United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015 No. 32

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 25, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CRESENT HARDY 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 6, 2015, 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.

BRING A CLEAN DHS BILL TO THE FLOOR

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a question: Should America be brought to the brink of her own security and safety? With that question, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans and the Speaker, to put on the floor of the House the full funding of the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of beginning my tenure on this committee in the aftermath of the tragedy on 9/11. Some of us who served at that time were able to go to the site after 9/11. We were able to go soon enough to see some of those who were in the midst of recovering, since the first responders of New York refused to leave anyone behind.

It was a devastating and emotional time, but the resilience of that time also reflected America's values. I remember very strongly standing on the steps of the House, Republicans and Democrats, singing the song ''God Bless America.''

What we have come to today is that we are frivolously using these political tactics of taking political security over national security and rejecting our responsibility of ensuring that the men and women who are on the front lines for the security of this Nation can continue their jobs.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a court order that has temporarily issued an injunction. That court in Texas did not in any way assess the constitutionality of the President's executive actions. Why? Because he has the authority. His comments that have been repeated over and over again about his lack of authority were, yes, he does not have the authority to convey an immigration status. His executive actions are not on immigration status. They are simply keeping families from being torn apart and mothers and fathers and children from being deported. It is not an immigration status. It is a stay of deportation.

And so the fuss that is being made impacts the TSA officer tragically shot in a Los Angeles airport, or New York or Houston or Dallas or Chicago or Raleigh-Durham; that TSA officer who stands on the front lines of our security and we look them in the eye and tell them they cannot be paid. You know, Mr. Speaker, when the shutdown happened before, it was Democrats who had to retroactively ensure that those workers were paid.

We want border security? We won't be paying our Border Patrol agents or ICE agents. Even though it is suggested that fees will take care of it, there are 30,000 employees that the fees will not take care of.

So I rise today pleading to have my friends acknowledge that, first of all, they are wrong on the executive actions. As we go to a hearing in Judiciary, I will be able to show that these individuals will probably be vetted more extensively than many others in the immigration process. Fourteen provisions have to be utilized before they can be eligible for the executive action the President has suggested.

But what I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, as I started by saying, is that we are bringing America to the brink. In the midst of my comments, I indicated that I remember how we came together in the tragedy of 9/11. Well, we have a tragedy right now. We have a raging ISIS and ISIL, we have an unknown terrorist threat, and we know that the United States, although strong, stands, as the rest of the world does, needing to be prepared for those who want to be individualized, franchised terrorists.

I take my responsibility seriously. I believe in the Constitution. I even believe in language that indicates, as we say often in the Declaration of Independence, that we all are created equal, and language in the Constitution that says we have come to form a more perfect Union.

This is not perfect, and this can be remedied. I ask the Speaker to put this bill on the floor of the House in the name of firefighters and police officers and ICE officers and grants going to cities for using their best tactics; fusion centers that deal with terrorism—in their name, and many others, like Border Patrol; ICE, as I indicated; the Secret Service, as I indicated; TSA agents; parts of FAA; and FEMA, when the North is freezing and needs that kind of assistance.

In the name of the people of the United States of America, how much pleading do I need to do? As a member of the Homeland Security Committee believing in those innocent families who have come here to do nothing more than to work on behalf of their families and desire to be united, on behalf of the mothers and fathers, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Speaker put on the floor of the House a clean DHS bill so that we can vote now, now, now.

SERVING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans Affairs Office of the Inspector General issued a report last Wednesday on their investigation into the nearly 14,000 veteran benefits claims that were found in a filing cabinet in Oakland, California.

Last year, these claims were brought to our attention by VA staff members, who have known about these claims for many years—despite their best efforts to raise awareness of the injustice in how these claims were being handled.

In July 2014, the former Deputy Under Secretary of the VA for Field Operations testified before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that the 14,000 claims that were found in a file cabinet had been brokered so that they would receive attention by the VA's highest performing offices.

Just 2 weeks prior to that on a site visit to the Oakland VA, the regional and division management told me that these 14,000 claims basically never existed. As a matter of fact, they claim it was a story made up by disgruntled employees.

The VA's Office of Inspector General's investigation confirmed the discovery of 14,000 claims in a filing cabinet, confirmed that some of these claims dated back to the 1990s, confirmed that thousands of these claims had not been processed, and confirmed that the staff at the Oakland VA had not been directed to properly store these claims.

Oakland VA's management claimed after my visit that they then had discovered 13,184 veteran benefit claims and 2,155 claims which required action or review. But during an onsite review, the Office of Inspector General could not confirm the existence of these claims due to the Oakland VA management's ''poor recordkeeping practices.''

How was the Oakland VA able to arrive at such exact numbers without maintaining records that allowed the OIG to verify the existence of these claims? It just doesn't make sense, and we have to get to the bottom of these numbers. The VA is required by law to respond to every initial claim they receive, to safeguard Federal records, and to protect private information of the veterans they work with.

When the Oakland VA managers discovered that 2,155 claims were more than several years old and required action or review, a special projects team was formed to complete this urgent task. Members of this team have told my staff that many of those claims belonged to veterans who had passed away while waiting for benefits to be processed and that their families were never contacted.

Inexplicably, the Office of Inspector General later discovered that 537 initial claims that had been marked by this special team as processed were never actually processed. Some of these claims were as old as June 2002, yet another troubling instance of the Oakland VA managers failing to provide the type of service northern California's veterans deserve.

The VA Office of Inspector General viewed only 34 of these unprocessed claims, though for some reason they declined to select a random sample. Instead, the 34 claims were selected ''judiciously,'' which didn't make any sense. Of the 34 claims that were reviewed by the Inspector General's office, seven still remain unprocessed. In fact, though, these claims had been reviewed several times from December 2012 to June 2014 without any action being taken. In one instance, a veteran with PTSD was underpaid almost $3,000 because his initial claim was not processed correctly.

This type of dysfunction and complete lack of oversight and accountability cannot continue in Oakland or at any VA regional offices across the country.

Sadly, this report sheds very little light on who should be accountable for these failures and is incomplete.

I am grateful the report was done and that the inspector general did delve into this issue at Oakland and many other offices, but the fact that no real conclusions were made on who is to be held accountable means much work remains to be done. We must continue to search for these answers and work to make sure the VA regional offices are properly serving our veterans.

I am also grateful, on the positive, for the many staff members of the VA—many, former veterans themselves—who care about this. They process many of these claims and make sure veterans are served. But we see there are a lot of holes in the system, obviously, that are making many veterans not have the confidence that they are going to be served, that they are going to get their claims processed, or indeed get health care if they need it later.

Indeed, the tragedy we have is that anywhere from 12 to 22 veterans give up each day in this country and commit suicide. Because they have no hope left of having the promise kept to them shows that we have much to do.

So I am grateful for those VA staffers that come to us blowing the whistle on what is wrong with the system when they can't get help from their management to make things right. We ask them to please keep coming forward.

Contact my office, contact my staff on what needs to be done to get the word out to help make this right, because we want the VA to function well. We want the employees to feel like they are part of a system that is serving veterans and to have a good relationship within their office, but also to ultimately serve what we need as taxpayers and Americans that revere our veterans.

PASS A DHS FUNDING BILL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I stand here this morning as a member of the Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Homeland Security. Our subcommittee is responsible for setting and overseeing funding for the operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

In 2 days, on February 27, astoundingly, funding for the Department of Homeland Security runs out because the Republican majority can't agree on a bill due to their internal disagreements on the immigration provisions which are contained in the same bill because it is in the same Department.

Although a clean funding bill, H.R. 861, could quickly be brought to this House floor for a vote to fund the entire Department for the remainder of this fiscal year, Republicans have defaulted to the rightwing extremists in their own party and instead have chosen to hold the security of our Nation hostage in order to contort the legislative process.

They would defund the President's immigration executive order merely because they want a partisan win more than they want to govern. What a tragedy.

□ 1015

To quote an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post: ''The fervor of Republican partisanship, especially in the House, is immune to logic beyond an insistence on victory at any cost.''

This is a Republican Party that just a year and a half ago shut our Nation's government down for 16 days, stopping critical services and doing significant harm to the U.S. economy; then, too, they seemed more interested in a political win than responsible governance.

Recall, their party also had the opportunity last Congress to bring a bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill to the floor for a vote but declined to act. They have chosen not to address a concern that an overwhelming number of Americans believe needs to be resolved.

There are grave consequences for forcing the Department of Homeland Security into a shutdown. The Republican Congress would cripple the Federal Emergency Management Agency's preparations for future disasters as

more than a fifth of personnel are furloughed.

The Republican Congress would end the Federal Emergency Management Agency's training activities with local law enforcement for weapons of mass destruction.

The Republican Congress would cut off pay to thousands of Department of Homeland Security employees who are personally tasked with protecting our homeland.

The Republican Congress would stop research and development work on countermeasures to protect us against devastating biological threats, on nuclear detection equipment, and on cargo and passenger screening technologies.

The Republican Congress would shutter the Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, meaning there will be no alerts or coordination efforts with local law enforcement agencies if a nuclear event occurs.

This is so utterly irresponsible. In an era of amplified global threats, brutal terrorist attacks throughout Europe, and escalating tension throughout the Middle East, to cut off funding for the Department tasked with ensuring our homeland security is safe and secure is truly dangerous.

This sort of behavior throws sand into the gears of a great society, of a great country, the oldest Republic on the face of the Earth. The American people surely are looking for reassurance that their government will offer them the security and dependability they expect.

We have a responsibility to protect their security, even if it means we no longer can indulge in political brinksmanship.

Mr. Speaker, we have a working bipartisan majority here in this House that holds the power to govern this Nation. All it needs is the will.

Let's bring the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill to the floor today. Let's stop playing political games with the safety and security of the American people.

We owe it to them to govern and to do the job we were elected to do.

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 17 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Tierian Cash, National Chaplain for the American Legion, Longs, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, in whose name we trust and pray, it is fitting to pause, if but momentarily, to recognize You, the One in whom does finally reside all authority and power and by whose grace we are allowed to exercise that which You have committed to us.

Accept our homage, O Lord, and hear us when we pray for wisdom to lead with integrity, compassion, and conviction.

We are mindful that around the world today our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsmen are standing the watch to safeguard our peace and liberty.

Grant to all who serve and their families Your blessings.

Accept, O Lord, these prayers, and may we perceive and know what things to do and receive grace and power to fulfill what is expected of us. We commit our best efforts and our Nation to Your keeping.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND TIERIAN ''RANDY'' CASH

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, please join me in welcoming to the House of Representatives today our guest chaplain, my constituent and fellow resident of Lincoln County, North Carolina, Reverend Randy Cash.

A native North Carolinian, Reverend Cash was commissioned as a Navy chaplain in 1980. During his 26 years of Active Duty, Reverend Cash has done tours supporting both the Navy and Marines with time in Liberia, the Congo, and Albania and supporting Operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and, most recently, Operation Enduring Freedom.

Additionally, Reverend Cash has served as deputy chaplain to the U.S. Marine Corps and multiple roles for the Naval Chaplaincy School, including commanding officer.

Reverend Cash is visiting Washington this week for the 55th annual conference of the American Legion, for which he currently serves as national chaplain for that fine organization.

Please join me in welcoming Reverend Cash to the House of Representatives, and thank him for his years of dedicated service to our Nation, our Nation's men and women in the military, and our veterans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

EDUCATION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I believe in an opportunity society where hard work, education, innovation, and risk are rewarded and we empower individuals, not government.

Unfortunately, Washington's broken reflex these days is: when in doubt, regulate. That type of thinking must cease if we are to reach this Nation's full potential. One of the clearest examples of unnecessary and unsuccessful Federal intervention is the law currently governing our K–12 education system.

This week, the House will consider the Student Success Act, which empowers the people closest to students with the authority to make education choices in their respective States and communities.

Local control always delivers programs and services more efficiently and effectively. By scaling back Washington's one-size-fits-all micromanagement of classrooms, this legislation takes positive steps toward ensuring local educators have the flexibility required to meet the diverse needs of their students.

FUNDING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security is charged with safeguarding our Nation from acts of terrorism, drug trafficking, and many other serious threats.

Whether they serve in the Coast Guard, Border Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, or elsewhere, the men and women who work for the Department of Homeland Security in my home State of New Hampshire and across this country play a vital role in keeping our families safe; yet Congress is poised to shut down DHS this Friday for partisan political reasons.

This would undermine our security and impact hardworking men and women from across my district, like Darrell, from Groveton, New Hampshire, who serves in the Coast Guard, and Lee, another Granite Stater, who works for Customs and Border Protection. She wrote to me recently and said: ''No one wins if this political standoff continues.''

I agree. We were elected to work together in the best interest of those we represent, not to play partisan political games.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department of Homeland Security open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

FEDERAL TEXAS JUDGE IMMIGRATION RULING

(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, my constituents and a majority of Americans oppose President Obama's executive amnesty. His amnesty is unconstitutional, which is why I am pleased that U.S. district court Judge Andrew Hanen has blocked Obama's amnesty from going into effect. Not surprisingly, the administration is now appealing.

As the legal process works its way through the courts, Congress must continue to stand strong and fight the President's unlawful amnesty. Just this month, I exposed Obama's empty words that illegals getting amnesty would be paying taxes. The IRS Commissioner confirmed that Obama's amnesty will, in fact, allow the IRS to give illegals thousands of dollars.

These tax refunds aren't refunds in the usual sense but amnesty checks from the IRS. This is wrong. I am working on legislation to stop it. Law-abiding and hardworking American taxpayers deserve nothing less.

COUNTING DOWN TO GOP SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are playing politics with the security of the American people, and the American people deserve better.

What was absolutely laughable a few days ago, it now appears that they are prepared to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. They won't budge, even though they have known all along that the House version of the bill will never pass the Senate, and if it did, the President would surely veto it, as he should.

They are willing to burden this entire country with all the dangers and disruptions that a funding lapse would bring. They are willing to shut down funding for the security in the New York City rail system, communications equipment in Los Angeles, bomb-sniffing dogs in Massachusetts, and firefighter positions across this Nation, just so that they can put on another hollow, pointless political show.

This legislation is failure by design. I find it scandalous that the Islamic terrorists are fully funded; yet the Department of Homeland Security that protects our citizens may not be.

I urge a vote on a clean Homeland Security bill for the protection of our citizens.

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS TO CHANGE COURSE

(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, during the Presidents' Day break, I served on a delegation meeting with the leaders of Afghanistan, Jordan, and Iraq. Each was grateful for the support given in their fight against terrorists who seek mass murder of innocent civilians.

Daesh, the Arab translation of ISIL, has spread as a cancer across the region and threatens to attack the American people. President Obama's failing policies are weakening defense, and he needs to change course, as he did with the 2009 Afghan surge.

In Syria, the President's strategy has set the stage for Daesh to expand. In Iraq, his failure to achieve a status of forces agreement has led to instability. The attack on Libya has led to a failed state. The pitiful negotiations with Iran puts America at risk. His claimed success in Yemen has proven inaccurate.

Radical Islamists have declared war on the West, intend to exterminate Jews, and seek to destroy modern democratic civilizations. The first mass slaughters have been of fellow Muslims at mosques, at soft targets, but safe havens anywhere are a threat to American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

THREE DAYS UNTIL THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, there are only 3 days left until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, forcing thousands of TSA, Customs, Border Patrol, and Secret Service agents to put their lives on the line to protect American citizens without being paid.

This has gone on far too far. We have taken weeks of time on the floor of this House, waiting for what we know ultimately would be passed, and that is a clean Homeland Security bill.

Every Democrat has cosponsored legislation to fully fund this Department, without trying to overreach and get through the appropriations process that which the majority is unwilling to do legislatively.

If you were so interested in immigration policy, the majority would long ago have brought comprehensive immigration reform to the floor of the House. Have we seen that? No—neither have we seen any legislation that the American people are really looking for, legislation that would put America back to work, build new infrastructure, and create jobs in this country.

This has gone on far too far. We have got to get this essential function of government fully funded and get back to the business that the American people sent us to.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its essential mission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

PRESIDENT OBAMA VETOES KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

(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, despite overwhelming bipartisan support from my colleagues in both the House and the Senate, the President vetoed the Keystone XL pipeline project in the name of political expediency; rather than listening to a majority of the American public, the President's veto kowtows to a

vocal minority of extreme environmental groups.

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision yesterday is a giant leap backwards on a road to energy independence, effectively saying ''no'' to the creation of over 40,000 American jobs and lower energy prices for businesses and families.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama had the opportunity to stand up and show true leadership, but unfortunately, he chose to, once again, hide behind political motives.

□ 1215

ECONOMIC GROWTH FOR NEVADA

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, just this morning, Nevada Attorney General Laxalt testified before the House Judiciary Committee, claiming that the implementation of DAPA and extension of DACA would cause undue economic hardship for our State. Well, I would like to see his evidence, because data show that granting administrative relief to qualified undocumented immigrants would actually contribute to economic growth.

Thanks to these executive actions, the legal workforce will expand, and average wages for all workers will increase by $170 a year. The Federal deficit will be reduced by $25 billion, and GDP will grow from $90 billion to $210 billion over the next decade. Furthermore, it is estimated that expanding DACA and DAPA will increase Nevada's GDP from $700 million to $1.7 billion over the next 10 years and lead to $21 million in additional tax revenue for the State over the next 5 years.

