that act as local problem-solving centers bringing together local issues and UC research. Across California, more than 300 campus-based specialists and county-based farm and youth advisors work together to provide solutions to agriculture related problems. UCCE helps farmers develop more efficient growing methods, solve pest management problems, and institute irrigation methods that require less water. UCCE also promotes the importance of healthy eating habits and regular exercise to adults and children through the 4–H Youth Development Program.

Mr. Bob Beede, UCCE Emeritus Farm Advisor, has been an instrumental part of UCCE success for many years. In 1980, after two years as Staff Research Associate for tree crops and grapes at the Kearney Agricultural Center, Bob became a farm advisor for grapes, tree fruits, nuts, and vegetables in Kings County. Since 1980, Bob has served in many capacities, including advisor of Tulare County nut crops, which was his main focus until his recent retirement. Bob has had an incredible impact on the booming nut crop industry and is a world authority on pistachio production as well as a key advisor for walnut culture.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate the University of California Cooperative Extension Kings County and Bob Beede for their recognition as 2014 Agriculture Supporter of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO HAMILTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE SERGEANT KIMBERLY JAYNE JOWITT

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Hamilton County Sheriff's Office Sergeant, Kimberly Jayne Jowitt. Sadly, after a more than three-year battle with cancer, Sergeant Jowitt passed away on July 27, 2014. For more than three decades, she served the people of Hamilton County with a dedication that our community and the entire state of Indiana owe a debt of eternal gratitude.

Born on August 2, 1955 in Indianapolis, IN, Sergeant Jowitt was a lifelong Hoosier. After graduating from Heritage Christian School and Indiana University Kelley School of Business, she was hired as a civilian employee by the Hamilton County Sheriff's Office in 1978.

During her career with the Sheriff's Office, which spanned an admirable 37 years, Sergeant Jowitt held several positions serving Hamilton County; most recently as an administrative sergeant handling special assignments. A career public servant, she worked tirelessly to make Hamilton County a better place to live.

Although Sergeant Jowitt had many ups and downs during her battle against cancer, she remained faithfully optimistic and never lost her will to fight. She brought this same tenacity to her career serving Hamilton County becoming the first female officer, investigator and supervisor in the history of the Hamilton County Sheriff's Office. I am proud to represent a community with a legacy of female public servants as dedicated as Kim Jowitt.

As a member of the House Homeland Security Committee and Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications, I know firsthand the important role that public servants like Sergeant Jowitt play every day. Without people like Kim Jowitt, who are willing to dedicate their entire career to public safety and service, Hamilton County would not be the safe, prosperous and vibrant community it is today.

Sergeant Jowitt is survived by her husband, Noblesville Police Chief Kevin Jowitt, and her daughter, Crystal. My condolences and well wishes go out to Sergeant Jowitt's entire family and the Hamilton County law enforcement community. My thoughts and prayers are with them.

INTERNATIONAL PLASMA AWARENESS WEEK

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate International Plasma Awareness Week, which will occur October 12 to 18, 2014. During this time, there will be observances throughout the United States and Europe designed to raise global awareness of the need for plasma to create lifesaving therapies, recognize the value that plasma donors contribute in saving and improving lives, and increase understanding of rare diseases and plasma protein therapies.

Raising awareness about plasma protein therapies is vitally important for the following reasons:

Plasma-derived therapies and recombinant blood clotting factors, collectively known as plasma protein therapies, are unique, biological products for which no substitutes or alternative treatments exist. They save and improve lives of individuals throughout the world;

Plasma protein therapies are used to treat bleeding disorders, primary immune deficiency diseases, alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency, and certain rare, neurological disorders;

These therapies are also used in emergency and surgical medicine to save and improve lives;

Plasma protein therapies have significantly improved the quality of life of, markedly improved patient outcomes for, and extended the life expectancy of individuals with rare, chronic diseases and conditions;

Healthy, committed donors provide plasma essential to manufacture these lifesaving therapies; and

There are over 430 plasma collection centers in the U.S. that have demonstrated their commitment to plasma donor and patient safety and quality by earning International Quality Plasma Program (IQPP) certification.

I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me and rise in commemoration of International Plasma Awareness Week, a time dedicated to raising awareness about crucial, lifesaving therapies attained through using plasma proteins.

TRIBUTE TO TEAYS VALLEY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Teays Valley Christian School, located in Scott Depot, Putnam County, West Virginia, who is celebrating the 30th anniversary of its first graduating class with a Gala on October 18, 2014. I am happy to say that, under the direction of Principal Jack Davis, teachers and staff, Teays Valley Christian School has become one of the finest private, Christian schools in the state of West Virginia.

Founded in 1979, Teays Valley Christian School started in converted Sunday school classrooms at Scott Depot Christ Fellowship, offering kindergarten through 8th grade classes to approximately 65 students. The school expanded, offering kindergarten to 12th grade and currently, 351 students are enrolled from Putnam, Kanawha, Mason and Cabell counties. In addition, the student body represents 83 churches which support the school's emphasis on ''unity of spirit across denominational lines.''