So, in short, General, not implementing the President's actions is not only morally indefensible, but also economically foolish. And, I might add, holding up DHS funding for this purpose is a shameful political act that puts Americans at risk.

M–855 AMMO BAN

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for the rights of law-abiding Americans to protect their homes, and I am standing in opposition to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' unreasonable proposal to ban entire classes of ammunition.

As an American, I personally use this ammunition to defend my home and my family, and that is my constitutional right. I find it ironic that the President of the United States continues to say, well, if we would just arm the people of other countries, then ISIS wouldn't exist, while he uses each and every means possible to violate our Second Amendment right to protect ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to set the record straight, and I look forward to meeting with the ATF and discussing their budget and making sure that they don't have the legal authority or the funding to take away Americans' constitutional rights to keep and bear arms and ammo.

DHS SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, in 3 days, the Department of Homeland Security will needlessly run out of funding—yes, 3 days. Shutting down the Department of Homeland Security will jeopardize local disaster relief grants. It will stall critical safety training for firefighters and first responders and will force thousands of Border Patrol agents, Active Duty Coast Guard servicemembers, and airport security screeners across the country to work without pay.

House Republicans are threatening the safety and security of our Nation and our families by refusing to pass a clean security funding bill, instead, pushing for anti-immigration amendments. This is unwise, this is unnecessary, and this is wrong. We should not play partisan politics when our Nation's security is on the line.

We must pass a funding bill that does not include harmful provisions, so that our Nation remains safe and secure. That is why I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

STRENGTHENING TAX-FREE 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 529, a bill I have cosponsored that strengthens tax-free 529 college savings accounts. The cost of higher ed has increased by more than 500 percent since 1985, yet the President recently proposed a tax hike on 529 savings of students and middle class families.

There is a big difference between being able to afford college and being able to pay for it. The 529s help bridge that gap for millions of working Americans who make too little to cover tuition but just enough to be ineligible for financial aid.

Our Nation's long-term prosperity depends on our ability to prepare the next generation for success. Let's start now by passing H.R. 529.

DHS SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand that a clean, straightforward Department of Homeland Security funding bill be brought to the House floor for a vote immediately. After today, there are only 2 more days until the entire Department of Homeland Security is shut down, 2 days until the men and women who work to protect our national security stop receiving a paycheck, 2 days until the doors are shut at the Department responsible for ensuring America's safety.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to debate the merits of immigration reform, then bring an immigration bill to the floor. We would welcome that debate. We are ready to work on a comprehensive bill to fix a broken system. In the meantime, don't play games with our national security.

Again, I urge the House leadership to bring a clean funding bill. It is H.R. 861. We need to keep the Department of Homeland Security open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe, and we need to be able to move forward to work on the pressing matters facing our country.

DHS SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect us to deliver solutions and to fix problems; they expect us to act responsibly and govern. We can do this by working together and averting a shutdown at the Department of Homeland Security.

Let me be clear: shutting down the Department of Homeland Security should not be an option, and I am adamantly opposed to letting this happen.

Our first and foremost responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to protect our Nation. Ever since the attacks of September 11, 2001, the need for the Department of Homeland Security became clear, and the Department of Homeland Security has proven vital to keeping the American people safe amid an ongoing war against terror.

Terror threats do not just go away until Washington is able to come to a compromise. There is certainly broad disagreement, Mr. Speaker, in this country over the President's executive actions. By shutting down DHS, it only makes us more vulnerable to attacks. It is absolutely the wrong approach to addressing this disagreement. There is no room for political brinkmanship when the security of the American public is at stake.

SELMA VOTING RIGHTS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of the voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery and to urge my colleagues to pass voting rights legislation in this Congress.

In 1960, there were only 66,000 African Americans registered to vote in Alabama. In 1965, there were 15,000 Black residents of Dallas County, Alabama, where Selma is located, but fewer than 200 were registered to vote. African Americans who attempted to vote faced intimidation, discrimination, and worse.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the unrelenting efforts of heroes like our colleague from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, helped correct these injustices. But the fight isn't over. State legislation, ballot initiatives, and court cases across the country in recent years have jeopardized the voter registration protections that JOHN LEWIS and others fought so hard for.

We need to stay vigilant, and we need new legislation today. As we celebrate Black History Month, let's recognize how far we have come. Let's pass voting rights legislation in this Congress for the good of the country.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE VETO

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, for more than 6 years, the President has called for taxpayer-funded infrastructure projects. In the first year of his administration, he squandered nearly $1 trillion on so-called shovel-ready projects that he later joked weren't shovel ready at all. Mr. Speaker, $1 trillion is $8,000 taken from every family in America, on average. That is what we spent. That is what he joked about when it turned out we got very little for it.

Now along comes the Keystone pipeline. It promises $8 billion of private investment at no cost to taxpayers. That major infrastructure project would have produced 42,000 construction-related jobs and, when finished, more than a half million barrels a day of Canadian crude oil entering the American economy. That is what he vetoed after it was sent to him with bipartisan votes out of both Houses.

He calls this middle class economics. The reality is it is a war on the middle class. And that is no joke.

DHS SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the imminent danger our country faces in 3 days. Right now, Republicans have decided that it is more important to listen to the Tea Party and their extremist views rather than funding the Department of Homeland Security.

And I don't want to hear this mess from Republicans about, oh, the workers are still going to get paid. Let me tell you something. We are talking about 250,000 essential employees that could go without pay—that are airport screeners and are doing important things like keeping us safe—and sending them to work without pay, where they don't know how they are going to make their car note; they don't know if they are going to be able to pay their mortgage or bring groceries home. That is putting America in danger.

We need to keep Homeland Security open. We need to stop playing this reckless game that the Republicans are putting us through because it is the duty of Congress to keep American families safe and govern responsibly.

Republicans need to realize that the only path through this is having us do a clean DHS bill. It is time for Republicans to join the 192 House Democrats that have already signed up. We need to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

ISIS

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the last several months, Islamic State has shown just how barbaric they can be. They are willing to kill and torture innocent people in the most savage ways to intimidate the United States and the civilized world. With the recent beheadings in the Middle East and the multiple shootings in Europe, it is very clear that terrorism is a problem that only continues to grow.

Islamic State might be the most well-trained, well-equipped, and well-financed terror group we have seen; and if an international coalition is not willing to stop them, no one will.

I have supported President Obama's use of airstrikes since they began several months ago to push back on Islamic State, and I still strongly believe that we should continue these strikes with our Arab partners.

Throughout our history, we have shown that we can overcome any obstacle and defeat any enemy if we are willing to stand up to it.

However, I have so far been disappointed that the President has asked for an Authorization for Use of Military Force without articulating a clear strategy on how to ultimately defeat the enemy. If President Obama would present such a plan, I believe both Republicans and Democrats in both Chambers would stand with him and show the world that we are united in confronting this dangerous enemy.

I hope the President takes this opportunity to lead and unite the American people toward defeating our latest adversary in the war on terror.

DHS SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are only 3 days until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, forcing more than 50,000 TSA airport security screeners and tens of thousands of Customs and Border Protection officers to work without pay. Many of these dedicated public servants work at Los Angeles International Airport, LAX, which is in my congressional district. They screen the passengers and examine the cargo to keep the airports secure.

LAX is the sixth busiest airport in the world and third busiest in the United States. In 2013, LAX served more than 66 million passengers and processed more than 1.9 million tons of cargo with a value of over $91.6 billion.

The security of LAX is critical for the people of Los Angeles and the entire country, and the public servants who work hard every day to keep our airports safe deserve to be paid for the work that they do. Let's fund DHS now.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1230

CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, today, as we consider many issues surrounding the education of our Nation's youth, I rise to draw attention to the importance of career technical education. Having raised five kids, I understand how access to quality learning is critical to ensuring that every child has an opportunity to achieve their potential.

That is why I have worked to support career and technical education and teach students the relevant skills they need to get a good-paying job. Often referred to as vocational, or voc-ed, CTE

courses frequently offer on-the-job training that translates into employment right after graduation. That means more opportunities for students and less debt.

I was proud to learn that Cheboygan Area High School in my congressional district was named one of the top schools in northern Michigan in CTE, an achievement for which Cheboygan Area Schools should be justifiably proud. It is my hope that students in northern Michigan and all over the United States will take advantage of quality CTE programs to further their careers and continue to grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to supporting measures that help to return control of education to States and parents, allowing families to choose an educational program that fits their needs.

CELEBRATING WEST COAST PORTS AND ILWU, PMA DEAL

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I, along with the rest of the country, am breathing a sigh of relief that full-time work has resumed at our west coast ports. I wanted to publicly thank the ILWU and the PMA for staying at the table and finally reaching an agreement. I want to thank President Obama and our Labor Secretary Perez for their help in bringing about a resolution.

Many of my colleagues here in Congress were calling me daily for updates because the workers, the farmers, the businesses, and the consumers in their districts were also impacted by what happens on the west coast ports.

I represent the men and women who work on those ports, so our economy in the harbor area was greatly affected, but we also realize that these ports are an economic engine for the entire country. Our west coast ports support millions of American jobs and provide a vital link to global commerce. So today I am going to testify before the Budget Committee to remind Congress that we should fully fund all the ports in this country because they are such an important link to our economy.

NET NEUTRALITY

(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, as you can see, we have quite a variety of issues that we are talking about today. Whether it is the President's executive amnesty and overreach, the overreach of the DHS, or the veto of the Keystone pipeline, people are concerned about what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn our attention to another issue: the takeover of the Internet by the Federal Communications Commission. We just completed a hearing at the Energy and Commerce Committee on this issue. I tell you there is great concern about what the FCC would do with the Internet.

The Internet is not broken, and it does not need the Federal Government to fix it. So people are rightfully concerned about that. The FCC, in taking control of the Internet, would do a couple of things. First of all, it would be a loss of some of our freedoms because the FCC would reclassify the Internet to title II. Now, title II of the Communications Act is the 1930s-era law that regulates telephones and telecommunications. It would thereby subject the Internet, which is an information service, to a host of taxes, regulation, and international consideration. This is not the direction we want to go with the Internet. Let's not use 1930s-era laws on an information service. Let's make certain that the FCC delays their net neutrality order and that we work together to keep the Internet open and free.

DHS SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, as I stand before this body today, it is with a tremendous amount of concern for the brave men and women who are protecting our country and work for the Department of Homeland Security. We are only about 48 hours or so away from a potential shutdown, and I am concerned about these people, who are going to have to continue to work because they are dedicated, loyal, and patriotic Americans but won't be getting paid if we allow this government to shut down.

Now, all we have to do in this House of Representatives is to bring up a clean Homeland Security funding bill. That is all we have to do. The Senate majority leader said he would do that. So we can get this problem solved right away.

This situation is being handled in the courts, and this body of ours, this House of Representatives, is no place to try to work out some sort of ideological partisan divide around immigration. This is an occasion for us to look out after the safety and security of the American people and to fund and pay the salaries of the workers who guarantee that security, not a time for partisan ideological chicanery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry on its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

THE IRS' PUTATIVE LACK OF FUNDS FOR TAX FORMS AND INSTRUCTION BOOKLETS

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on an issue that many constituents brought to my attention. Tax Day is right around the corner, and as many folks prepare to file their taxes, they are having issues locating the proper forms.

The IRS has notified local libraries—and even congressional offices like mine—that it does not have the money to distribute enough tax forms and instruction booklets so that taxpayers can file their returns accurately and on time. As a result, Mr. Speaker, seniors and those without access to the Internet are scrambling to find 1040 instruction booklets and tax schedules they need to accurately file their taxes. My office distributed nearly 40 tax instruction books and tax forms during a recent community office hours event in Lebanon County, and the demand continues to grow daily.

Mr. Speaker, the IRS' claim that they can no longer afford to send tax forms to local libraries due to budget cuts is disingenuous. And while needing more than 40 pages of instructions to complete the least complicated tax return is proof enough for simplifying the Tax Code, it is no excuse for the IRS to make paying your Federal taxes an even bigger headache by making it more difficult for my constituents to get the documents they need. Let's get our tax forms where they are needed.

THE CONCERNS OF OUR DISTRICTS

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges we have here in the House of Representatives is to speak to any issue during this period of time.

Regrettably, I rise today to speak of the death of an iconic figure, a dynamic force for social justice, Georgia Jones Ayers, who was not from my congressional district but from Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON's district, and I am sure that the two of us will add additional remarks.

I also happily today come to the floor to congratulate the Dillard High School girls basketball team and the Palm Beach Lakes High School basketball teams. Dillard and Coach Pinder, my dear friend, have had such a consecutive run that they are becoming a real force nationally as well as locally, and Palm Beach County took theirs as well. So I am fortunate that I have girls basketball teams that are champions, and I proudly congratulate them.

CADILLAC TAX

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the estimated 12 million Americans in the middle class who are paying more than $1,000 extra per year because of the excise tax on health care plans included in the ObamaCare legislation called the Cadillac tax. This legislation is set to take effect in 2018; however, employers, labor unions, and municipalities all back home are already preparing for this devastating tax.

In order to comply with this 40 percent penalty on health care plans, Mr. Speaker, employers and municipalities are looking at increasing deductibles, reducing benefits, and shifting costs to consumers as well as property taxpayers. In fact, in Manchester, our State's largest city, an anticipated cost of 5 to $6 million alone will impact the property taxpayers. This will undoubtedly result in an increase in our local property taxes, which, as every Granite Stater knows, are already sky high.

Mr. Speaker, Americans simply can't afford this tax, which is why I introduced a repeal bill. I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats to get this bill passed.

HONORING SISTER CLARE CARTY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great leader and visionary in my community, Sister Clare Carty, who passed away on Saturday, February 14, at the age of 78. Sister Clare was born in Philadelphia and entered the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia in 1955, beginning her career as an elementary school teacher. In 1980, she joined the St. Mary Medical Center system as an assistant administrator, where I happened to be working as a hospital pharmacy clerk. I will never forget her kind interaction with her staff. Nobody was more proud of the colleagues, physicians, and volunteers at St. Mary's than Sister Clare.

In 1982, Sister Clare rose to the rank of president and CEO at St. Mary. Her persistence and leadership led to the development of one of the first community hospital open heart surgery programs in the area, as well as the establishment of the only trauma center in my home community of the County of Bucks.

After two decades of work, Sister Clare left St. Mary to serve in the development of Home Health Services for Catholic Health East, and once she retired from health care administration, she devoted her time to the Sisters of St. Francis. Sister Clare was instrumental in establishing the Mother Bachmann Maternity Center, Children's Health Center, Family Resource Center, and Bucks County Health Improvement Project.

Mr. Speaker, you won't meet many people with the compassion, character, and very capable leadership of Sister Clare. She touched and improved not just the medical center but our entire community. I celebrate her life and her legacy, her faithful example, and her leadership. We are certainly grateful to know Sister Clare, and I am thankful for everything she did for the people of Pennsylvania and all those that she served.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 529, SECTION 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS AMENDMENTS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 121 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 121

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 529) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill 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 Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of March 2, 2015, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of March 1, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend, 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. WOODALL. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot going on in this rule today, a lot to be proud of.

I would like to start by thanking the folks on the Parliamentarian staff and Mr. Steve Cote on the Rules Committee. Folks don't pay a lot of attention to what goes on down here sometimes, what goes on behind the scenes, in order to bring a bill to the floor. We did a little extra work this time around. I am grateful to folks for working with me to get that done.

House Resolution 121 is a closed rule, but it makes in order the consideration of two bills. One is H.R. 529, a bill that passed by unanimous consent out of the Ways and Means Committee, that goes into these college savings plans and corrects some provisions that made it difficult for folks to redeposit money into those plans—again, all about trying to educate our children, to make sure they have the opportunities that we would want for them.

The second provision made in order by this rule is the general debate of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act. Folks may not know the Student Success Act yet, Mr. Speaker, though they will. It will become as normalized of a term as No Child Left Behind.

That was the last time we reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe we will find much disagreement in this Chamber about the need to go back into that language now, 13 years later, and make some improvements in order to better serve our children.

We might disagree about what those improvements are, but we know it is time to go back and get into that language and really try to make a difference for those families, students,

and schools back home. H.R. 5 intends to do just that.

This rule also provides suspension authority for any time through March 1 to bring up a resolution that either makes appropriations for or continues appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security.

You heard a lot about it during the 1 minutes this morning, Mr. Speaker. What we have is Department of Homeland Security funding which, as you know, funds so much of the immigration services function of our government.

As you know, a Federal judge has said that the plans the President has laid out cannot be completed lawfully. This House went forward and said: If it can't do those things lawfully, we are certainly not going to fund them in this bill.

Now, the Senate has not even been able to bring that bill up for debate, blocked on the Senate side from any discussion whatsoever.

We are going to hopefully find a resolution between now and the end of this week. I don't know when that resolution is going to come. When that resolution comes, I don't want to see this House delayed in bringing that resolution to the floor. Again, we have already done our work. My hope is the Senate can pass that bill, and we can go ahead and send it directly to the President's desk.

Whatever those machinations may need to be, this rule makes bringing an additional provision in order as soon as that language becomes available. That is maximum flexibility to do what I think folks on both sides of this Chamber want to do, and that is to ensure the steady, continuous, deliberate functioning of this government.

Mr. Speaker, No Child Left Behind, it was passed by a Republican House and a Republican Senate and sent to a Republican President for his signature. Today, that same Republican House is bringing forward a rewrite of that bill.

As much as we all have a love and affection for children, as much as we want public education in this country to succeed, sometimes, we don't get it right.

Again, I want to celebrate the bipartisanship in that. It is not everybody just looking to find somebody to blame. I think folks went into that process trying to do the very best that they could; but, in fact, we ended up with some top-down solutions that did not serve our districts as well as we would have hoped.

I am very fortunate, Mr. Speaker. I come from a district with wonderful public schools, just wonderful public schools. In fact, we are the fastest growing congressional district in the State of Georgia.

It is not because of any particular strong business presence, though we have a tremendously strong business presence. It is not because of our location in some pleasant area, though it is a particularly pleasant area. It is because our school systems are second to none.

It is hard when we have to have these conversations about funding for local schools because the money that I spend on these children is money that I am borrowing from these children.

It has to be an investment in these children. It has to be something that enables them to succeed even more tomorrow than they are today because I am borrowing it from their future. I am mortgaging their future in order to invest in them today. We all want those dollars to be used as well as they can.

It would be easy to have a conversation about funding children to say: Well, if $1 is good, then $2 must be better, and if $2 is good, then $4 must be better, and if $4 is good, then $1 million must be better, and if $1 million is good, then $1 trillion must be better.

I would dispute the attestation of any colleague who can find that direct correlation between dollars and performance. Dollars are critically important, and this bill provides those, but performance is tied to parents, it is tied to teachers, it is tied to principals, it is tied to communities. We cannot mandate that performance. We can only try to help those local folks succeed.

I know a lot of my colleagues are concerned that unless we mandate a solution from Washington, we will allow local communities to fail. I know that concern is heartfelt. I don't come from one of those communities.

The community I come from says: Washington is not getting it so right, but, trust us, we will take care of children down here because no one in Washington loves our children more than we do.

Again, we see that.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that children are going to succeed in this country, but there is an achievement gap. There is a gap, Mr. Speaker, depending on what your ZIP code is, between what success we expect to come from your family and what success you can actually attain.

I come from a county, Mr. Speaker, that is widely diverse, that has all the economic challenges you can imagine and all the economic successes that you can imagine as well. We come together to make sure that no child is left behind and to make sure that no child is held back.

We have both schools that are succeeding in ways that I could stand on this floor and brag about for hours, taking students from which the system expects so little and creating an opportunity for them to succeed so extraordinarily. I would like to see that replicated in school districts across the Nation. I see it back home in my school.

But we also have the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, GSMST. U.S. News & World Report names it the third best high school in the United States of America. I, of course, think U.S. News & World Report got it wrong. We are the absolute best high school in the United States of America.

A majority of that student body, Mr. Speaker, are minority students. A majority of that student body had an opportunity to go anywhere in the county they wanted to go, but they stood in line, hoping to win the lottery to get out of a school that was already performing well to get into this school where they could be exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, there are children standing in line across this country waiting to be exceptional. This bill aims to clear that line away and allow every child in America to achieve the excellence that you and I both know they deserve.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much at this time to be able to accommodate the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY. She was going to be scheduled to speak earlier. I am going to allow that she go forward now to discuss something that is very important, and then I will proceed with my opening, if the Speaker will allow.

There are only 3 days left until funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires, which will shut down many of the crucial operations that keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule that will allow for consideration of a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill. With such serious consequences, it is time to put politics aside and prioritize the safety and security of the American people.

To discuss that particular aspect of the proposal, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to immediately take up and pass a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Delaying the full-year bill limits the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's unity of effort initiative designed to improve coordination in our security missions; limits the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign; creates uncertainty regarding ICE's capacity to detain and deport dangerous criminals; complicates the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border stations; delays implementation of the new security upgrades at the White House and hiring increases of the U.S. Secret Service; delays terrorism preparedness, my colleagues, and response grants for State and local public safety personnel and from fusion centers.

I understand that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel quite strongly about the President's use of executive orders on immigration policy; but do they have the courage of their convictions to look the first responders they represent in the eye and to tell them that they are holding up critical assistance to firefighters, law enforcement, EMTs, and emergency managers because of a fight that is ideological over immigration?

This is disgraceful. The Homeland Security bill should never have been held hostage with only 3 days left until the Republican shutdown. Hasn't this gone on long enough? Isn't it time to abandon this failed strategy and pass a clean Homeland Security bill?

To that end, I urge this whole House to join me today in defeating the previous question so that my colleague Mr. HASTINGS can offer an amendment to provide a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I rise, obviously, in opposition to the rule and underlying bill because neither of these measures will keep the Department of Homeland Security from shutting down in 3 days, something that I am sure is of vital interest to my friend from Georgia who is an advocate, continuously and has been since being on the Rules Committee and here in Congress, of having an open process.

I would only urge that we understand that the last Congress, the 113th, was the most closed Congress in the history of all of the House of Representatives; yet, at this point, in this, the 114th Congress, we find ourselves in this position. In the last Congress, 38 percent of the rules were closed at this point, six out of 16.

As of today, this House has approved 75 percent of its rules that are closed. In other words, this Congress is on a path to be twice as closed as the last, which had the most, in history, closed rules.

Now, my friend Mr. WOODALL certainly understands that, and every Member of this House understands that. A lot of times, constituents hear us, and it sounds a whole lot like Washington speak, but the fact is, just simply, that when a rule is closed, as this one is, with the exception of one portion that is open for yet another provision in the measure, H.R. 5, but when a rule is closed, that means all of the other Members, all of your constituents who do not have an opportunity if they so choose, are precluded from offering an amendment to the base bill that is being discussed.

□ 1300

Congress has 3 days to act before we shut down; and truthfully, I don't believe that my friends on the Republican side are crazy enough to shut down the government at this point, so I think something is going to happen. I don't know what.

It is not like this debacle caught us by surprise. It was obvious way back when Congress funded the rest of the government for the year but funded DHS for only a few months. Yet each week my Republican friends continue to consider bills that will do nothing and go nowhere. And now, without a road map out of this quagmire, my Republican friends are threatening to double down on their politics by shutting down the agency responsible for our national security, yet somehow we find ourselves talking about completely unrelated measures.

You can disagree with the President—and many of you do, and sometimes some of us do. Great. It is a beautiful free country that we live in—but don't put our national security at risk to do it.

Now, I have heard my Republican colleagues' talking point—oh, no, don't worry about national security; most of the DHS employees will still work, and very little will change—but that is just a guess, because those employees will be expected to work without pay.

Among those who are expected to work without pay are more than 40,000 Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection officers, more than 50,000 TSA aviation security screeners, more than 13,000 Immigration and Customs Enforcement law enforcement agents and officers, more than 40,000 Active Duty Coast Guard military members, and more than 4,000 Secret Service law enforcement agents and officers.

Footnote right there. Very occasionally when we are talking budget matters and when we are talking authorization and appropriations, we talk about the need for certainty for the agencies that have to implement the measures that are before them. Well, that could not be truer at any point any more than with DHS needing that certainty as well.

To add insult to injury, when all this gets fixed—and it will need to be fixed—we will need to pass another measure to retroactively ensure that they receive their paychecks. But until then, there is no way for them to know when they will be paid. That kind of gamble is not the best way to ensure the stability of our national defense, and it is not fair to ask of the men and women keeping us safe.

We talk a lot about job creation here in this institution. My friends across the aisle gut clean air and water protections in the name of job creation. In the name of job creation, my friends hack away at the policies implemented to keep big banks from preying on hardworking Americans. If, by chance, DHS shuts down, approximately 30,000 employees would be furloughed. That is 30,000 families with jobs taken away.

Who knows how long a shutdown will last. We have already had months to address this lapse in funding. Why do we do this? Why is it every time we get ready to do something important, we play brinksmanship, we come up until the day of? It is really the kind of holding up of our process that is deleterious to the good of this country.

Just because DHS employees are furloughed or not being paid but still must go to work, that doesn't mean that their mortgage payment or their car payment or any other bills are going to go away. What are they supposed to say? ''Don't worry. I will pay you retroactively''? You can't run your household that way, and we certainly should not be running our government that way. For the life of me, I cannot understand why my Republican friends will not join House Democrats in supporting clean legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

So, after all that, what do these two education bills that are in this particular rule have to do with keeping DHS open? I have no idea. I consider them to be important, but they don't have anything to do with what is the most germane issue before us today, the most pertinent issue.

If the goal is to make college more affordable, there is no reason to focus on provisions used by only 3 percent of families. We need to make higher education more affordable for all Americans. Moreover, my friends have yet to explain what makes these 529 provisions so important that they are willing—listen to me carefully—to add $51 million to the deficit for these particular measures, $51 million added to the deficit that they talk so much about.

The other measure, H.R. 5, makes even less sense. It would have catastrophic consequences for our Nation's most vulnerable youth and their educators. I respect my colleague from Georgia immensely. I respect his intellect immensely. I am proud that his schools are doing extremely well in the community that he is privileged to serve. But I can tell you, based on what I know, that any changes to the No Child Left Behind program must adhere to the spirit of the law. In Florida, we didn't only leave children behind; we lost them and couldn't find them.

Somehow or another, we keep changing these things without having the accountability and the transparency. We cannot and we should not leave any child in America behind. Children with disabilities, English learners, families with less financial resources, and those from racial and ethnic minority groups of underserved communities all deserve quality education, and our Nation would be better for it if they all received quality education.

These two bills are distractions from the main event, side shows for the center ring of the circus. It is time for Congress to focus on the things that matter, because even as our economy grows stronger, we still have plenty of real work to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Just to be clear—we are down here talking about education today—I share my friend's passion for proper funding of this government. This House passed its funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security on January 14—January 14. This isn't something that has happened to us this week. January 14, the House did its business. The Senate has tried over and over and over to bring up a bill, and the Democrats haven't allowed them to even have the debate on the bill.

This all being said, this is a bill that refuses to fund what a Federal Court said would be illegal to do. How in the world we have been able to define the House work product that refuses to fund what the court said it would be illegal to do as somehow the wrong bill to bring to the floor is just a testimony to the messaging machine that my friends had. I wish we had more of that machine here. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back on the topic of the day, what does matter for our children back home.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of both of the bills that this rule brings to the floor: H.R. 529 and the Student Success Act. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am especially pleased that the Student Success Act is a major rewrite of the No Child Left Behind law. I was the only member from the Tennessee delegation—the 11-member delegation in the House and Senate, and I think one of 45 in the House—that voted against the original No Child Left Behind law, which was a great overreaction to failed school systems in a few of our Nation's biggest cities, and we certainly didn't need it in east Tennessee. That, much to my surprise, turned out to be one of the most popular votes I ever cast among public schoolteachers in east Tennessee.

I am here primarily today to speak in support of H.R. 529, which this rule also includes. Richard Vedder, an economist from Ohio University, wrote a few years ago a book called ''Going Broke By Degree,'' talking about how difficult it was to pay for higher education in this country today. Around the same time, U.S. News & World Report came out with a report that said college educations were almost becoming out of reach for most middle class families. We need to be doing everything we can to help families pay for college education, and we certainly don't need to be encouraging students to go further into debt.

It shocks students at the University of Tennessee when I tell them that it cost me $90 a quarter my first year at the University of Tennessee, $270 for the whole year. I heard the minority, the respected minority leader, Mr. HOYER, give a speech one time. He said his first year at the University of Maryland it cost him $87 a semester.

But then in the mid-1960s, the Federal student loan program came in, and the colleges and universities around the country started using that as a way to tamp down any opposition to tuition or fee increases, and college tuition and fees have just gone out of sight since that time.

I have been speaking out for years about how harmful the Federal student loan program has become for college students and their families. Now many others are saying the same thing. Kathleen Parker, writing in The Washington Post in January of 2013, said:

> Since 1985, the cost of higher education has increased 538 percent, while the consumer price index (inflation) over the same period has gone up 121 percent.

That is four-and-a-half times as much on the increases in college education.

Floyd Norris, writing in the international New York Times last February said: ''Student loans are creating large problems that may persist for decades. They will impoverish some borrowers and serve as a drain on economic activity.''

Hedge fund manager James Altucher wrote: ''We are graduating a generation of indentured'' students.

I can tell you, when I went to the University of Tennessee, people could work part time, as I always did, to pay all their tuition and fees. Almost no one got out of school with a debt; now, almost everyone does. Total outstanding student loan debt is now well over a trillion dollars. I think it is $1.3 trillion, and some people think it may be one of the next bubbles to burst.

So what does H.R. 529 do? It makes it easier for families to save for college educations. We need to do this. We also need to give bigger grants and so forth to the universities and colleges that hold their tuition and fees below the rate of inflation. We need to incentivize the colleges and universities to stop raising their tuition and fees at four and five times the rate of inflation. Until we do that, H.R. 529 is the least we can do to help out the middle class families of this country that are having so much trouble paying for their students, their children to have college educations.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I support these two bills.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both of us how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), a good friend of mine, a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Florida for allowing me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5, Student Success Act. This bill would continue unnecessary and arbitrary K–12 education funding cuts and erode accountability for historically underserved students. We should be preparing the next generation, but this bill is a step backwards in achieving academic excellence for 90 percent of the Nation's students.

Mr. Speaker, diverse organizations across not only my State, the great State of Ohio, but across this Nation, educational organizations, educational funding organizations, parents and lawyer advocacy groups, business leaders and groups, disability and exceptional children's groups, and the NAACP and civil rights organizations are against this and very concerned about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the way we fund all of our schools and educate all of our young scholars is a reflection on our values and commitment to equality.

□ 1315

Access to education is a civil right. It is the key to the middle class and to a prosperous nation. This bill would constrain educational opportunity and equality. We need an education bill that improves education and that invests in all of our children. H.R. 5 fails our children, Mr. Speaker, and H.R. 5 fails our Nation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my friend that I can feel her heart in those words. I am just tremendously proud to serve in a place where people really do care about the next generation, making sure that we are able to achieve those goals. I regret we are not finding the agreement on that today, but I am certain, as long as there are folks here who believe in achieving that goal together, as my friend does, we will get there.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be joined today by a freshman Member from the Georgia delegation, an incredibly hardworking Member.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come before you to talk about and support H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation to replace No Child Left Behind, to restore local control over education, and to empower parents and local education leaders to hold schools accountable for effectively teaching students.

I spent last week in my district, and I visited elementary and high schools, specifically schools that would be affected by the Student Success Act. These schools were located in some of the most impoverished areas of my district. I listened in classrooms, held forums to hear from parents and local education leaders, and spoke to teachers and administrators about the challenges they are facing. What I heard across the board was that the Federal Government and their compliance issues in the classroom are holding back our educators from effectively teaching our students.

Top-down education mandates have failed to help students and have forced educators to waste valuable time and resources filling out paperwork and worrying about compliance with Federal requirements. Instead of this one-size-fits-all approach, we need policies that enhance teachers' abilities to focus on the individual needs of the students. We need bottom-up reforms that give authority to the parents, teachers, and local education leaders, who work with their children and students every day and who know them best.

H.R. 5 includes a number of conservative reforms to push back against the growing reach of the Federal Government into schools and to restore local control. It replaces the current national accountability system for school performance and replaces it with State-led performance standards. It gets rid of more than 65 unnecessary or ineffective Federal education programs, repeals Federal requirements for teacher quality, and protects local and State autonomy over decisions in the classroom. H.R. 5 returns responsibility to parents, States, and local leaders to hold schools accountable instead of Washington bureaucrats.

I saw that example work in a city that is in one of the most impoverished areas of my district, where parents actually lined up at 3:30 in the morning to enroll their students into theme schools. Each elementary school was broken up into a theme. The superintendent there had no idea that parental involvement would be that significant. I was there to witness the success of this theme school concept. I asked: Where did this idea come from? It did not come from Washington. It did not come from the Federal Government. It came from the creativity of the teachers and from the input of the parents and of the local administrators.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows the needs of students better than the people who work and spend time with them every day. By empowering parents, teachers, and local education leaders, H.R. 5 takes strong steps forward in putting the control of education back in the right hands and in helping to provide every student with the opportunity to receive a good education. There is no debate today that every child deserves a good education. The debate is whether the Federal Government is in charge or whether we empower our local citizens to get the job done.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its essential mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield for the purpose of debate only. If we can pass this rule, this rule makes in order the immediate consideration with the same-day authority of any funding bills that come before this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this is pretty immediate. We need to get this done this week. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that will keep the Department open so we can keep the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understood my friend, he is asking that we bring up a bill that will fund what it is the court said would be illegal to fund. I cannot yield for that kind of request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its vital mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield back my time when my friend is. As soon as we pass this resolution, it will be in order to bring up any additional funding bills that come before the House today, but I cannot yield during this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished leader of the Democratic Caucus, for purposes as she sees fit.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that will keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), my classmate and good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my classmate and good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, that would keep the Department open so it can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a new Member of Congress who is on the Oversight Committee.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 5. The legislation represents a significant backward step in the efforts to help all of our Nation's children and their families prepare for their futures.