The school's mission statement reflects the core values of the school and the reason for its formation: ''Teays Valley Christian School is dedicated to working in partnership with the family to provide a high quality, balanced, Bible-based education that develops the essential knowledge, skills, and character traits necessary for students to make a lifelong commitment to Jesus Christ and to fulfill God's purposes in their lives.''

Teays Valley Christian School is accredited through the Association of Christian School International (ACSI) and the North Central Association (NCA). It is affiliated with the Association of Christian Schools International, North Central Association, ACSI Ohio River Valley, West Virginia Christian Athletic Tournament, and the West Virginia Department of Education.

The school is proud of its rigorous academic curriculum and qualified staff that have provided an education to over 600 students, 90 percent of which have attended and completed college. The school's college entrance exam scores are consistently higher than state and national averages. The school is proud of two national merit scholars who have graduated over the past 5 years. A well rounded program is offered to students including programs in the fields of music, fine arts, drama, as well as athletics.

Since its humble startup, Teays Valley Christian School has evolved into a full scale academic institution offering students a well rounded faith based academic curriculum. The emphasis on hard work and academic achievement with a Christian foundation has proven to be a successful formula for the school, its students and alumni.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to Congratulate Teays Valley Christian School on its success and on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of its first graduating class. I wish the school great success with its upcoming Gala celebrating all graduates of this special academic institution. Hopefully, this will be the beginning of the next 30 years of academic excellence at Teays Valley Christian School. I am truly privileged to serve such a distinguished group of West Virginians.

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN, ORLANDO MARTORANI, AS HE CELEBRATES HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Orlando Martorani a Happy Birthday as he turns 100 years old on October 19, 2014.

Orlando Pedro Martorani was born October 19, 1914 in Bayamon, Puerto Rico. He began a career as a bookkeeper and married Mercedes Delgado Garcia in San Juan, Puerto Rico on December 14, 1941, exactly one week after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Orlando and Mercedes began their life in Puerto Rico and their first child, their daughter, Gilda, was born in 1942. In December of 1943, Orlando answered the call to military service, joining the U.S. Army as a member of the Coastal Artillery Corps.

The Coastal Artillery Corps was responsible for the defense of the coasts and harbors of the United States during the first half of the 20th Century. As a member of that corps, Orlando was briefly assigned to duty in Inglewood and San Diego, California before being stationed in Panama, guarding the Panama Canal. He also would be stationed in Boston, Massachusetts to guard German Prisoners of War.

On being discharged in February of 1946, Orlando returned to his life in Puerto Rico where he and Mercedes raised their family. After retiring in 1980, Orlando and Mercedes came to live in Murphysboro, Illinois.

A short-wave radio enthusiast, Orlando is also a Chicago Cubs fan and, even though he has been waiting 100 years, he still has hopes of seeing the Cubs win a World Series in his lifetime.

Orlando cared for Mercedes until she passed away in 2003. He has two children, Gilda and a son, Orlando, who is also a U.S. Army veteran who served in Vietnam. He also has six grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Orlando Martorani a Happy 100th Birthday and wishing him all the best in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 480, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

HONORING THE HONOREES OF THE MAINE WOMEN'S LOBBY GALA

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorees of the 2014 Maine Women's Lobby Gala: The Voice of Maine Women—Loud and Clear. The Maine Women's Lobby works tirelessly to increase opportunities for women and girls in Maine and to ensure that they are protected from violence and discrimination through education and advocacy.

The Maine Women's Lobby Gala celebrates the power of Maine women and honors five inspirational female leaders in the state. These women have demonstrated a commitment to furthering the lives of Maine women through work in civil rights, economic security, health care, violence prevention, and more.

This year's award recipients are Mary J. Herman, Cheryl Miller, Maine Attorney General Janet Mills, Zam Zam Mohamud, and Abbie Strout. Mary J. Herman, one of the earliest lobbyists for the Maine Women's Lobby, is the recipient of the Liz Crandall Spirit Award for her continued volunteer work and philanthropy in the state. Cheryl Miller is the recipient of the Catalyst Award for fostering economic growth and building community as the head of the Maine Development Foundation's Leadership Maine Program. Maine Attorney General Janet Mills is the recipient of the Trailblazer Award for setting an example for women in Maine politics as the state's first female District Attorney and Attorney General. Zam Zam Mohamud will receive the Community Power Award as the first Somali woman in Maine to run for public office and for being a dedicated leader in her community. Abbie Strout is the recipient of the Spark! Award for her work as a tireless women's health activist with the Mabel Wadsworth Women's Health Center.

Through their leadership and incredible commitment to their communities, these recipients improve the lives of Maine women today and serve as inspiring role models for our young girls.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating the honorees of the Maine Women's Lobby Gala on their outstanding service and achievement.

HONORING KATHLEEN A. MILLISON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kathleen A. Millison, City Manager for the City of Santa Rosa, upon her retirement.