I speak as a parent, as a grandparent, and as a past school board president. H.R. 5 abandons the historic Federal role in education at elementary and secondary levels. It is the role of ensuring the educational process of all of America's students, including students from low-income families, students with disabilities, English learners, and students of color. It also fails to maintain the core expectation that States and school districts will take serious, sustained, and targeted action, when necessary, to correct achievement gaps and to reform low-performing schools.

Additionally, H.R. 5 fails to identify opportunity gaps or to correct inequities in access to resources and supports that students need to succeed, such as challenging academic courses, excellent teachers and principals, after-school enrichment or expanded learning time, and other academic and non-academic supports.

The bill's caps on Federal education spending would lock in recent budget cuts for the rest of the decade, and the bill would allow funds currently required to be used for education to be used for other purposes, such as spending on sports stadiums or tax cuts for the wealthy.

Finally, H.R. 5 fails to make critical investments for our Nation's students, including high-quality preschool for America's children, support for America's teachers and principals, and investment in innovative solutions for the public education system.

For these reasons, I oppose H.R. 5. It would deny Federal funds to the classrooms that need them the most, and it fails to assure parents that policymakers and educators will take the action students need when they are not learning.

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

I have not had an opportunity to meet the gentlewoman from Michigan, but because I serve on the Rules Committee, I have had an opportunity to see all of the amendments that she has submitted for this bill. I know one of those amendments that she submitted is to make sure that all of our learning plans take special note of children in foster care and to make sure those folks are not forgotten, and I am grateful to her for her attention to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Florida if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do.

Mr. WOODALL. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank the gentleman for his long service.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was created to address the enormous inequality in America's educational system, which created widespread poverty and segregation. Today, we know that we are still not educating Black and Latino students at the same level we educate White students. Fifty years after the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, educating all children, regardless of their backgrounds, is still one of the most important challenges we face as a nation.

That is why equity must start at the heart of any attempt to overhaul our education system, but the Student Success Act does little to help kids in Minnesota who are struggling in schools with too few resources. Rather than eliminating the disparities in our education system, the bill today will only increase the achievement gap and leave behind students from low-income neighborhoods and students with disabilities.

□ 1330

Education matters, far beyond the individual student. Three-fourths of the return on early education goes back to the community and ensures a healthier society and more stable economy.

One of the biggest gaps in literacy in the U.S. is between the children of college-educated and non-college-educated parents. We must be more committed to maximizing the potential of all students. Our students and teachers deserve better. I urge that we all oppose H.R. 5 so we can create education reform legislation that ensures every student can realize their goals and dreams.

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

I am grateful to the chair for permitting me earlier to allow Mrs. LOWEY to speak to the previous question. As I indicated, if we are not successful in defeating this measure then I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question, if I may.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' when we get to this.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), my classmate and good friend.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise again to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule, amend it, and make in order H.R. 861.

We are just 3 days away from the Department of Homeland Security being without the funds it needs to protect our Nation. Secretary Johnson and agency heads have warned us that if the continuing resolution to fund the Department expires, national security operations will be disrupted and essential personnel will be required to work without pay. They also warn that passing another CR will not address the uncertainty of being able to meet our long-term security needs.

Democrats have a responsible solution. Two weeks ago, Appropriations Committee Ranking Member NITA LOWEY and I introduced H.R. 861, which contains the precise language of the November 2014 bipartisan bill negotiated in good faith by the chairs and ranking members of the House and Senate Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittees.

H.R. 861 is cosponsored by every House Democrat. This bill would pass the House, pass the Senate, and be signed into law by the President. All it needs is for the Republican leadership to do the responsible thing and bring H.R. 861 to the floor for a vote. By doing this, we will demonstrate to the American people that we know our Nation's security takes priority over politics and unrelated policy debates.

To let funding for Homeland Security expire or, instead of a full-year funding bill, take the easy way out by kicking a viable solution down the road with a continuing resolution, is to fail the American people and the trust that they have placed in us as Members of Congress to protect them and our country from harm.

Let's pass H.R. 861 today.

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

In closing, there are 3 days left until the Department of Homeland Security will shut down. As I have said earlier, I don't believe that is going to happen. I believe my friends will be about the business of making sure that it does not occur. I hope they do because our country needs to make sure that we are not in any insecure position going forward.

Notwithstanding that, the brinksmanship continues, and we are here considering two bills that will go nowhere. That, to me, is the state of play right now. If my friends want to pass these education measures, they need to take care of business first. And it is time to quit messing around.

Mr. Speaker, there is a list of extraordinary organizations in this country that are against H.R. 5. I lift from a list that I will insert into the RECORD the names of the Congressional Tri-Caucus; the American Association of People With Disabilities; the American Association of University Women; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Foundation for the Blind; the Association of University Centers on Disabilities; the Autism National Committee; the Center for American Progress; the Children's Defense Fund;

the Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Easter Seals, which most of us contribute to; the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network; the NAACP; the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the National Association of School Psychologists; and the National Down Syndrome Congress.

Disability plays a major role in this particular legislation, and the fact that all of these organizations are standing up saying that they are opposed to it should get our attention.

In addition, the United Negro College Fund, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 5

Congressional Tri-Caucus, The Advocacy Institute, Afterschool Alliance, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, American Association of People with Disabilities, American Association of University Women, American Federation of Teachers, American Foundation for the Blind, Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Autism National Committee, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Center for American Progress, Center for Law and Social Policy, Children's Defense Fund, Committee for Education Funding, Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, Council of Great City Schools, Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Democrats for Education Reform, Disability Right Education and Defense Fund.

Easter Seals, Education Post, Education Law Center, First Focus Campaign for Children, Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, Human Rights Campaign, The Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Leading Educators, League of United Latin American Citizens, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, NAACP, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, National Association of School Physcologists, National Center for Learning Disabilities, National Council on Independent Living, National Council on Teacher Quality, The National Center on Time and Learning, National Congress of American Indians, National Council of La Raza.

National Coalition for Public Education, National Disability Rights Network, National Down Syndrome Congress, National Education Association, National Urban League, Partners for Each and Every Child, Poverty & Race Research Action Council, Public Advocates Inc., Stand for Children, Southeast Asia Resource Action Center, TASH, Teach Plus, TNTP, The Education Trust, United Negro College Fund, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HASTINGS. All of these people are opposed to this measure, and yet we find ourselves going forward. It is time for us to get real in this Congress, stop having closed rules, and let all of the Members in this body participate in the decisional process as we argue measures that are needed on behalf of our country.

This is a great institution, and the people that serve here are absolutely wonderful people, but somehow or another we have gotten stuck. And by getting stuck, we are not able to do the things that are vital for the Nation. We need to unstick it and get on with the business, knowing that we can sit in a room together and come to conclusions not only about education, but about energy and every aspect of American life that we have a responsibility for.

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

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

I have lots of agreement with my friend from Florida. I always do. I am always a little surprised by how much I agree with him when he comes down here to talk, but we do need to unstick this place.

We are talking about two issues today. One is H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, where every Member in this room wants to see our children succeed. Every Member in this room wants to see the achievement gap closed, and yet we grapple with how to achieve that goal together.

We have also in this rule, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 529. That measure passed unanimously out of the Ways and Means Committee. We found a problem, and we found a solution that we could agree on together to move it forward. It is moving forward.

And in the tradition of being unstuck, I am told that just in the last few minutes the Senate has found a pathway to move forward on a DHS funding bill. Again, we passed that bill back on January 14. The Senate has been struggling to find a pathway forward. I don't mean a pathway to pass it. I mean a pathway to even debate it. Apparently, we have seen that wall be broken down here in the last few minutes, and I am glad to hear that.

There is a role to be played, Mr. Speaker. There is a role for this House to play in our constitutional Republic. There is a role for the Senate to play and there is a role for the White House to play. That is true when we are talking about Federal education policy. It is true when we are talking about Homeland Security policy. It is true when we are talking about immigration policy. I am not always satisfied with how well we in the House defend that constitutional prerogative.

Again, we are here today to talk about H.R. 5, which is going to fix a bill passed by an entirely Republican infrastructure here in Congress that today Republicans disavow as being a terrible mistake. They wish we could have done better. I am glad we are striving to do better. It is not a Republican issue, it is not a Democratic issue. It is an American issue. And what could be more American than trying to help our public schools succeed?

You hear a lot of worry in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. You hear folks worried that if we change this provision or if we change that provision, what will be the impact on those children who right now are threatened by a substantial achievement gap in this country? But in the same moment, Mr. Speaker, someone will stand up on the other side of the aisle talking about those very same children and say: If we do not change these provisions today, we will sentence these children to a lifetime of underperformance, of not being able to meet their full potential.

I don't question anyone's motive on this floor. In fact, I am grateful for the passion that folks have on this floor.

This rule is only step one of H.R. 5, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad for that. When my colleague from Florida spoke earlier about the closed nature of the process and how much better and brighter this institution is when the process is opened, he is exactly right. He is right every time he says it, and I am right every time I say it. It is absolutely true.

It is not fast. It is not efficient. Arguably, sometimes it even borders on dysfunctional. But it is the right thing to do to in order to end up with the best product that we can at the end of the day. And to the degree that we are able to do that, Mr. Speaker, I believe we will continue to strive to do that. This bill today is an example of that.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, just so folks know what they are coming to vote on, doesn't deal with the amendments to the Student Success Act. We are planning on going back to the Rules Committee this afternoon for a completely new hearing in order to make as many amendments as we can available to the underlying bill. This rule is only to have general debate on H.R. 5 before the amendment process begins and to have debate on H.R. 529, that bill that passed unanimously out of the Ways and Means Committee hearing.

So often we come down here and we are talking about divisive issues, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to be down here today talking about something on which we can agree: a good bipartisan bill coming out of Ways and Means, an opportunity to open up the process and have voices be heard on H.R. 5 today and tomorrow.

The gentleman from Florida had it right, Mr. Speaker. I am blessed to be from a part of the country where folks understand that education isn't just something. It is everything.

Don't talk to me about loving opportunity in this country if you don't have a commitment to education. Don't talk to me about lifting folks up from this rung of the ladder to this rung of the economic ladder if you don't have a commitment to education. And don't talk to me about taking somebody else's dollars and spending them on education and thinking that alone is going to create better outcomes for that child.

You need money, absolutely you do, but you need that commitment locally. You need the commitment of teachers, you need the commitment of principals, you need the commitment of mothers and fathers. You need the commitment of communities. And we have yet to figure out how to mandate that commitment from Washington, D.C.

I am grateful that I live in a community where we figured out how to grow it from within. You can walk into the worst school in my district, Mr. Speaker, and you will find folks headed off to

Stanford on scholarships—first-generation Americans; you will find folks headed off to the University of Chicago on full scholarships—folks who come from generational poverty; you will find folks headed off, of course, to the University of Georgia, the finest institution in the United States, because they want to be close to their family and they want to invest in the community that has been so good to them. Hope lives there. Opportunity lives there.

I am grateful to Chairman KLINE and the folks on the Education Committee for doing what they can. It is not all that I would like to see, but to do what they can to get out of the way of those innovators in my community, to do what they can to allow folks to experiment with some things and find out what works, as we have, and then take those local ideas and spread those ideas locally, do what they can to prevent the Federal Government from saying: We know best how to educate children, and instead turning the Federal Government just into a funding stream, where we can, to say: You know how to educate children. We trust you.

So often we conflate issues in this body, Mr. Speaker. The issue is not that children can't learn. They can. The issue is not that public schools can't teach. They can and they do. But there is an issue with generational poverty. There is an issue with an achievement gap.

I am not sure that H.R. 5, no matter who crafted it and how long we work to do it, I am not sure that we can solve that problem with H.R. 5. In fact, I don't believe that we could—not with any Elementary and Secondary Education Act bill.

We are doing what we can today, and I hope we will be back in this institution tomorrow to do more. Goodness knows, we do a lot of things in this town that disadvantage that next generation of Americans. I am proud today to be working on at least one bill that will do something to advantage those young people and their future.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 121 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 861.

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. WOODALL. With that, Mr. Speaker, 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. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 121, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1020.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 181, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer

Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
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
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
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)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Hinojosa
Lee
Long
McNerney
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Wilson (FL)

□ 1411

Ms. BASS, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. PINGREE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). 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. HASTINGS. 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 243, noes 178, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—178

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
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
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
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)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer
Byrne
Hinojosa
Lee
Long
McNerney
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Wilson (FL)

□ 1418

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.

STEM EDUCATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1020) to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 8, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—412

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—8

Amash
Brat
Buck
Duncan (SC)
Garrett
McClintock
Sanford
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—12

Byrne
Hinojosa
King (IA)
Lee
Long
McNerney
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Wilson (FL)

□ 1429

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.

REQUESTING UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO CALL UP H.R. 861, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now bring up H.R. 861, the clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill to protect America that would keep the Department open so that we can carry out its mission of keeping the American people safe and, as well, protecting our national security over political security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

SECTION 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS AMENDMENTS

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 121, I call up the bill (H.R. 529) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 121, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

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

H.R. 529

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) When the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 became law, the tax treatment of section 529 college savings plans was changed so that qualified distributions were no longer taxed as income. The favorable tax treatment of college savings plans was made permanent with the passage of the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

(2) Section 529 college savings plans empower middle-class families to accumulate savings to offset the rising costs of attending college.

(3) The latest data from the College Savings Plan Network shows that there are 11.83 million 529 accounts open throughout all 50 states, which represent $244.5 billion in total assets. The average 529 account size is $20,671.

(4) States that sponsor 529 college savings plans have taken steps to ensure these plans are a tool that all families can use to save for college, including setting minimum contributions as low as $25 per month to encourage participation by families of all income levels.

(5) The President's fiscal year 2016 Budget proposes raising taxes by taxing certain future distributions made from 529 college savings plans.

(6) The tax proposed by the President would discourage the use of 529 college savings plans, requiring families and students to take on more debt.

(7) Purchase of a computer represents a significant higher education expense and therefore

should be eligible for qualified distributions under 529 college savings plans.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1) enact policies that strengthen 529 college savings plans, and

(2) make 529 plans more modern, consumer-friendly, and responsive to the realities faced by students today.

SEC. 2. COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT PERMANENTLY ALLOWED AS A QUALIFIED HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSE FOR SECTION 529 ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 529(e)(3)(A)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(iii) expenses for the purchase of computer or peripheral equipment (as defined in section 168(i)(2)(B)), computer software (as defined in section 197(e)(3)(B)), or Internet access and related services, if such equipment, software, or services are to be used primarily by the beneficiary during any of the years the beneficiary is enrolled at an eligible educational institution.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF DISTRIBUTION AGGREGATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 529(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. RECONTRIBUTION OF REFUNDED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 529(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 3, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF REFUNDED AMOUNTS.—In the case of a beneficiary who receives a refund of any qualified higher education expenses from an eligible educational institution, subparagraph (A) shall not apply to that portion of any distribution for the taxable year which is recontributed to a qualified tuition program of which such individual is a beneficiary, but only to the extent such recontribution is made not later than 60 days after the date of such refund and does not exceed the refunded amount.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to refunds of qualified higher education expenses after December 31, 2014.

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—In the case of a refund of qualified higher education expenses received after December 31, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, section 529(c)(3)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) shall be applied by substituting ''not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph'' for ''not later than 60 days after the date of such refund''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 529, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this critical and timely issue and my colleague Congressman KIND of Wisconsin for 4 years of bipartisan efforts to encourage families to invest for their children's future.

I rise today in support of H.R. 529, my legislation that reaffirms Congress' commitment to not only preserving, but strengthening, expanding, and modernizing 529 college savings plans.

Currently, there are nearly 12 million 529 accounts open in all 50 States. Considering there were only 1 million accounts open in 2001, the growth in popularity of these accounts is truly remarkable and is still on an upward trajectory.

The popularity of 529 accounts among American families is no mystery. Higher education costs across the country are rising at a pace that exceeds the rate of inflation, and folks are looking for ways to plan responsibly for the future.

A 2014 Gallup Poll of America's top financial concerns showed that among adults between the ages of 30 and 49, ''not having enough money to pay for your children's college'' is a top concern for families, trailing only retirement concerns.

It is natural that folks would turn toward 529 savings accounts. These accounts are easy to set up and use and accountholders can make a monthly contribution as small as $10 to invest to their children's future on a tax-deferred basis.

The 12 million 529 accounts today have an average balance of around $20,000, which will go a long way toward helping families offset college costs and helping students to begin their careers with a lighter debt burden.

When the President proposed a plan in his 2016 budget to tax future distributions from 529 savings accounts, Members on both sides of the aisle were appalled.

His billion-dollar tax proposal on families saving for college would have completely eliminated the purpose of saving responsibly for higher education in the first place and would have inevitably moved more students toward student loans and other sources of financial aid.

We fundamentally disagree with the direction of the President's policy proposal, and instead, we want to make 529 college savings plans more consumer friendly and reflective of the realities faced by students today.

This legislation will make computer purchases with 529 plans a qualified expense. Computers are an essential part of higher education, and the law should be updated to reflect that.

A Pew Research Center report in 2011 found that a vast majority of undergraduate, graduate, and community college students use some sort of computer to participate in a college experience that now features online courses, class work, and e-textbooks. I believe this is a commonsense modernization measure.

The bill will also remove distribution aggregation requirements, which are an outdated burden on 529 plan administrators and States. When 529 college savings plans were originated back in 1996, the funds were taxed before they were deposited into the account and then taxed a second time when they were used to pay for higher education expenses.