Ms. Millison's four years as City Manager in Santa Rosa cap off a career of more than 35 years in public service. Before she brought her talents to Santa Rosa, Ms. Millison served the City of Clovis as City Manager for almost 20 years and previously held the position of Assistant City Manager for Clovis. Before settling in California, Ms. Millison served as an Assistant City Manager, Planning Director and Assistant Planner for multiple communities throughout Washington and Oregon.

During her time serving the City of Santa Rosa, Ms. Millison is credited for countless improvements in our community that will benefit residents for years to come. For instance, Ms. Millison worked to create guidelines for managing community growth. She improved public utilities and community amenities while also working diligently to create a stronger, more robust and inviting local economy.

In addition to her work for the city, Ms. Millison served as a board chair of the California Association of Local Economic Development, a member of the board of directors of the Institute for Local Government, and is a past president of the City Manager's Department of the League of California Cities. In recent years, Ms. Millison has been involved in local leadership as well, particularly with public school foundations, local history associations and regional economic development associations. Her fellow community members have recognized her for this work with numerous awards.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Millison for her invaluable service to the City of Santa Rosa. Her unyielding dedication to protecting and improving our community is greatly appreciated by the entire Santa Rosa community and we wish her a most enjoyable retirement.

HONORING BLUEFIELD, VIRGINIA'S GRAHAM HIGH SCHOOL

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks today in honor of Bluefield, Virginia's Graham High School, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

Graham High School was first established in 1914 as a secondary school, and thousands of students have graduated in the time that has passed since its doors first opened a century ago. Obviously, the students, staff, and the Graham High School building itself have changed over the last 100 years, but the school's tradition of excellence has remained constant.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating the students, faculty, and alumni of Graham High School on its 100th anniversary. As we note the school's great alumni and many championships including everything from football and basketball to creative writing, may we also take a moment and reflect on what is yet to come. I congratulate Graham High School and the surrounding community on this exciting milestone, and look forward to many more great accomplishments from future Graham G-Men and G-Girls.

HONORING MUELLER & CO., LLP

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mueller & Co., LLP, a certified public accounting and business consulting firm with locations in Elgin and Chicago. Mueller & Co., LLP, which serves my constituents in the Sixth District, has been recognized as one of the best places to work in the State of Illinois.

For over 45 years, Mueller has cultivated personal and professional relationships with

their communities and clients. Mueller & Co., LLP clients include privately held and publicly traded companies, local governments, nonprofit organizations from a wide variety of industries, and independent professionals.

With over 75 employees at their Elgin office, Mueller has been listed in Crain's Chicago Business as the 19th largest accounting firm in the Chicagoland area. They have also consistently earned the distinction of being one of the ''Best Places to Work in Illinois'' by the Daily Herald Business Ledger, one of only sixty Illinois companies to receive this honor.

Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues in the House, please join me in honoring Mueller & Co., LLP for their legacy of achievement. Mueller & Co., LLP is a company that truly cares not only for their clients, but also for their employees.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF CORCORAN, CALIFORNIA

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the City of Corcoran, California as they celebrate their 100th Anniversary this summer.

Corcoran was incorporated in 1914 and has grown tremendously over the last 100 years. The city is located in the middle of California's fertile Central Valley and has played an important role in supporting this region's vibrant agricultural economy.

At the turn of the 20th century, the area where Corcoran now stands was a major component of the state's economy as it served as a junction for the San Francisco and San Joaquin Valley Railroad. The city began when H.J. Whitley, a land developer from Southern California, purchased 32,000 acres and moved his colleague, J.W. Guiberson to the area. Guiberson and his family were responsible for building the city's first home and business and establishing the first church in the community. Agriculture was, and still is, the highlight of this area. At its infancy, the most successful crops in Corcoran were alfalfa, grains, and sugar beets.

Despite its size, the city is home to a thriving community. For example, the J.G. Boswell Company, founded in 1925, has ties in both agriculture and real estate and is one of the largest irrigated farming operations in the world. The area also offers many educational opportunities for its youth including West Hills College and College of the Sequoias. In 2009, the Technology Learning Center opened at Corcoran High School to serve students in the community. There are also many organizations that work hard to cultivate an interest in and further understanding of agriculture in our children, such as the Future Farmers of America program and the Corcoran 4-H Club. This wonderful city is rich in history and certainly has a bright future ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the City of Corcoran, California in celebrating a successful and prosperous 100 years.

IN HONOR OF KEVIN L. COTTER OF QUINCY, MA

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Kevin L. Cotter in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the United States' labor movement and to his hometown of Quincy, Massachusetts.

The son of Edward and June Cotter, Kevin was born on October 15, 1948, in Somerville, Massachusetts. Kevin attended St. Catherine's Grammar School in Somerville, and then went on to Sacred Heart High School in East Cambridge until it closed in 1965. Kevin then completed his schooling at Somerville High School, graduating in 1966.

Upon his graduation, Kevin applied to Plumbers' Union Local 12, where he was sworn in on October 24, 1966. He served a five-year apprenticeship and became an active Journeyman member of Local 12 in 1971. Since then, Kevin has held several appointed and elected positions throughout his career: 1973, elected to Local 12's Examining board, 1976, elected as a trustee to the Pension Annuity, Health, and Welfare Funds, 1982, served as President of the Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston, 1985, elected Business Manager of Local 12. He was re-elected as Business Manager of Local 12 in 1997.

Further, Kevin held positions in addition to his responsibilities at Local 12 including: President of the Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston in 1983, appointment to the Board of Directors of Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency by Governor Michael Dukakis in 1986, Marketing Officer for Custody Services to Union, Taft-Hartley Benefit Funds at State Street Bank, appointment to Board of Directors of the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority by Boston Mayor Thomas Menino in 2002, and Commissioner of the Quincy Housing Authority in 2002. Kevin was also elected as a delegate to the United Association National Convention in 1976, 1981, 1986, 2001, 2006, and 2011, in addition to serving on dozens of national and local labor related boards, committees, and councils.

Recognizing his good work, several organizations have honored Kevin throughout the years. In 1991, he was the recipient of the Daniel J. Tobin award from the New England Chapter of the Irish American Coalition. In 2000, he received the Jewish National Fund ''Tree of Life'' Award. In 2004, he was the labor recipient of the ''Cushing Gavin Award'' from the Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston for excellence in Labor Relations. Additionally, in 2007 he was selected for the ''Gompers, Murray, Meaney Award'' by the MA AFL–CIO.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin is known for his integrity, loyalty, and his quick sense of humor. He has had the good fortune of being married to Betty for forty-two years; they are the proud parents to three children: Lisa, Colleen, and Kevin, and grandparents to four grandchildren: Isabelle, Gianna, Gabrielle, and Cecilia. I thank Kevin for his leadership and his service.

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARY MEDICAL CENTER

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 90th Anniversary of Cary Medical Center in Caribou, Maine. Nearly a century after its founding, Cary continues to serve the people of Northern Maine with the highest quality of care, all while maintaining a special commitment to our nation's veterans.

Cary Memorial Hospital first opened to the public in September of 1924. The medical center was built on land donated to the City of Caribou by the late Dr. Jefferson B. Cary for the purpose of building a hospital. Over the next 50 years, the Hospital would welcome a number of expansions, before Caribou voters welcomed a new state-of-the-art $7 million hospital in the mid–1970s.

Just as its namesake was a pioneer as one of the first medical professionals in Aroostook County, since its opening, the new Cary Medical Center has continued to lead the way in the future of healthcare. From the new private hospital rooms at its opening to the new Women's Imaging Center—offering the most advanced breast cancer diagnostic service in Northern Maine—the hospital has been a medical leader for the state and the region.

Perhaps closest to my heart, Cary Medical Center is known for its unwavering commitment to our nation's veterans. In 1988, Cary was the first hospital in the United States to open a VA Community-Based Outpatient Clinic. For the last several years, Cary has offered specialty care to veterans through VA's Project ARCH (Access Received Closer to Home). I was proud to help bring this program to Maine and work closely with Cary's leadership to ensure the program will continue through the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, Cary is consistently recognized as one of the top hospitals in Maine and is focused on improving the health of all Mainers. As Cary nears a century of service and caring for the community and the region, I hope that you will join me in honoring the medical professionals, hospital staff, and patients who make Cary a wonderful place to provide and receive care.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE THERESE McCUSKEY

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor my friend, Anne Therese McCuskey, who died September 4, 2014, in our hometown of Charleston after a long illness. Anne was an exemplary public servant and avid Republican. She always exhibited common sense about political issues, personal issues and was a tireless advocate. I have always been grateful that Anne was willing to work in my first Congressional campaign and serve as my District Director when I entered Congress in 2001.

Born in 1949 and raised in Erie, Pennsylvania, Anne graduated from Villa Maria Academy high school and was among the first women to graduate from Gannon University. She came to West Virginia University as a graduate student in 1971. At WVU, she earned a master's degree in social work, met her beloved husband John, and developed an abiding affection for the Mountain State. She loved her adopted home state and devoted the next 40 years to inspiring West Virginians to reach their true potential.

After graduating from WVU, she and John moved to Bridgeport, where Anne served as Clinical Director for Summit Center, an eight-county regional mental health center, and held leadership positions in the United Way of Harrison County. Anne and John moved their family to Charleston in 1985, when my father, Governor Arch Moore, appointed John as the state's Commissioner of Finance and Administration. As a Charleston resident, Anne expanded her professional efforts on behalf of West Virginians. She was appointed to the Commission for National and Community Service, as well as the West Virginia Governor's Committee on Crime Delinquency and Corrections, the West Virginia Parole Board, the West Virginia Behavioral Health Advisory Council, and the Governor's Advisory Committee on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. She served as Vice President of Government Relations for the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Director of Government Relations for the Charleston Regional Chamber of Commerce and Development, and President of the Black Diamond Girl Scout Council.