At that time, it made sense for plan administrators to aggregate accounts for beneficiaries with multiple 529 accounts in order to determine the taxable dollars dispersed among the accounts.

However, the law was changed back in 2001 so that 529 savings are only taxed once now, before they are put into the 529 account. The only taxable funds at disbursement are for nonqualified expenses. According to a GAO report from 2012 that has the most recent data on the topic, nonqualified distributions from 529 plans only made up 5.3 percent of total distributions in 2010.

Because of the past changes to tax treatment of 529s, it no longer makes sense for plan administrators to aggregate these accounts for tax purposes. It represents an undue burden, which could potentially raise the administrative cost for operating these plans. This is why this legislation will remove these requirements.

Finally, the bill will allow a student who receives a refund on any 529 qualified expenses to redeposit those funds into their 529 without penalty.

Refunds of 529 dollars could happen for any number of reasons: a student may withdraw from a certain course, may receive a scholarship offer or other financial aid after their 529 plans have already been used, or may have to withdraw from school because of an illness.

Whatever the reasons, subjecting these funds to a penalty works against the spirit of 529 college savings plans, and this bill will correct that.

These are sensible yet important improvements to 529 college savings plans that should receive resounding support from both sides of the aisle. As we continue our work in the House to empower hardworking families with bottoms-up solutions, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am a strong supporter of 529 college savings plans. When I cochaired the Education and Family Tax Working Group with Representative DIANE BLACK from Tennessee during the 113th Congress, we heard from education stakeholders that education tax benefits should reflect a three-legged stool

with one leg helping families save for college, one leg helping families pay for college, and one leg helping families repay college.

College is, indeed, expensive, and it is a wise public investment to use Federal incentives to encourage families to save for college.

H.R. 529 makes three important improvements to 529 accounts: one, it makes computer technology an allowable expense; two, it improves the calculation for taxing distributions to better reflect one's earnings; and, three, it allows distributions that are refunded by a college upon a student's withdrawal to be reinvested in 529 accounts within 60 days without being subject to a tax.

I support these important improvements to 529 education plans. In addition, I hope that the Republican leadership will advance the bill's sister bill, the Savings Enhancement for Education in College Act, which was H.R. 529 in the last Congress and also championed by Representatives JENKINS and KIND.

This former H.R. 529 bill includes the two substantive improvements to 529s that advocates explain would best help middle-income families save more for college.

We know that low- and moderate-income families have a harder time saving for college because they have less extra cash available to put away in a savings account.

The Savings Enhancement for Education in College Act would substantially help low- and middle-income families save by allowing low-income taxpayers to take advantage of the saver's credit and allowing employers to match up to $600 a year in 529 contributions.

I think that these provisions are excellent. The saver's credit currently helps offset part of the first $2,000 that low-income workers voluntarily contribute to IRA and 401(k) plans. Extending this tax benefit for 529 plans is a commonsense way to help increase college savings by low- and moderate-income families.

Further, I think that the employer match is an especially promising tool to improve college savings by lower-income Americans because it adds $600 a family didn't have for college before that can grow and support education over time.

These two improvements are needed because the savings data show that 529 savings have dropped tremendously since 2009. From 2005 to 2009, around 60 percent of the accounts saw contributions; however, in the last few years, the account contributions have been closer to 45 percent.

I am a bit surprised that these substantive improvements are not included in the bill before us today, and I truly hope that Republican leadership will advance these 529 provisions that would tremendously improve savings for lower- and middle-income Americans.

In the interest of fairness, I also hope that we make computer technology an allowable expense for the American opportunity tax credit.

Currently, computers and software are not qualified expenses for the AOTC, and I think that the definition of qualified expenses should be uniform across 529s and AOTC benefits. These are all great improvements that have, in fact, been made.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it won't be all that much time. I just simply want to congratulate the gentlelady from Kansas on bringing this legislation forward. We brought this out of committee. We had no resistance because this is just a commonsense bill.

This upgrades the law to reflect the realities of a college education. You ought to be able to buy a computer. You ought to be able to buy software with your college savings dollars because it is an essential ingredient to your education.

More importantly, if a person gets a refund if they cancel a class, if for some reason the college rebates money to you, you ought to be able to put it back into your savings plan. These are commonsense ideas that make this important vehicle for savings more workable and reflects the common problems that people have in this 21st century.

It is essential that we give people and families the ability to save for education. This bill also sends a signal: we believe in the 529 plans; 529 plans are going to stay; they are a good thing; we are not going to attack them; we are going to develop and grow them.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who is a cosponsor of this legislation and a tireless advocate for education.

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

I want to thank my partner in crafting this legislation, Representative JENKINS. This has been the product of a few years of hard work, of listening to various outside groups and trying to understand the difficulty of saving for higher education that many working families are experiencing today.

The legislation before us, H.R. 529, as the chairman of the committee just pointed out, is a commonsense proposal with some reasonable technical corrections to the 529 savings plans that already exist in all 50 States, allowing for the qualification expense for computers and software, which is a new learning tool that sometimes is required in the classroom for higher education. It allows for the refund of tuition and expenses if you had to withdraw from college for some reason, and it also reduces and minimizes the unnecessary bureaucratic and administrative paperwork. In that respect, there are some commonsense steps that we can do to modernize the 529 program and make sure that it is working for more families.

I do agree with my colleague from Illinois that we have a challenge of trying to democratize these programs a lot more. We have roughly 3 percent participation rate in 529s throughout the entire Nation. We have got to figure out a way to do a better job of increasing those savings opportunities for more families, but especially lower income families that don't have the disposable income right now in order to participate in these programs, whether it is the tax credit that Representative DAVIS was talking about, employer matches, by thinking creatively of how we can democratize these so more families can take advantage of them. That is going to be crucial.

In Wisconsin alone, we have got roughly 257,000 accounts in the State Edvest program and Tomorrow's Scholar 529 plans. The families have saved about $3.7 billion for college or their technical schools, reducing the need for greater student loans, helping them access college. These programs not only encourage savings for college but help middle class families get in the habit of saving for other important life events, such as retirement, that we have to do a better job at.

I also think, given that the Congressional Budget Office has a cost associated with it, which is roughly $5 million a year—not a lot in Federal budget terms—that there is no reason at all why we couldn't have brought this legislation to the floor today with an acceptable pay-for so we are not adding any deficit to future generations.

In fact, again, Representative DAVIS offered, during the committee markup, a responsible amendment that would have done a better job of means testing the 529 contributions and cutting it off to families that earn up to $3 million. Now, to put this in perspective, the top 1 percent of income earners in Wisconsin earn less than $1 million. So it was still a very generous, high threshold, but it was enough money to pay for the $51 million expense over the next 10 years that the Congressional Budget Office scored this at. There is no reason why we can't be making these type of tough decisions as well when it comes to policy changes that make sense for working families and act in a more fiscally responsible manner.

I think these 529 accounts have been established. They do work well for those who can participate. And this is especially important for a State like Wisconsin today, whose Governor just submitted a budget proposal calling for a cut of over $300 million out of our university system, a university system

that is really the pride and joy of the State of Wisconsin, has given us a competitive advantage, not only in the upper Midwest, but throughout the Nation and the world, where we had some of the top scholars and researchers wanting to come there to do their work, students wanting to stay in the State so they can participate in these UW system colleges and universities that we have.

Obviously, the Governor wants to take it in a different direction; $300 million worth of cuts gets into the bone. So, again, we have got to think creatively of how we can make it affordable for families to be able to send their kids on to school. This is one way to do it: savings in 529s.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

We ought not also ignore other important financial aid programs that especially speak to the needs of low-income children: the Pell grant program, work-study opportunities on and off campus, the GEAR UP and TRIO programs. This, too, helps many students—including myself, who is the first generation that went on to school—to be able to afford higher education so we are not driving these kids deeper and deeper into debt. The average undergrad in Wisconsin, by the time they graduate, has $28,000 worth of debt. It is the second largest debt in the Nation behind mortgages. At $1.2 trillion, it exceeds all credit card debt.

So the 529 is another vehicle to try to alleviate that student indebtedness issue that is affecting more and more kids and families throughout the Nation. We ought to fix it by making a pay-for. This is a good first step, necessary policy changes. I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), an esteemed member of the House Committee on Ways and Means and subcommittee chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, do you notice something? Did you notice that, as Speaker and the person who is presiding over this Chamber today, oftentimes you hear a great deal of difficulty between the two parties and a lot of wrangling and a lot of different positions and so forth that manifests itself in arguing and so forth, but did you notice something? You are hearing both sides of the aisle coming before you and coming before this House and saying the same thing, and that is we ought to move H.R. 529.

There is a recognition, and I think my constituency in suburban Chicago is breathing a collective sigh of relief right now because they are saying: Hey, people are paying attention to things that matter to me and matter to my future and matter to my children, that is, they are taking a bill or a provision in the law that has been successful and they are improving it. They are bringing it up to date under the leadership of the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), and she is joined by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), and everybody is coming together around that idea that says 529s need to be protected and defended. And we need to make sure that they are kept up to date, because back home this makes all the difference in the world. I think this is one of these types of moments that is very significant and that we can build on.

I thank the gentlelady for her leadership. I thank Mr. DAVIS for his, and I rise in strong support of this measure.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, I thank the gentlelady, and I thank the Speaker.

It is good news to be able to come on the floor of the House and be able to speak to hardworking parents and the basis of all of our joy when we are giving an opportunity for our young people to be able to participate in higher learning, in this instance, college education. The 529 fix, if you will, deals with the savings accounts and tax-free disbursements for the purpose of paying for college tuition, purchasing college credits, and other qualified educational expenses.

I do want to join my colleague from Wisconsin and add that the idea of other equipment dealing with the new technology special needs services is crucial.

I want to thank Mr. DAVIS for his astute work in the committee, looking to make this a little bit more balanced. Certainly we are appreciative of those who have been successful and have achieved financial success. I enjoy that. But I do think with our concern about a deficit—which, by the way, has been reduced substantially under President Barack Obama—that this idea that Mr. DAVIS had would have been a worthy inclusion into this legislation.

However, I am grateful, again, that we are now high tech and the 529 accounts include computers and software as qualified educational expenses. It would also allow for refunded tuition, educational expenses, particularly if a student withdraws due to illness.

I was talking to one of my young people, college students, and also my husband is a part of the team of higher education and sees it all the time where youngsters leave because they are ill and fail to let the professor know, and all of a sudden they are running up a bill.

I do want to say that this fix is urgent because we need to help people save, but it is also urgent, Mr. Speaker, that we immediately move to put the Homeland Security funding on the floor of the House. I had asked yesterday for it to be immediately put on the floor of the House last night or today in order to do our duty, and our duty is to ensure the safety and security of this Nation.

It is sad for me to note that those like Border Patrol agents and ICE agents and TSOs whom we pass by every day will be some of those who will be unpaid. They are essential, and we will go past them and thank them for their services—I often do in airports across America—but yet we will stand here and not have a resolution and a solution to pay them their salary.

We had a hearing today in Judiciary. I was very glad to note that I think the weight was on the side of the President that he had constitutional authority, that he is not rendering any immigration status, that he is doing what he is allowed under the law; the Attorney General is allowed to have discretion as to employment status; no benefits will be conveyed on these individuals; and, frankly, we have an emergency and we need to pass that bill.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I won't take that. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Let me just say that I think we appropriately are on the floor dealing with H.R. 529. I again thank the work of the Committee on Ways and Means ranking members and, as well, the ranking member and chairman of the full committee.

But as we frame the work that this Congress must do, I don't know how we stand here on Wednesday, 24 to 48 hours out from a collapse of the Department of Homeland Security, no funding, and actually are here and looking out at the face of first responders and those who are on the front lines of borders, airports, FAA, ICE officers, and we would stand and hold hostage these hardworking Americans who, in this climate when we are looking to malls or we are hearing, seeing videos and various charges of those who want to do harm, that we would not want an orderly process for 5 million people who have about 14 items—14 items—that they must comply with to even be eligible, but 5 million people who simply want us to know that they are here and they are here to do good and not to do harm. That is an orderly process for knowing how to secure this Nation.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

With that, I ask for a vote for H.R. 529 and H.R. 5 and the funding of Homeland Security.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the

well while another Member is under recognition.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our majority leader.

□ 1500

Mr. MCCARTHY. I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her work on 529 and bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, during the President's speech on the State of the Union, he presented what he called ''middle class economics.'' It didn't take long for people to realize that the President's plan meant taxing the middle class to pay for bigger government and pipe dream projects. Nothing demonstrated this anti-middle class agenda more than the President's plan to attack education opportunity for middle class families by taxing 529 saving accounts. Now, after families cried out against the President's plan, he dropped it, and I am happy about that. The President has rightly chosen to not do harm, but now he should work with the House to do some positive good.

My wife and I have two children—Connor and Meghan. Connor is in college today, and Meghan is a senior about to enter college. When we found out, with joy, that we were to have children, we didn't have much great wealth, but we started putting away $50 a month. Why? Because we dreamt like every other American. It was no longer what you could become but what opportunities your children will have.

Education has been the great equalizer in this country, and there is no greater way to do that than by allowing those who may not have great wealth but who have a great opportunity with their children to have a 529 account. But, like anything, we should modernize it because education changes just as technology has changed.

Could you imagine today sending your children to college but telling them to learn without having a computer? Isn't that a part of the education system, too? That is what this 529 account will also expand to. So, today, when we talk on the floor, it is really about the future, but it is about the future of every single family from every walk of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I differ with the President on many issues, and I would say the majority of this House differs with the President in that he would tax every parent or every grandparent who wanted to put away for a brighter future for their child or grandchild. Luckily, he turned back. Today is a chance to work with us, to work with us on a greater America with something that is stronger. What that means today is that we can all join so the 21st century can be even stronger, and we can keep the promise we made to every American—that every generation will improve on the generation before him. That is the opportunity that this 529 account gives us.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

I agree with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) that this is, indeed, a bipartisan piece of legislation and that it is good for higher education and for those who are attempting to access it.

I want to commend Ms. JENKINS and Mr. KIND for their leadership in developing it. I agree with its purpose, and I urge its passage.

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

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for engaging in this informative and productive debate. If America is going to remain competitive, I cannot imagine a more important thing than maintaining the affordability of higher education. There is much to be done, but today's vote is a critical and simple step that Congress should take to empower folks to save for higher education and, ultimately, to make it more attainable for more hardworking Americans.

I hope that Congress passes this legislation today with the broad support that it deserves so that we can give American families an improved way to invest in their 529 college savings plans.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of 529 college savings plans—including the College Savings Plans of Maryland—I am pleased to support today's legislation, which makes three common sense technical changes to these valuable savings tools.

First, HR 529 makes the purchase of a computer and internet access a qualified expense for 529 accounts, reflecting the reality that computers and the internet are a modern necessity for today's college students. Second, the bill allows students who receive refunds from colleges to reinvest those refunds back into their 529 accounts, provided that reinvestment occurs within 60 days of a student leaving college. And finally, the bill eliminates the existing aggregation requirement for purposes of calculating distributions that are includible in a beneficiary's taxable income.

Mr. Speaker, unlike other tax bills that have come before us recently, today's legislation does not seek to permanently extend temporary provisions of the code without paying for that permanence—and it does not add tens of billions of dollars to the national debt. Rather, HR 529 makes several modest improvements to a program already permanently authorized in law—and it does so at a much lower cost.

Accordingly, I will cast a yes vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H.R. 529, a bill that would expand section 529 college savings plans, when it passed the House today. I strongly believe in improving access to higher education, and encouraging families to save for college is a critical part of this in an era of rising tuition costs and deepening student debt. Since 1996, 529 plans have saved American families more than $225 billion. H.R. 529 makes several changes to update 529 plans, including removing penalties for students who are forced to withdraw from college and expanding the eligible uses. While I will vote for this bill, I wish this Congress would do more. The cost of higher education continues to increase and millions of American students carry non-dischargeable debt that totals over $1 trillion. At the same time, my Republican colleagues have slashed Pell grants, refused to provide students with the low interest rates granted to America's biggest banks, and continue to support predatory, for-profit institutions that shortchange our most vulnerable students. I support the modest improvements in H.R. 529, but I urge my colleagues to take up further measures to improve access to college and reduce student loan debt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 121, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. I am opposed to it in its current form.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ted Lieu of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 529 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 5. PARENTS' RIGHT TO KNOW COST OF BROKERAGE FEES AND IMPACT ON LONG-TERM SAVINGS.

Section 529(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''REPORTS.—Each officer'' and inserting the following: ''REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each officer'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FEES.—Each such officer or employee shall make an annual report to each designated beneficiary of an account under such program—

''(A) disclosing the type and amount of fees with respect to such account,

''(B) demonstrating the impact of such fees on the investment returns of such account over a 10-year and 20-year period, and

''(C) disclosing the range of fees for investments available to accounts under such program.''.

SEC. 6. RATES OF RETURN AND LOW FEES.

Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) RATES OF RETURN AND LOW FEES.—Each officer or employee having control of

the qualified tuition program shall take such steps as are necessary to ensure, to the extent practicable, high rates of return and low fees under such program.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Let me start by thanking my Republican colleagues for introducing this bill. It makes changes to 529 plans that many on my side of the aisle have also been calling on for years. I support 529 plans, as do many of my constituents. It helps people plan and pay for college, and my wife and I currently invest in 529 plans.