Anne took great pride in finding talented people and cultivating their talents on behalf of West Virginia. She turned this pride into a career as a campaign professional, working on campaigns throughout the state. In addition to serving as my District Director, Anne later became Executive Director for the West Virginia Republican Party. But Anne always had two favorite candidates, her husband and her son, both named John McCuskey. Beyond her impact at the state and national level, Anne's efforts had a personal impact on everyone in her path.

Although leading an active civic and social life, Anne's first devotion always was to her family. She leaves behind her husband of 38 years, John F. McCuskey, and their children, John B. McCuskey and daughter-in-law Wendy, their daughter, Elizabeth McCuskey and her partner, Victor, as well as an extensive, extended family.

Anne was a truly a great wife, parent, public servant, and patriot. I am so honored to have known and work as closely as I did with her. All, who had the pleasure of knowing her, will experience a void as a result. She had a determined confidence and I will always remember her sage words of advice, "always soldier on and politics isn't Sunday school."

Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia, and indeed, the United States of America owe Anne McCuskey a debt of gratitude for her many years of distinguished service in her professional and personal life. I am honored to call her my friend and fellow West Virginian.

RECOGNIZING YATES CONSTRUCTION 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor a hallmark industry in South Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District, Yates Construction, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

In 1960, Bill Yates began managing small construction projects for Central Construction while attending classes at The University of Mississippi. While working for Central Construction during college, Bill was able to learn how to develop the skills that would lay the foundation for starting a construction company of his own. In 1963, Bill led his first significant project under the name of W.G. Yates, General Contractor, and in 1964 W.G. Yates & Son Construction Company was formed. Later that year, the company was incorporated as Yates Construction, and has been family owned and operated ever since.

As Yates Construction began to grow, they developed the company motto to be: "On time, within budget, to your satisfaction", which was cultivated as the company's reputation for all of those who have had dealings with Yates Construction over the 50 years of their existence. In 1977, Yates Building Supply was formed and opened their first location in Philadelphia, MS, providing building supplies and home improvement products. In 1978, Yates Heavy Division was formed to accommodate larger projects, helping meet the needs of their clients on a broader scale. In 1986, Yates Engineering Corporation was established, and has been dedicated to provide total performance and management service as well as related support-services to their clients. In 1997, The Yates Companies was incorporated and expanded, opening locations across the southeast region of the country and North America. In 2002, Yates Services was formed. In 2009, Yates Construction's mission statement and core values were formally recognized as "to provide value to our clients" and "Safety, Integrity, Passion, Commitment."

Now, with William G. Yates, III in the President's seat, it is easy to see why this company is a respected part of our local, state, and regional economy. It is my privilege to recognize the 50th anniversary of Yates Construction, and wish the Yates family success for many generations to come.

ROGER STEWART

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate to honor the life of a true champion of environmentalism, Roger Stewart. His outstanding career in public service and his countless efforts to protect the natural resources of our community will be forever remembered.

Mr. Stewart grew up on a farm in the New York-New Jersey area. At the age of 18, he joined the Army Air Corps where he served during World War II. He went on to spend the next 21 years serving his country as a pilot. Prior to his retirement as an Air Force Major, he went back to school for a degree in zoology from the University of South Florida. Soon after graduation he accepted a position as a County Health Department biologist with Hillsborough County Department of Health's Pollution Control. Mr. Stewart created the original Water Sampling Network while at the Health Department.

Mr. Stewart paved the way for environmental advocacy in Tampa Bay. He zealously led the, then newly created, Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) in the late 1960s. Despite only having a handful of employees, Mr. Stewart aggressively spearheaded the cleanup of Tampa Bay by creating rules that protected wetlands and forced powerful local companies to reduce air pollution. In February 1974, Mr. Stewart courageously appeared on CBS's "60 Minutes" and expressed concern about the rate of development which was outpacing the protections for sensitive environmental ecosystems as well as air and water quality. He showed viewers the damaging sewage spilling into Tampa Bay. After the interview Mr. Stewart was temporarily fired but brought back to lead the EPC a short time later.

Thanks to Mr. Stewart's leadership, the EPC has grown to a robust staff that has carried out many State, Regional, and Federal level regulatory duties without losing the ability to enforce and maintain local standards. Mr. Stewart, an Air Force pilot-turned-environmentalist, kept Hillsborough County elected officials consistently accountable for making natural resources a priority over corporate profits. He retired in 2000 and passed away on August 21, 2014 at age 89.

Mr. Stewart was an unabashed "purist in the environmental business". His heroic commitment to environmentalism made an unforgettable mark on the Tampa Bay community. Tampa Bay is a better and more beautiful place to live thanks to his efforts. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Tampa Bay community, I am proud to recognize Roger Stewart for his lifelong service to the State of Florida.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 11, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 15

3 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine equality for the District of Columbia, focusing on discussing the implications of S. 132, to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

SD–342

SEPTEMBER 16

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the state of small depository institutions.