There is one amendment to this bill that, I believe, will make it far better, and that is disclosure. The motion to recommit would put in an amendment that says that there has to be a separate report that talks about the types and numbers of fees and how much these fees are and how they impact the performance of the product over 10 to 20 years.

Prior to entering politics, I served as a corporate vice president at a financial services company, and it is clear that the foundation upon which Wall Street rests is disclosure. It is the social compact that Wall Street has with Main Street. It is the compact that they have with investors in that they will describe a product—how it works, the fees on that product, and how it performs. By having a separate report that parents can see, one that talks about the fees on these products and how these fees impact the performance, it will allow middle class families to better gauge for themselves how their investments are doing and which investments to select. Does this makes a difference? Yes, it does. Let me give you an example.

Savingforcollege.com offers this scenario:

If an annual return for a 529 account is 7 percent and if one account charges 20 basis points and another charges 40 basis points, here is the difference on an investment of $5,000: over the course of 18 years, the 529 plan charging the lower fees will save the investor $542. The underlying bill would change existing law to allow 529 funds to be used to purchase a laptop computer for school, and $542 would allow you to buy a laptop.

Right now, every State has different rules for disclosure, and they have different fees. For example, in my State of California, we have relatively low fees that range between $142 to $154 over 10 years, but then you have States like Montana and Arkansas, which have some of the highest low-end fees, which could range between $1,100 to $1,200 over 10 years. That makes a huge difference to middle class families.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit, which merely provides disclosure to middle class families so they can better understand their 529 plans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

This motion would do the exact opposite of what this legislation is trying to accomplish. This bill is attempting to simplify 529s, but this motion would add unneeded complexity, leading to fewer people saving for a college education. It would burden all families who are saving as well as burden States and plan administrators with more red tape. As the former State treasurer of Kansas, I believe I can offer a unique insight from my experiences with 529 plan administration.

This simply adds an undo administrative burden. It increases the costs, which would leave less money for students to spend on their higher education costs. It seems to mandate the increase of rates of return, and Congress should not be in the business of setting the risk of a personal investment. It increases administrative expenses, and it goes in the opposite direction of the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 176, nays 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—176

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NAYS—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Byrne
Costa
Hinojosa
Lee
Long
Lynch
McNerney
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Wilson (FL)

□ 1541

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. LABRADOR, ISSA, SANFORD, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. DUFFY, WALDEN, FLORES, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to reiterate the announcement of March 25, 2014, concerning floor practice.

Members should periodically rededicate themselves to the core principles of proper parliamentary practice that are so essential in maintaining order and deliberacy here in the House. The Chair believes that a few of these principles bear emphasis today.

Members should refrain from trafficking in the well when another, including the presiding officer, is addressing the House.

Members should wear appropriate business attire during all sittings of the House, however brief their appearance on the floor may be.

Members should refrain from engaging in still photography or audio or video recording in the Chamber. Taking unofficial photographs detracts from the dignity of the proceedings and presents security and privacy challenges for the House.

Members who wish to speak on the floor should respectfully seek and obtain recognition from the presiding officer, taking the time to do so in proper form, including 1-minutes. The proper form would be to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

□ 1545

Members should take care to yield and reclaim time in an orderly fashion, bearing in mind that the Official Reporters of Debate cannot properly transcribe two Members simultaneously.

Members should address their remarks in debate to the presiding officer and not to others in the second person or to some perceived viewing audience.

Members should not embellish the offering of a motion, the entry of a request, the making of a point of order, or the entry of an appeal with any statement of motive or other commentary, and should be aware that such utterances could render the motion, request, point of order, or appeal untimely.

Members should attempt to come to the floor within the 15-minute period as prescribed by the first ringing of the bells. This has been an ongoing problem and Members should make every attempt to be here within the prescribed 15 minutes. Members should be advised that if they are in the Chamber attempting to vote, the Chair will try to accommodate them. But as a point of courtesy to each of your colleagues, voting within the allotted time would help with the maintenance of the institution.

Following these basic standards of practice will foster an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect. It will ensure against personal confrontation, among individual Members or between Members and the presiding officer. It will facilitate Members' comprehension of, and participation in, the business of the House. It will enable accurate transcriptions of proceedings. In sum, it will ensure the comity that elevates spirited deliberations above mere argument.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to these matters.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 401, noes 20, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

AYES—401

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel

Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—20

Clarke (NY)
Ellison
Fudge
Grijalva
Hastings
Hoyer
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
McCollum
Napolitano
Pocan
Richmond
Rush
Schrader
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—11

Byrne
Costa
Hinojosa
Lee
Long
McNerney
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Speier
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1552

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 84, "yea" on rollcall No. 85, "yea" on rollcall No. 86, "yea" on rollcall No. 87, "yea" on rollcall No. 88, "no" on rollcall No. 89, and "yea" on rollcall No. 90.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 124

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Capps and Mr. Polis.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Takano and Mr. Foster.

(3) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Clarke of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 121 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1558

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act. This week, we have an opportunity to advance bold reforms that will strengthen K–12 education for children across America.

A great education can be the great equalizer. It can open doors to unlimited possibilities and provide students the tools they need to succeed in life. Every child in every school deserves an excellent education, yet, Mr. Chairman, we are failing to provide every child that opportunity.

Today, approximately one out of five students drops out of high school, and many who do graduate are going to college or entering the workforce with a subpar education. The number of students proficient in reading and math is abysmal. The achievement gap separating minority students from their peers is appalling. Parents have little to no options to rescue their children from failing schools.

A broken education system has plagued families for decades. Year after year, policymakers lament the problems and talk about solutions, and once in a while, a law is enacted that promises to improve our education system.

Unfortunately, past efforts have largely failed because they are based on the idea that Washington knows what is best for children. We have doubled down on this approach repeatedly, and it is not working.

Federal mandates dictate how to gauge student achievement, how to define qualified teachers, how to spend money at the State and local levels, and how to improve underperforming schools. And now, thanks to the unprecedented overreach of the current administration, the Department of Education is dictating policies concerning teacher evaluations, academic standards, and more.

No one questions whether parents, teachers, and local education leaders are committed to their students, yet there are some who question whether they are capable of making the best decisions for their students.

Success in school should be determined by those who teach inside our classrooms, by administrators who understand the challenges facing their communities, by parents who know better than anyone the needs of their children. If every child is going to receive a quality education, then we need to place less faith—less faith—in the Secretary of Education and more faith in parents, teachers, and State and local leaders. That is why I am a proud sponsor of the Student Success Act.

By reducing the Federal footprint, restoring local control, and empowering parents and education leaders, this commonsense bill will move our country in a better direction.

□ 1600

The Student Success Act provides States and school districts more flexibility to fund local priorities, not Washington's priorities. The legislation eliminates dozens of ineffective or duplicative programs so that each dollar makes a direct, meaningful, and lasting impact in classrooms. The bill strengthens accountability by replacing the current national scheme with State-led accountability systems, returning to States the responsibility to

measure student performance and improve struggling schools. The Student Success Act also ensures parents have the information they need to hold their schools accountable. It is their tax money, but more importantly, it is their children, and they deserve to know how their schools are performing.

Mr. Chairman, the bill reaffirms that choice is a powerful lifeline for families with children in failing schools by extending the magnet school program, expanding access to high quality charter schools, and allowing Federal funds to follow low-income students to the traditional, public, or public charter school of the parents' choice.

Finally, the Student Success Act reins in the authority of the Secretary of Education. We must stop the Secretary from unilaterally imposing his will on schools, and this bill will do just that. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that is why the White House and powerful special interests are teaming up to defeat this legislation. They fear the bill will lead to less control in Washington and more control in States and school districts. Let me assure the American people: that is precisely what this bill will do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to help all children, regardless of background, income, or ZIP Code, to receive an excellent education by supporting the Student Success Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5, a bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, a landmark civil rights law enacted under President Lyndon B. Johnson. As we approach the 50-year anniversary of its enactment, we cannot take lightly ESEA's mission, goals, and achievements over the course of five decades. It is by that yardstick of history that we must judge H.R. 5 today and determine if it will move our education system closer to meeting the challenges of the 21st century and prepare our students for the global economy.

We all know too well that quality education is even more vital today than it was generations ago. In our rapidly changing economy, our Nation's continued success depends on a well-educated workforce. A competitive and educated workforce strengthens the very social fabric of America: people with higher levels of education are less likely to be unemployed, less likely to need public assistance, less likely to become a teen parent, and less likely to get caught up in the criminal justice system. Over the course of ESEA's history, we have recognized that for many politically disconnected populations, equitable access to an education has not been a reality. It was necessary for the Federal Government to fill in the gaps of funding our public school systems.

Inequality was inevitable when most school systems are funded by real estate taxes, and further by virtue of the fact that in our democratic society, we respond to political pressure. For 50 years, Congress has recognized that low-income students were not getting their fair share of the pie and that supplemental resources were absolutely necessary to ensure that all children had access to quality public education. As a result, Congress has a longstanding policy to target our limited Federal funding to schools and students who get left behind in an unequal system.

Mr. Chairman, one of this bill's most troubling provisions, which strikes at the heart of ESEA's long history of targeting resources to our neediest students, is the so-called portability provision. Now, present law gives greater weight to funding in areas of high concentration of poverty. Under H.R. 5, portability, a State agency could use all of its title I funds to districts based solely on the percentage of poor children, regardless of the concentration of poor people in a district.

As a result, much of the title I support intended towards those areas of concentration of poverty would be reallocated to those wealthier areas. In other words, the low-income areas would get less, and the wealthy areas would get more. I ask: If that is the solution, then I wonder what you think the problem was? Analysis from a number of organizations, including the Department of Education, demonstrates title I portability will take money from the poorer schools and school districts and give more to affluent districts. This disproportionately affects students of color, and this is just simply wrong.

Data shows that H.R. 5 would provide the largest 33 school districts with the highest concentration of Black and Hispanic students over $3 billion less in Federal funding than the President's budget over the next 6 years. Furthermore, the Center for American Progress found in its review of portability that districts with high concentrations of poverty could lose an average of $85 per student, while the more affluent areas would gain more than $290 per student.

There is an overwhelming body of research that shows that targeting resources to schools and districts with the highest concentrations of poverty is an effective way to mitigate the effects of poverty. Current law reflects this evidence and targets funding to schools where there are greater concentrations of poverty, and this bill rolls the clock back and reverses that.

To add insult to injury, H.R. 5 eliminates what is called maintenance of effort, a requirement of ESEA that States maintain their effort and that the Federal money will supplement what they are doing. As a result of this bill, States could use their education funds to fund tax cuts or other noneducation initiatives, thus turning ESEA into a glorified slush fund where politics would drive funding allocations. And we know who is going to lose when politics are at play—our children.

There are other flaws with H.R. 5. This bill sets no standards for college or career readiness and allows students with disabilities to be taught with lesser standards. It limits our investment in education over the next 6 years because there are no adjustments for inflation. It block grants important programs, diluting the purpose and the outcome. Taken as a whole, these policies will have a disproportionate impact on students of color, students with disabilities, and our English language learners. It is no wonder that business groups, labor groups, civil rights, disabilities, and education groups have all expressed deep concerns about this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 5, as it will turn the clock back on American public education. In its current form, the bill abandons the fundamental principles of equity and accountability in our education system, it eviscerates education funding, it fails to support our educators, and it leaves our children ill-prepared for success in the classroom and beyond. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, it is now my great pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his great leadership on this bill and in the committee generally.

I rise in strong support this afternoon because every student, Mr. Chairman, every student deserves an effective teacher, an engaging classroom, and a quality education that paves the path for a bright and prosperous future. That is what we all want. Unfortunately, despite the best of intentions, the Nation's current K–12 education law has failed to provide students this fundamental right. In fact, the law has only gotten in the way.

Far from taking us back to the past, this bill will take us to the future, where we should have been for a while now in terms of education, so that we can maintain competitiveness with the rest of the world and win in the 21st century.

No Child Left Behind's onerous requirements and the Obama administration's waiver scheme and pet projects have created a one-size-fits-all system that hinders innovation and stymies local efforts to improve student learning. As a result, too many young adults leave high school today without basic knowledge in reading, math, and science. They are ill-equipped to complete college and compete in the workforce, and consequently they are deprived of one of the best opportunities they have to earn a lifetime of success. We shouldn't shackle any student to that kind of future.

Americans have settled for the status quo for far too long, and today we have an opportunity to chart the new course. The Student Success Act departs from the top-down approach that has inefficiently and ineffectively governed elementary and secondary education and restores that responsibility to its rightful stewards: parents, teachers, State and local education leaders, and the local taxpayers.

First, the bill gets the Federal government out of the business of running our schools. It eliminates the dizzying maze of Federal mandates that has dictated local decisions and downsizes the bloated bureaucracy at the Department of Education that has focused on what Washington wants rather than what students need. The whole theme of this bill is that we trust teachers, parents, local education officials, and our local taxpayers much more than we would ever trust a Federal bureaucrat.

Mr. Chairman, I find it funny that the other side, those who are against this bill, actually cite the Department of Education in arguing what a bad bill this is. Imagine a Federal bureaucrat actually arguing to devolve its power back to its rightful owners. Of course they are going to be for the status quo. They benefit from the status quo. The students do not.

Second, the bill empowers parents and education leaders with choice, transparency, and flexibility. It ensures parents continue to have the information they need to hold schools accountable and helps more families escape underperforming schools by expanding alternative education options such as quality charter schools. It also provides States the flexibility to develop their own systems for addressing school performance and the autonomy to use Federal funds in the most efficient way.

This bill respects, Mr. Chairman, that it is the people's property. It is their tax dollars. We shouldn't be forcing any kind of maintenance of effort requirement on States or local jurisdictions. It is their decision to decide what to do with their money.

With the Student Success Act, we have an opportunity to overcome the failed status quo of high stakes testing and Federal waivers. We have an opportunity to reduce the Federal footprint in our Nation's classrooms. We also have an opportunity to signal to moms, dads, teachers, administrators, and State officials that we trust them to hold schools accountable for delivering a quality education to every child.

As my good friend, former colleague and fellow Hoosier Governor Mike Pence, said before the House Education and the Workforce Committee earlier this month:

> There is nothing that ails education that can't be fixed by giving parents more choices and teachers more freedom to teach.

That is exactly what this bill does. This bill fosters an environment to accomplish that very thing. So I urge my colleagues to join me in replacing a broken law with much-needed, commonsense education reforms and ask you to vote ''yes''—''yes''—on the Student Success Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is overwhelming bipartisan consensus that we need to replace No Child Left Behind. And there is overwhelming bipartisan consensus that a rewrite of No Child Left Behind should promote local flexibility and support schools, not punish them. So I am deeply disappointed that the House has not come together to produce a bipartisan bill.

Despite a common goal and a long history of setting aside differences to work together on this important legislation, this bill does not adequately support America's students. Unfortunately, the Student Success Act shifts resources away from communities where poverty is most concentrated and freezes funding for America's most needy students at a time when public school enrollment is on the rise and more than half the students come from low-income families.

H.R. 5 does not support a well-rounded education for all students, it does not ensure college- and career-ready standards for all students, it does not promote quality afterschool programs, and it does not do enough to reduce emphasis on high-stakes tests.

The original goal of ESEA was laudable—equity. ESEA deserves a full review by the House so we can implement thoughtful solutions that reflect the current needs in our schools. But this bill does not protect historically underserved students.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this act, and I ask my colleagues to do the same. We need a law that is serious about addressing the challenges educators and students face today.

□ 1615

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), who has been active in this bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask, if I could, for the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee to engage in a colloquy with me concerning the importance of ensuring the Federal Government does not interfere with States' rights over public education.

Mr. KLINE. I, as the chairman of the full committee, would be happy to engage in that colloquy.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no constitutional role for the Federal Government in education.

However, I understand that the funds under this act are accepted voluntarily by each State, but I am concerned that State bureaucrats often simply accept these funds and all the strings without any input from our constituents or locally elected officials. I saw this in the Texas House.

I very much appreciate that the gentleman from Indiana and Chairman KLINE worked with me to protect the 10th Amendment and to ensure that States knowingly accept the strings attached to these programs before they receive any funding under this bill.

I want to be clear that this provision simply ensures that locally elected officials, parents, and other interested stakeholders have the opportunity to stand up and voice concern or support for accepting Federal funding at their State capital before any unelected, unaccountable bureaucrat can accept that money and all the strings that come with them.

I want to ask if the chairman concurs that this is the intent and the result of the language that you have included in the Student Success Act?

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me thank my colleague from Texas for his leadership on this important issue. I understand and appreciate your concern about this Federal role in education policy.

That is why we were happy to include your amendment in the underlying bill. It made the bill stronger and gave another tool to parents and local officials to protect their rights when it comes to educating our children.

This amendment, in combination with other strong provisions to rein in the Secretary, including an absolute ban on his ability to force any State to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other particular standards, ensures the Federal Government cannot dictate what is taught in schools, what assessments are given, or what standards are used.

In fact, this amendment ensures States willfully accept the limited requirements that will come with these funds and reaffirms what decisions should be left to the States.

I thank the gentleman for offering this provision and his commitment to a limited Federal role in education, and I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for protecting the 10th Amendment rights of the States to control their public school system and affirming a parents' right to control their child's education.