SD–538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine retirement savings 2.0, focusing on updating savings policy for the modern economy.

SD–215

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sarah R. Saldana, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, both of the Department of Homeland Security, and Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.

SD–342

2 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine harnessing the power of telehealth, focusing on promises and challenges.

SD–562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold a joint hearing to examine Ebola in West Africa, focusing on a global challenge and public health threat.

SH–216

Committee on Finance

Subcommittee on Health Care

To hold hearings to examine the Children's Health Insurance Program, focusing on protecting America's children and families.

SD–215

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

9:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States policy towards Iraq and Syria and the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

SH–216

SEPTEMBER 17

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 2141, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes, H.R. 4366, to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement, the nomination of Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, and any pending nominations.

SD–430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine why net neutrality matters, focusing on protecting consumers and competition through meaningful open Internet rules.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine the impact of rising inequality on the American economy.

SD–538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–253

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 2670, to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian land in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts.

SD–628

SEPTEMBER 18

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine tax audits of large partnerships.

SD–342

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5465–S5522

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2783–2791, and S. Res. 540–541. **Pages S5507–08**

Measures Reported:

S. 1275, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue a fishing capacity reduction loan to refinance the existing loan funding the Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 113–251)

H.R. 2052, to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment. (S. Rept. No. 113–252) **Page S5507**

Measures Passed:

Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act: Senate passed S. 2154, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S5514**

Gold Star Fathers Act: Senate passed S. 2323, to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service. **Page S5514**

Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments: Senate passed H.R. 1233, to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, after agreeing to the committee amendments. **Pages S5514–18**

National Drug Take-Back Week and National Prescription Opioid and Heroin Abuse Awareness Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 466, designating the week of October 27 through November 2, 2014, as ''National Drug Take-Back Week'', and designating October 2014 as ''National Prescription Opioid and Heroin Abuse Awareness Month'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S5518**

Slaves and Free Black Persons in the American Revolution Memorial: Senate passed H.J. Res. 120, approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution. **Page S5518**

Measures Considered:

Election Contributions and Expenditures—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5468–78, S5487**

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 3791 (to the committee-reported substitute to the joint resolution), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5487**

Reid Amendment No. 3792 (to Amendment No. 3791), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5487**

Reid Amendment No. 3793 (to the language proposed to be stricken by the committee-reported substitute), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5487**

Reid Amendment No. 3794 (to Amendment No. 3793), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5487**

Reid motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 3795, of a perfecting nature. **Page S5487**

Reid Amendment No. 3796 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 3795), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5487**

Reid Amendment No. 3797 (to Amendment No. 3796), of a perfecting nature. **Page S5487**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the joint resolution, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the

Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, September 12, 2014. **Page S5487**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the filing deadlines for first-degree amendments to the joint resolution be at 12 noon, on Thursday, September 11, 2014, and second-degree amendments be at 1 p.m., on Thursday, September 11, 2014. **Pages S5518–19**

Paycheck Fairness Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex. **Pages S5487–S5502**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

The motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on April 9, 2014, was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on April 9, 2014, was agreed to.

By 73 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. 260), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate upon reconsideration agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S5488**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 11, 2014, Senate continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture; and that all time during adjournment, recess, or morning business count post-cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S5518–19**

Moment of Silence for 9/11 Victims—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following the prayer and pledge on Thursday, September 11, 2014, there be a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001. **Pages S5518–19**

Hoover, Rung, Radzanowski, Ballentine, Nimmich, Sembler, Davenport, and Arroyo Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Department of State, Anne E. Rung, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, David Radzanowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Miranda A. A. Ballentine, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, Joseph L. Nimmich, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, Elizabeth Sembler, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Judith M. Davenport, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and David J. Arroyo, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; that there be two minutes for debate equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed; that any roll call votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; and that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S5518**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Michele Thoren Bond, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Consular Affairs).

Michael Young, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2020. **Page S5522**

Messages from the House: **Page S5504**

Measures Referred: **Page S5504**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S5504**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S5504, S5518**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S5504**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5504–07**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S5507**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5508–09**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5509–12**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5502–04**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5512–13**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S5513–14**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5514**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—260) **Page S5488**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:39 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 11, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S5518–19.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Lisa Afua Serwah Mensah, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Stabenow, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

FREIGHT RAIL SERVICE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine freight rail service, focusing on improving the performance of America's rail system, after receiving testimony from Senators Heitkamp and Hoeven; Arthur Neal, Deputy Administrator, Transportation and Marketing Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture; Jerry D. Cope, Dakota Mill and Grain, Rapid City, South Dakota, on behalf of South Dakota Grain and Feed Association; and Cal Dooley, American Chemistry Council, Shane Karr, The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, and Edward R. Hamberger, Association of American Railroads, all of Washington, DC.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of William V. Roebuck, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain, Judith Beth Cefkin, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu, Barbara A. Leaf, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, and Pamela Leora Spratlen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uzbekistan, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CYBERSECURITY, TERRORISM, AND BEYOND