I appreciate you confirming the intent of this amendment. It will mean a far greater role for States and parents in their child's education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hate to throw cold water on the last colloquy, but I think it is important to note as we debate this bill, which never had the benefit of a public hearing or a

single subcommittee hearing, is that the Federal mandate for annual testing does not change as a result of this law.

What does change regarding that testing requirement is that the dedicated funding stream, which Congress at least had the decency to pass back in 2002, that is eliminated.

What you are doing is you are maintaining a mandate and you are eliminating the funding to pay for that mandate for testing. What we are ending up with, for all the talk about reducing the Federal footprint, is that we are doubling down on the Federal requirement that States have to have annual testing in schools, which every Member in this Chamber has heard about in loud protest over the last 13 years.

What this shows is that when the process is broken—and it was broken in this case, no committee-subcommittee meetings, no hearings, rushing it to the floor on a hyperpartisan basis, not one single Democratic amendment was accepted at the committee during markup, that is what you end up with, is a deformed bill, which should be defeated.

I urge in the strongest terms possible a ''no'' vote. Let's go back and do this the right way.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Just to address a notion of what is done in secret and what is not done in secret and whether or not people have had a chance to weigh in on this legislation, as my friend knows—and I do thank him for not mentioning basketball, by the way—as my friend knows, this bill has had multiple hearings over several years.

It has been debated in committee. It has been debated on the floor of the House. It has been debated in the media. It is much discussed and much known—in contrast to the bill, the amendment, a substitute that my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle brought forward in committee, 851 pages, that nobody had seen outside the Democrat Caucus, so I believe this bill is well known, and it is the right direction to move us forward into the future to make sure that all of our children receive the quality education they deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond to the idea that our substitute was produced.

I would apologize to the gentleman for having sprung the substitute on him.

However, 2 legislative days after his bill was introduced, he scheduled a markup on the bill, so we produced a response to his bill in 2 legislative days. That is all the time we were allowed.

We would have allowed hearings. We would have liked hearings on his bill and our bill, but that just wasn't to take place because of the rush to judgment.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), the ranking member of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose H.R. 5, the Student Success Act.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act reaffirmed the Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education that every child has the right to an equal educational opportunity. H.R. 5 undermines the law's original intent, turning back the clock on equity and accountability in American public education.

As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of ESEA, Republicans have chosen to honor the anniversary by bringing a partisan bill to the House floor that tears apart the historic Federal role in education.

H.R. 5 should be known as the ''Ensure Students Don't Succeed Act.'' The bill is a backward leap in our country's education system, not a forward one.

Every student in America has a right to a quality education. It is our job as Members of Congress to make sure that right is protected, something that H.R. 5 does not do.

I refuse to fail our children and their families because our children deserve so much more than this legislation provides.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am very, very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the current K–12 education system is failing our students, and State and local attempts to make it better have been hampered by an enormous Federal footprint.

Parents and education leaders have lost much of their decisionmaking authority to Washington bureaucrats, and the Secretary of Education has bullied States into adopting the Obama administration's pet projects.

Unsurprisingly, student achievement levels remain worrisome. Just 36 percent of eighth grade students read at grade level, and only 35 percent are proficient in math.

For far too long, our schools have been governed by a top-down approach that stymies State and local efforts to meet the unique needs of their student populations. We can't continue to make the same mistakes and expect better results. America's students deserve change.

Fortunately, this week, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to chart a new course with the Student Success Act, legislation that reduces the Federal footprint in the Nation's classrooms and restores control to the people who know their students best: parents, teachers, and local leaders.

The Student Success Act gets Washington out of the business of running schools. It protects State and local autonomy by prohibiting the Secretary of Education from coercing States into adopting Common Core or other standards or assessments and by preventing the Secretary from creating additional burdens on States and school districts.

The bill reduces the size of the Federal education bureaucracy. Currently, the Department of Education oversees more than 80 programs geared towards primary and secondary education, most of which are duplicative and fail to deliver adequate results for students. The bill eliminates over 65 of these programs and requires the Secretary of Education to reduce the Department's workforce accordingly.

The Student Success Act repeals onerous, one-size-fits-all mandates that dictate accountability, teacher quality, and local spending that have done more to tie up States and school districts in red tape than to support education efforts. It returns responsibility for classroom decisions to parents, teachers, administrators, and education officials.

The bill also provides States and school districts the funding flexibility to efficiently and effectively invest limited taxpayer dollars to boost student achievement by creating a local academic flexible grant. It provides the public with greater transparency and accountability over the development of new rules affecting K–12 schools.

Education is a deeply personal issue. After years of the Secretary of Education running schools through executive fiat, we understand that people are concerned about what a new K–12 education law will do.

That is why a number of key principles have guided our efforts to replace the law since we began the process more than 4 years ago: reducing the Federal footprint, restoring local control, and empowering parents and education leaders.

Those principles are reflected throughout the legislation, including specific safeguards that protect the right of States to opt out of the law, as well as the autonomy of home schools, religious schools, and private schools.

Organizations such as the Council for American Private Education, the Home School Legal Defense Association, and Committee on Catholic Education of U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops have expressed support for the Student Success Act because they know it will keep the Federal Government out of their business and preserve their cherished rights.

A host of administration bureaucrats is attempting to defeat these much-needed changes. They know each reform that returns flexibility and choice to parents and school boards represent a loss of power in D.C.

It is time we put the interests of America's students above the desires of Washington politicians.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. FOXX. By reversing the top-down policies of recent decades, the Student Success Act offers conservative solutions to repair a broken education system.

It would finally get Washington out of the way and allow parents, teachers, and State and local education leaders the flexibility to provide every child in every school a high-quality education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

I have to ask the majority: When did local control come to mean spend Federal dollars but ditch the Federal oversight?

During our markup last week—and I certainly heard today Member after Member arguing how removing Federal standards would help local leaders make tough decisions. This is absolutely backwards.

For 9 years, I served on the second largest school board in California, the sixth in the Nation, and I distinctly remember every school in the district making a compelling case for extra resources.

Which is why, frankly, we should be debating how to increase the size of the pie that goes to education, rather than only arguing on how to cut it up.

I still remember particularly one board meeting agonizing over the decision to move money from one needy school to another. We had to cut our budget, and we had to make a decision. In the end, the law and the safeguards around title I helped direct us to make sure the money went to the students that needed it most.

Ultimately, the direction in the law helps us balance competing needs, and I urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

□ 1630

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5, also known as the Student Success Act. Having spent 24 years as a classroom teacher, I am especially concerned about the title I funding mechanism in this legislation. We have seen time and time again that block grants often redirect funding away from intended populations and are a prelude to further cuts.

I also oppose the Republican bill's portability provision, which betrays the original intent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. ESEA is meant to promote equitable opportunity and education for all and to help raise the academic achievement of low-income children. This legislation will do the opposite.

Finally, I object to the utter lack of Federal accountability in H.R. 5. While I oppose the current test-driven, high-stakes accountability system, I want the right accountability system, not no accountability system.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation goes too far. It cuts too deep and takes too many steps backward. I oppose H.R. 5. I call on my colleagues to do the same.

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

I just want to address this issue of grants and block grants and so forth we are starting to hear a little bit about.

I have been hearing for years, as I talk to superintendents in Minnesota and around the country, their frustration with the maze of Federal programs, 80-some Federal programs, each with its soda straw of funding and requirements for action and reporting. They have told me again and again: I have got money here, and I don't need it there. I need money here, and I can't move that money. I don't have the flexibility to move that money. I need to be able to put the resources where my students need it.

So, by eliminating 65 of those soda straws of individual controls and giving that flexibility to superintendents, we allow the money to be spent where it is needed the most. I think that is one of the great strengths of this bill, and it is one of the reasons why the American Association of School Superintendents does support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Chairman, this bill breaks the promise made 50 years ago to help all kids get a good, quality public education and to recognize the challenges faced by kids living in poverty.

When talking about the problems with this Republican bill, one wonders where to start. Is it the tearing apart of public education that comes in the form of dismantling title I funding? or the fact that the portability scheme is a slippery slope to turning our public school system into one big taxpayer-funded voucher program with public dollars sent to private schools? or the fact that Republicans have failed to address the need for early education or the maintenance of efforts of education? or that this bill diminishes the focus on professional development for teachers or the clear protections for collective bargaining agreements that are already part of State laws? or, ultimately, that this bill provides insufficient funding lower than what the title I authorization for last year authorized under the current law?

This bill doesn't provide real student success, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a member of the committee.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed 50 years ago to embody the promise that education is a right, not a privilege. We are supposed to be guardians of that promise, not the architects of its demise.

This reauthorization was an opportunity for Congress to delve in and debate the most pressing issues facing our schools. Sadly, the Republican majority chose to introduce a partisan bill behind closed doors without a single public hearing. Now we have a bill that reflects that lack of inclusion, takes hundreds of millions of dollars from our most vulnerable children, and weakens the safeguards that govern taxpayer money.

When I served on my local school committee, a tough economy meant some really difficult decisions. Not everyone was happy, but we listened. We listened to teachers, administrators, parents, students, experts, and fiscal watchdogs, and we were guided by one simple principle: what is best for our students. It is a shame Congress couldn't find the will to do the same.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 5.

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a former college professor and now a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5.

Two weeks ago, our committee came together expecting to seriously consider this bill, but instead Republicans said ''no'': ''no'' to moving beyond the status quo, ''no'' to investing in the futures of our kids, ''no'' to supporting our teachers and principals, and ''no'' to ensuring the success of our neediest students.

Guess what. You said ''yes'' to taking money from our poorest students like Robin Hood in reverse, ''yes'' to erasing the gains we have made over the past 50 years, and ''yes'' to denying students success. This bill ignores the obvious needs of our students and turns its back on some of our most vulnerable.

I hope we are not fooled by the name of the bill. Student Success is a failure. It clearly sets up our students to fail. H.R. 5 fails on all accounts. It fails our neediest students. It fails to invest in our teachers and our principals. It fails to prepare students for college and careers. This bill deserves an F.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, could you advise how much time is available to both parties?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a former mayor.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is our responsibility to provide America's young people with every opportunity to obtain a world-class education in the best possible environment so they can compete in an increasingly global economy. That is why it is critical that we reauthorize ESEA the right way. Schools and educators deserve certainty, continuity, and direction based on new research and informed by our experience from the last decade, and students deserve the best education we can provide. H.R. 5 is not the right way to do it.

H.R. 5 would freeze funding at current levels for 6 years, representing over $800 million in cuts compared to presequester funding. By funding programs with block grants and introducing title I portability, this fails to support greater achievement of low-income students, students of color, students with disabilities, and English language learners. This fails students in so many ways.

We should be working together to ensure that a reauthorized ESEA improves student achievement, supports teachers and principals, and provides high-quality education for all students. This bill does not accomplish this.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Upon signing the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act, President Johnson described education as ''the only valid passport from poverty.'' This bill threatens to tear up that passport. It caps Federal education funding at 2015 levels, levels which are already woefully inadequate after years of drastic cuts, and makes no provision for inflation, let alone the growing need for Federal education programs.

The bill allows States to direct Federal dollars away from schools in districts with the greatest poverty. It permits States to reduce education funding with no accountability. It allows schools in wealthier neighborhoods to use title I funding without having to target funds to the students with the greatest needs. It is a blatant betrayal of the ESEA's fundamental purpose, which is to level the playing field for low-income kids.

It weakens or eliminates many successful programs, including 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative, which provides quality after school, summer school programs for disadvantaged children.

Mr. Chairman, it used to be that hard work in schools and on the job was the surest ticket to the middle class. Today, that compact is broken. Millions of hardworking families do not earn enough to make ends meet, let alone move up in the world. The cuts proposed in this bill would make matters even worse. Kids from poor neighborhoods are already being neglected, while those from wealthy areas get an ever-increasing slice of the pie. These disparities reverberate throughout their lives to create an increasingly divided, unequal society.

Let me put it simply: Without broad access to quality education, there is no future for the middle class. With this legislation, the majority is saying to America's low-income kids: You are on your own.

Mr. Chairman, that is not who we are. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), a new member of the committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, because our system, education system, is failing. Where I come from, we call trying to do things over and over again and expecting a different outcome insanity. I believe our system is broken to the extent that it is a moral imperative for Congress, at this point, to step up and act. Our students, our parents, our teachers should not have to settle for a failing system.

Before Congress, I worked in the private sector, and I also had an opportunity to work in State government, including the opportunity to serve as the majority leader of the Michigan Senate. At that time, I saw firsthand how much more effective we can be at the State level to use State resources and control where they are going than to have the Federal Government come in, step in and use, and expect the State to spend it in a certain way.

This system of top-down does not help the States; it puts us in a bad position. As a State legislator, had I the opportunity, I would have come here and supported the cause as well because it is the right thing to do. I do believe it is high time that we defend the 10th Amendment and rein back the Federal Government's role, especially in our children's education. Local teachers and parents know our children better than the Department of Education in Washington, D.C., ever could; and the result is that our system is broken, and that becomes clearer and clearer every day.

I just want to mention a couple statistics that I find alarming but instructive. First of all, 35 percent of our fourth graders are reading at a proficient level. Only 26 percent of our high school seniors are proficient in math. Just a couple examples that I mention. Those examples are unacceptable.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. The Student Success Act gives authority back to our States and expands opportunities so our children can get the best education opportunity possible. That is what they deserve, and that is what I was sent to Washington, D.C., to support.

This bill is also critical in ensuring the Federal Government cannot force a failed program like Common Core on the States. When looking at education reform, it is also important to make sure that we continue to protect the rights of our home schoolers and our private schools. That is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, we must reduce the Federal Government's footprint in our children's classrooms because it is making a mess of the education system. We are long overdue for change, and I believe the Student Success Act will move our Nation in the right direction.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, because this bill limits the amount of funding available, it moves money from low-income areas to wealthy areas, eliminates targeted funds for English learners and those with disabilities; it fails to set meaningful standards.

A lot of organizations oppose the legislation, including business organizations, child advocacy groups, civil rights groups, the organizations supporting those with disabilities and health groups, including the Congressional Tri-Caucus; the Advocacy Institute; the Afterschool Alliance; the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; the American Association of People With Disabilities; the American Association of University Women; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Foundation for the Blind; the Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Autism National Committee; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; the Center for American Progress; the Center for Law and Social Policy; the Children's Defense Fund; the Committee for Education Funding; the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities; the Council of the Great City Schools; the Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Inc.; Democrats for Education Reform; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Easter Seals; Education Post; Education Law Center; First Focus Campaign for Children; Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network; Human Rights Campaign; the Bazelon Center

for Mental Health Law; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Leading Educators; the League of United Latin American Citizens; the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the NAACP; the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund; the National Association of School Psychologists; the National Center for Learning Disabilities; the National Council on Independent Living; the National Council on Teacher Quality; the National Center on Time & Learning; the National Congress of American Indians; the National Council of La Raza; the National Coalition for Public Education; the National Disability Rights Network; the National Down Syndrome Congress; the National Education Association; the National Urban League; the National Women's Law Center; Partners for Each and Every Child; the Poverty & Race Research Action Council; Public Advocates Inc.; Stand for Children; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; TASH; Teach Plus; TNTP; the Education Trust; the United Negro College Fund; the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They are all in opposition to this legislation.

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

□ 1645

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I often don't come to the floor to speak, but I felt compelled on this particular bill, H.R. 5, to talk about it. Why? Because I represent a district that has 90 percent of the public schoolchildren who live and receive reduced or free lunches and it is important for me to just state for the record that I think that a bill that takes away funding from public schools—targeted funding for low-income and poverty students—would be an abomination.

This bill is here because of the work of Lyndon Johnson 50 years ago. It was a civil rights bill, frankly. Why? It was an acknowledgment that socially disadvantaged children needed additional help. Somewhere along the line, Mr. Chairman, we have lost as a nation the notion of ''our children.''

It is always ''my child,'' not ''our children.''

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Until the parents of more affluent children see that their lives are intrinsically linked to children who are poor, we as a nation will never be the beloved community that so many civil rights leaders fought and died for.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for the opportunity to speak on this underlying bill, and I want to urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a member of the committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his work on this bill. It is a very important bill, and it is certainly very applicable to what is going on in our country right now.

Mr. Chairman, Federal intervention in our Nation's classrooms is at an all-time high, and the Obama administration continues to believe that they think they know what is best for our children. However, despite the continued intrusion into our children's classrooms, student achievement remains stagnant.

Out of 34 countries, students in the U.S. rank 20th and 27th in science and math respectively, so it is clear that our education system is not adequately serving our children, and it is not going to be fixed by Washington bureaucrats. Our education system can only be fixed by parents, teachers, aunts, uncles, coaches, and community leaders—the people who actually know what is best for our Nation's children.

That is why I am supporting H.R. 5. I am supporting this bill to put some restraints on the administration, to rein in the Department of Education, and to put the keys to our children's educations and futures back in local control where it belongs.

It repeals out-of-touch teacher qualification programs, and it allows State and local officials to determine who is qualified to teach their children. It also eliminates 65 programs and creates a grant program with greater flexibility for school districts.

We all know that children learn differently and at their own pace, and without this bill, the Secretary of Education can prohibit funds from being sent to States unless they adopt certain one-size-fits-all standards, like Common Core.