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine cybersecurity, terrorism, and beyond, focusing on addressing evolving threats to the homeland, after receiving testimony from Francis X. Taylor, Under Secretary, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, and Suzanne E. Spaulding, Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate, both of the Department of Homeland Security; Nicholas J. Rasmussen, Deputy Director, National Counterterrorism Center; and Robert Anderson, Jr., Executive Assistant Director, Criminal, Cyber, Response, and Services Branch, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

IRRIGATION IN INDIAN COUNTRY

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine irrigation projects in Indian country, after receiving testimony from Lawrence S. Roberts, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Stuart Paisano, Pueblo of Sandia, Bernalillo, New Mexico, on behalf of the Coalition of Six Middle Rio Grande Pueblos; Darrin Old Coyote, Crow Nation, Crow Agency, Montana; Ruth Jim, Yakama Nation, Toppenish, Washington; and Mitchel T. Cottenoir, Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes, Ft. Washakie, Wyoming.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Matthew Vincent Masterson, of Ohio, and Christy A. McCormick, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

OLDER AMERICANS AND STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Older Americans and student loan debt, focusing on how inability to repay student loans may affect financial security of a small percentage of retirees, after receiving testimony from Charles A. Jeszeck, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; William Leith, Chief Business Operations Officer, Federal Student Aid, Department of Education; and Rosemary Anderson, Santa Cruz, California.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 5431–5447; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 719 were introduced. **Pages H7432–33**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H7434**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Duncan (TN) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H7391**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H7396**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Cliff Lea, First Baptist Church of Leesburg, Leesburg, Florida. **Pages H7396–97**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:45 p.m. and reconvened at 3:04 p.m. **Page H7410**

Suspensions Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated on Monday, September 8th:

Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 2678, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building", by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 422 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 492 and **Page H7412**

Making technical corrections to Public Law 110–229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial: H.R. 4751, to make technical corrections to Public Law 110–229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 422 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 493. **Pages H7412–13**

Employee Health Care Protection Act: The House began consideration of H.R. 3522, to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H7402–08, H7413–20**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–56, modified by the amendment printed in H. Rept. 113–584, shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H7402, H7413**

H. Res. 717, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 491, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 490. **Pages H7402, H7410–12**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Reinstating and extending the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir: S. 276, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir and **Pages H7408–09**

EPS Service Parts Act of 2014: H.R. 5057, amended, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards. **Pages H7409–10**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, September 11th. **Page H7420**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H7402.

Senate Referrals: S. 898 was held at the desk and S. 1934 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H7431**

Quorum Calls Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7410–11, H7411, H7412, H7413. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:01 p.m.

Committee Meetings

REVIEW OF THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE'S PROPOSED GROUNDWATER DIRECTIVE

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry held a hearing to review the U.S. Forest Service's proposed groundwater directive. Testimony was heard from Thomas L. Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Scott A. Verhines, New Mexico State Engineer; and public witnesses.

IMPROVING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION POLICIES AND PROGRAMS THROUGH INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce

Training; and Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, held a joint hearing entitled ''Improving Department of Education Policies and Programs Through Independent Oversight''. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Tighe, Inspector General, Department of Education; and Jacqueline Nowicki, Acting Director, Education, Workforce and Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CREDIT REPORTING SYSTEM

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled ''An Overview of the Credit Reporting System''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LIBYA'S DESCENT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Libya's Descent''. Testimony was heard from Gerald Feierstein, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

GENOCIDAL ATTACKS AGAINST CHRISTIAN AND OTHER RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN SYRIA AND IRAQ

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations; and Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, held a joint subcommittee hearing entitled ''Genocidal Attacks Against Christian and Other Religious Minorities in Syria and Iraq''. Testimony was heard from Tom Malinowski, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Department of State; Anne Richard, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, Department of State; Thomas Staal, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development; and public witnesses.

ONE FLIGHT AWAY: AN EXAMINATION OF THE THREAT POSED BY ISIS TERRORISTS WITH WESTERN PASSPORTS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security held a hearing entitled ''One Flight Away: An Examination of the Threat posed by ISIS Terrorists with Western Passports''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Homeland Security officials: John P. Wagner, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Troy Miller, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Intelligence and Investigative Liaison, U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and Jennifer A. Lasley, Deputy Under Secretary for Analysis, Office of Intelligence and Analysis; and Hillary Batjer Johnson, Acting Deputy Coordinator, Homeland Security and Multilateral Affairs, Bureau of Counterterrorism, Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 4771, the ''Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 2014''; H.R. 4299, the ''Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act''; H.R. 5108, to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; H.R. 5401, the ''Protecting the Homeland Act''; H.R. 5421, the ''Financial Institution Bankruptcy Act of 2014''; and H.R. 5402, the ''Standard Merger and Acquisition Reviews Through Equal Rules Act of 2014''. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5421, H.R. 5401, and H.R. 5402. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 4771, H.R. 4299, and H.R. 5108.

THE STATUS OF THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE'S RESPONSES TO COMMITTEE SUBPOENAS AND THE CONTINUED LACK OF TRANSPARENCY ABOUT ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF AMERICAN WILDLIFE LAWS, AND OVERSIGHT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S SOLICITOR'S OFFICE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Status of the Fish and Wildlife Service's Responses to Committee Subpoenas and the Continued Lack of Transparency about Its Implementation and Enforcement of American Wildlife Laws, and Oversight of the Department of the Interior's Solicitor's Office''. Testimony was heard from Dan Ashe, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and Hilary Tompkins, Solicitor, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on H.R. 5412, the ''Bureau of Reclamation Surface Water Storage Streamlining Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 1600, the ''Requirements, Expectations, and Standard Procedures for Executive Consultation with

Tribes (RESPECT) Act''; and H.R. 4668, the ''Point Spencer Coast Guard and Public-Private Sector Infrastructure Development Facilitation and Land Conveyance Act''. Testimony was heard from Michael Black, Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Kip Knudson, Director of State/Federal Relations, Office of Governor Sean Parnell, State of Alaska; and public witnesses.

OBSTRUCTING OVERSIGHT: CONCERNS FROM INSPECTORS GENERAL

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Obstructing Oversight: Concerns from Inspectors General''. Testimony was heard from Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, Department of Justice; Arthur A. Elkins, Jr., Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency; and Kathy A. Buller, Inspector General, Peace Corps.

EXPLORING OUR SOLAR SYSTEM: THE ASTEROIDS ACT AS A KEY STEP

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space held a hearing entitled ''Exploring Our Solar System: The ASTEROIDS Act as a Key Step''. Testimony was heard from Jim Green, Director, NASA Planetary Science Division; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION: MANAGEMENT AND OUTLOOK

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Small Business Administration: Management and Outlook''. Testimony was heard from Maria Contreras-Sweet, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

THE STATUS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''The Status of the Merchant Marine''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 5404, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; H.R. 3593, the ''VA Construction Assistance Act of 2013''; H.R. 4276, the ''Veterans Traumatic Brain Injury Care Improvement Act of 2014''; H.R. 4399, the ''Comprehensive Department of Veterans Affairs Performance Management and Accountability Reform Act of 2014''; H.R. 4862, the ''Our Vets Deserve Better Act''; H.R. 4971, the ''Ask Veterans Act''; and H.R. 5094, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup certain bonuses or awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5404 and H.R. 3593. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5094, H.R. 4399, H.R. 4276, and H.R. 4971. H.R. 4862 was pulled from the markup after the failure of an offered amendment.

METRICS, MEASUREMENTS AND MISMANAGEMENT IN THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Metrics, Measurements and Mismanagement in the Board of Veterans' Appeals''. Testimony was heard from Kelli Kordich, Senior Counsel, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Department of Veterans Affairs; Laura Eskenazi, Executive in Charge and Vice Chairman, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

STATUS OF AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on the status of Affordable Care Act implementation. Testimony was heard from John Koskinen, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service; and Andy Slavitt, Principal Deputy Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider the nominations of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, and Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, both to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Peter Zumwalt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, Robert T. Yamate, of California, to be Ambassador to the

Republic of Madagascar, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Union of the Comoros, Virginia E. Palmer, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malawi, and David Nathan Saperstein, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, all of the Department of State, 3 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1690, to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007, S. 1535, to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, S. 2646, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and the nominations of Madeline Cox Arleo, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wendy Beetlestone, Mark A. Kearney, Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., and Gerald J. Pappert, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Victor Allen Bolden, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Armando Omar Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Stephen R. Bough, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, David J. Hale, and Gregory N. Stivers, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, and Arthur Lee Bentley III, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Florida, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Examining H.R. ____, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2014'', 9:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Office of Inspector General and Its Ongoing Failure to Comply with a Subpoena for Documents about a Recent Investigation'', 9:45 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''The Decline in Business Formation: Implications for Entrepreneurship and the Economy'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: At approximately 9:30 a.m., Senate will observe a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001.

At approximately 9:30 a.m., Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2199, Paycheck Fairness Act, post-cloture.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, September 11

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barber, Ron, Ariz., E1377
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E1379
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1383
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1375
Capito, Shelley Moore, W.Va., E1383, E1385
Castor, Kathy, Fla., E1378, E1380, E1382, E1386
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1376
Enyart, William L., Ill., E1384
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1376
Gardner, Cory, Colo., E1381
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1375, E1377
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1379
Green, Gene, Tex., E1380
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1384
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1377
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1376
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E1385
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1378
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1377
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E1383
Messer, Luke, Ind., E1381
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E1384, E1385
Miller, George, Calif., E1381
Murphy, Tim, Pa., E1384
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E1381, E1386
Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E1379
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1382
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E1378
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E1376, E1384
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E1375
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1376, E1379, E1384
Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E1378
Valadao, David G., Calif., E1375, E1377, E1382, E1385
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1379
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E1375

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.