I will be the first one to say that additional reforms to our education system are needed. No, this is not the silver bullet, but it is a great start, and it is a great bill. I support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to state for the record that graduation rates have been up since No Child Left Behind was passed. Black and Latino children are doing better, so it has been working, but we need to continue to improve.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the Statement of Administration Policy, which speaks to the administration position on H.R. 5. The Statement of Administration Policy goes as follows:

The administration strongly opposes H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, as approved by the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. Congress must act in a bipartisan way to reform the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to help States prepare all children for college and careers by giving them flexibility from No Child Left Behind mandates. However, H.R. 5 represents a significant step backwards in the efforts to help all of the Nation's children and their families prepare for their futures.

H.R. 5 abdicates the historic Federal role in elementary and secondary education of ensuring the educational progress of all of America's children, including children from low-income families, students with disabilities, English learners, and students of color. It fails to maintain the core expectation that States and school districts will take serious, sustained, and targeted actions when necessary to remedy achievement gaps and reform persistently low-performing schools. H.R. 5 fails to identify opportunity gaps or remedy inequities in access to the resources and supports students need to succeed, such as challenging academic courses, excellent teachers and principals, afterschool enrichment or expanded learning time, and other academic and nonacademic supports.

Rather than investing more in schools, H.R. 5 would allow States to divert education funding away from the schools and students who need it the most through the so-called ''portability'' provision. The bill's caps on Federal education spending would lock in recent budget cuts for the rest of the decade, and the bill would allow funds currently required to be used for education to be used for other purposes, such as spending on sports stadiums or tax cuts for the wealthy. H.R. 5 fails to make critical investments for the Nation's students, including high-quality preschool for America's children, support for America's teachers and principals, and investment in innovative solutions for the public education system.

The administration agrees on the need for high-quality statewide annual testing as required in H.R. 5, so parents and teachers know how children and schools are doing from year to year and to allow for consistent measurement of school and student performance across the State. However, this bill should do more to reduce redundant and unnecessary testing, such as asking States to limit the amount of time spent on standardized testing and requiring parental notification when testing is consuming too much classroom learning time.

The administration opposes H.R. 5 in its current form for all of these reasons but particularly because it would deny Federal funds to the classrooms that need them the most and fails to assure parents that policymakers and educators will take action when students are not learning.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, since No Child Left Behind was put in place, the Federal Government has dictated how States and school districts spend money, gauge student learning and school performance, and hire classroom teachers.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it isn't working. Washington bureaucrats, no matter how well meaning they are, will never have the personal understanding

of the diverse and special and unique needs of students than the teachers, administrators, and parents who spend time with them.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here today because I have to speak for Erin and Moses. Erin is my daughter-in-law and the mother of my four grandchildren. Moses was a student who tested her teaching ability and her passion for teaching.

Erin came to teach in a fourth and fifth grade classroom for special needs students in Cicero, Illinois. Freshly minted out of her educational training and master's program, she came in with a passion for teaching.

She came in because she was sent in that classroom as a full-time, continuing substitute because the teacher of that classroom had gotten up one day, had walked out of the classroom, and had never come back.

Erin was given the opportunity of a lifetime of teaching these students, and she began to invest her life into those students, especially in one young student, a fourth grader by the name of Moses.

Moses came from a difficult situation. Moses at that time in the fourth grade was not even fully potty-trained, but Erin invested her time and talent and, frankly, her treasure in the life of that student, as well as of the others. She had a wonderful outcome in working with the parent in the home, as well as with Moses in the classroom.

The next year, Erin was given the opportunity to be a full-time teacher, not a sub anymore. I will never forget the day when Erin came to me, with tears in her eyes, and said: ''Dad, I'm not sure I'm cut out for teaching.''

I said: ''Erin, why? You had an amazing impact for that 6 months of time you spent in the same classroom last year.''

She said: ''Now, all I'm doing is filling out paperwork for Illinois, for Chicago, and for the Federal Government.''

She ultimately had our twin grandsons and went from the classroom to the home, but there will be a day that comes when those four kids are at the stage when she can go back to the classroom. I want Erin to go back and have the ability to teach, to love on those kids, to direct them, to work with the parents, and not spend time filling out bureaucratic forms.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I support the Student Success Act. It replaces Federal control with State and local control.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. WALBERG. The bill allows States to establish and implement their own standards and assessments. The bill allows States to develop their own accountability plans for improving underperforming schools by eliminating federally prescribed school improvement and turnaround interventions. The bill provides State and local school districts flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we are speaking for. It is for the Erins and for the Moseses of the world—educational opportunities that should lead us into the future in great ways for this country and to lead the world.

□ 1700

This is what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. The Student Success Act places control back in the hands of education's rightful stewards: the teachers, the administrators, the States, the parents, and, ultimately, the students.

Let's pass this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ABRAHAM). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Consortium for Citizens With Disabilities says:

> The Student Success Act does not fully support students with disabilities, and in fact, it creates incentives for schools and districts to take students with disabilities, unchecked, off the track from having equitable access to and achieving a regular high school diploma.
>
> Incidence data reflects that less than 1 percent of all students have the significant cognitive disabilities, which corresponds to about 10 percent of students with disabilities.
>
> Without this limitation, we fear that schools may inappropriately assign students to the alternative assessment. Data show assignment to these alternative assessments may lead to reduced access to the general curriculum and limit a student's access to earn a regular diploma.

That is why the disability groups oppose the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to end with a reminder that this limits the funding. It transfers money from low-income areas to high-income areas. That is not just urban areas. There are over 2,400 low-income rural districts that will lose about $150 million, or 15 percent, of their total allocation, under the current law. The legislation eliminates targeting for English learners and those with disabilities. Finally, it fails to set meaningful standards.

For those reasons, we should join the administration in opposing H.R. 5, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As is always the case in these debates on the floor, we hear a lot of things. Some of them are actually factual; some of them are not. There is, shockingly, some hyperbole that comes along with this.

We did hear some things, though, from both sides of the aisle that I think are worth underscoring. One of the speakers on the other side of the aisle talked about how schools and States need continuity—I think was his word—predictability. That is exactly what we do not have now.

Right now, this country is operating under the law of the land, which is No Child Left Behind, and under a big, convoluted scheme of temporary conditional waivers which provide no continuity, no predictability, and that is why we are hearing on both sides of the aisle—from coast-to-coast and off the coast, as a matter of fact—that we need to replace No Child Left Behind.

I believe that as we replace No Child Left Behind, we need to put responsibility in the hands of parents and teachers and school boards and States, and not in the hands of Washington, D.C.

I think that it is not fair to say that there is not a problem. We heard from the ranking member that graduation rates have gone up. On the other hand, they haven't gone up much, and we are still in a position where a fourth, or 26 percent, of high school seniors are proficient in math. That means 74 percent—maybe I need to have a little math here—are not. Only 38 percent of those high school seniors can read at grade level. We have a problem with one in five students dropping out. We need to address that problem.

We heard a lot of talk about where title I funds go and portability to public schools. It is a question, I understand. There is a disagreement here, but we happen to believe it is fair that if you are a poor kid, if you are eligible for title I funds, you ought to get those funds. There is a disagreement. I think the children, if they are eligible, if they are in poverty, ought to get their share of title I funds.

One of the things we didn't talk much about today as we talked about the problems out there, we know that in some areas of the country you have children trapped in absolutely failing schools where less than half of the kids graduate and those that graduate are nowhere near ready to go to college or go to work.

So we have seen across the country and in most States public charter schools popping up, giving parents hope, giving them a chance to get those kids out of failing schools.

I said this the other day in the Rules Committee, because it was so moving to me. I went to a charter school in north Minneapolis. There were 430 kids in that school. Their parents are delighted with the education they are getting now and thrilled to get their kids out of failing schools.

When I asked the principal and the founder of the school if she could take more kids, she said: No, this is the right size for this school. She would like to replicate the school—and that is what this bill allows—so she can have another successful charter school. And how successful is it? There are a thousand kids, Mr. Chairman, on the waiting list to get in that charter school because their parents want to get out of a failing school system. This bill allows that to happen.

It comes down to, fundamentally: Who do you trust, Washington or local government? We want to put the control in the hands of parents and local school boards and States.

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

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 5, the ill-named Student Success Act. H.R. 5 would undermine significant gains made by No Child Left Behind, and eviscerate the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by dismantling its foundation of equity and accountability.

Under this bill, school districts with the highest concentrations of Hispanic students would lose more than $1.9 billion in federal funding. Los Angeles Unified School District which is more than 74 percent Hispanic faces the largest cut in Title I funds, over $80 million, which amounts to nearly 25 percent of their budget.

School districts with a high concentration of students living in poverty could lose $700 million in funding and high-poverty districts could see cuts as large as 74 percent. The portability of Title I funds would divert and dilute limited funds from schools with high needs and high concentrations of poverty. This undermines the fundamental purpose of Title I: to assist high needs and high poverty schools. With 35 percent of Latino children under the age of five living in poverty, this is the time to increase, not decrease funding.

Education is our nation's great equalizer. I would not be where I am today if it were not for the quality public education I received. For over 50 years, ESEA has been our nation's driving force for educational equity. Unfortunately, this Republican bill would dismantle the foundation of equality and accountability that ESEA has built over the last half-century. If we want our nation to remain a leader in the world, we must improve equal access to quality education for the next generation. Our students are the future of tomorrow, and we simply cannot let them down.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. ABRAHAM, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Eating Disorders Awareness Week. This time is dedicated to educating parents and children about the causes and serious health conditions and consequences of eating disorders.

Eating disorders affect more than 14 million Americans and have disproportionate impacts on teens and young adults. Beyond genetic links, factors such as consistent exposure to misleading advertising that distort one's own body image can lead to eating disorders. The key to containing this growing health issue is to spread awareness and promote authentic, healthy body images.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, along with a bipartisan coalition, we have urged the Federal Trade Commission to uphold their duty to protect American consumers by working with health professionals and the advertising industry to promote fair and responsible advertisements, especially for products geared for children and teens.

If you suspect that your child has an eating disorder, please seek professional help. There are many local resources available to families.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL BROADCASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ABRAHAM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extends their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of today's Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much this opportunity that we have this evening to inform and to educate my colleagues in the House, fellow Members of Congress, and even the American people through C–SPAN, about the importance of local radio and television broadcasters. They are important not only to our country, but I want to talk about how important they are to our communities—the communities we live in, the communities they live in, the communities they work in.

For decades, these broadcasters have been the first ones to respond to disasters and emergencies. They have saved numerous lives by their ability to be on the scene and to broadcast widely. They have helped communities pick up the pieces after a natural disaster or a manmade disaster. The broadcasters of our country, of our communities, have played a vital role in the quality of life in our communities.

I have been blessed throughout my career not just in public service but in other positions to work with local broadcasters hosting telethons to help find cures for diseases like muscular dystrophy, cancer, and many other diseases that our communities have tackled together.

Now, we need to remember that these radio and television stations are not monolithic corporations. They are owned and run and managed by our friends and neighbors, the people that we see every day.

Today is a big day. It is an appropriate day to celebrate—not just inform and educate but celebrate—the role of America's broadcasters in our communities. Because today, hundreds of Members of Congress were able to meet with their local television and radio station personalities and managers and representatives. Today, nearly 600 broadcasters came to Capitol Hill to tell their story of public service and to remind their Representatives of their role.

You may not know that these broadcasters are required by statute to serve the public interest. When I hear about the stories they cover, when I see the types of stories they cover, the lives they have touched, the service that they are providing, I am heartened to know that we have a vibrant, thriving system of local broadcasting in this country.

Unlike many other countries around the world, where national and regional news is what is available to their citizens, here in the United States, here in places like North Dakota and Texas and Arkansas and others, we have a system of local radio and TV stations so folks living in the same community are bound together by weather events, sporting events, news of the day, and human interest, all provided by an accurate local source.

I know in North Dakota we have seen weather emergencies where information from our local broadcasters was all that was available for those suffering the impacts of a storm. Several years ago, I myself, with my family, in 1984, spent all night—this was before cell phones, I know—spent all night in a car in a blizzard that came upon North Dakota suddenly. We were just off the interstate. The only communication we had was through KFGO Radio, which won a Peabody that year for broadcasting to us and to several others that were stranded in that storm.

So, today, we are going to hear a number of stories from Members of Congress across the country also touched by their local TV and radio stations. I thank them for sharing stories about their local stations. I will share some of mine as we go throughout this Special Order, but I want to call on somebody who knows a fair bit about broadcasting, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. CRAMER, I appreciate the opportunity. It is an honor to be able to stand up and advocate on behalf of our broadcasters, who are not only my constituents and your constituents, but my colleagues, because I am, as you mentioned, a former broadcaster, and I know firsthand the importance of broadcasting, as you indicated, to local and national communities.

You talked about a weather occurrence. Last week, my district and most of Arkansas was blanketed with ice.

□ 1715

I can tell you with certainty that a good number of my constituents were tuned in to their local radio station, their local television station, to hear about school closures and to hear about road conditions and to hear about other community closures and shelters that might be available and any number of things that are necessary in times of weather that could put them in a position of distress, so it is very, very important.

I have got some statistics here that really speak to the value proposition that they bring to our economy. In my district alone, there are 20 local television stations and 233 local radio stations in the State of Arkansas. That is statewide, not districtwide.

These broadcasters contribute $9.83 billion to our State's GDP, and they have provided roughly 22,000 jobs in the State of Arkansas.

Beyond Arkansas, in the entire country, local broadcasters account for 2.65 million jobs, and they provide—get this—$1.24 trillion to our GDP.

As we talked about, they provide a variety of services to communities that they support. One of the things that I didn't mention, as a broadcaster, I was a farm broadcaster, so you can appreciate this, being from North Dakota.

Most farmers rely on those market reports, weather reports, bug reports, disease reports, any number of things, information that is relevant to production agriculture that they rely on, so that was one of the things that helped launch my career. I was able to start a farm news network, operated it, started with four stations, and it is now up to 53 in a five-state area.

All of that is very specific to the local community and what is grown and raised in those communities, and so farmers have come to rely on that, and I am sure it is the same in your home State of North Dakota.

But I think the point that we are trying to make here is that every community is unique. Every community has their own needs, and no one knows those needs better than the broadcasters who serve those communities.

I just want to say, as a Congress, I think it is our duty to support broadcasters who do so much for the region and their communities, and I appreciate you taking the time to make this hour happen.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman wouldn't mind, I would like to ask a question. I know we didn't rehearse this, but in this era of all kinds of new information technologies available and ways of getting information, streaming and cell phones and smartphones and the like, maybe you could just share a minute or two about why it is still important, what role the broadcaster, the free, over-the-air broadcast through the public spectrum, why that matters in this era of new IT.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, you touched on it right there. It is free, over the air, they can access it. They don't have to have any special tool other than a radio.

Everybody's got a radio in their car or in their tractor, in their truck, in the office, whatever; and when everything else fails, you can't get a cell signal, you can't get your Internet, whatever, the radio is reliable.

From the farmers' perspectives, which obviously I have an interest in, they rely heavily on that, and there is an element of trust. Their local broadcaster is usually a trusted source of information, so that is why it is so important and why they rely so heavily on their local broadcaster, whether that be their 6 p.m. news.

I have been a news anchor on our local television station, and folks do become accustomed to hearing from you, and they trust that.

Here is the other thing that is interesting about broadcasters: they are integrating new media in conjunction with their broadcasting, so it sort of supplements what their core mission is, to provide that service to the community over the airwaves.

The great thing about broadcasters is they are very innovative. They are not a static business model. They are developing new technology, they are integrating new technology, and it all works together, with the core mission being to serve their communities.

You see fundraising efforts for the Make-A-Wish Foundation on the local radio station. That is important. Radio stations and television stations are innovative in community support activities.

AMBER Alerts, not only are they broadcasting those AMBER Alerts, but they are using texts and social media to supplement that and really help enhance their broadcasting efforts, too.

There is a lot of these things that you can't get along without, I think, without our public broadcasters, our local community broadcasters—television and radio—who operate on the airwaves.

Mr. CRAMER. Great points. Thank you so much for participating.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for having this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring an additional perspective to the importance of local broadcasters, TV, radio. I live down on the gulf coast. We call where I live in my district ''hurricane alley.''

Just since I have been in Congress, Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, Hurricane Humberto, Hurricane Ike, and Hurricane Gustav have all hit my congressional district. Now, some blame me. It is not my fault, but here they come, all of these hurricanes.

We are down on the gulf coast, and as soon as the hurricanes come through, guess what, there goes the power—electricity. Besides all of the flooding, the damage, the wind, all of this happens when hurricane season comes upon us in the summer.

The local folks, to get information, if they are still at home, they are watching local TV. Many are not because they have to leave because of rising water and wind damage.

When Hurricane Ike came into Galveston, Texas, it went across the island, and then when the wind shifted, it came back across the island, but that saltwater went across and came back. Tremendous damage in Galveston, Texas.

The only thing the people could listen to or find information, really, was their car radio as they are trying to leave the area. The radio stations and TV stations that are still on the air are very vital for public safety and information and about the weather. People listen to the local broadcasters about what is happening right there.

When Hurricane Rita came into Houston in 2005, approximately 2.5 million to 3 million people evacuated. Now, some say that this is the largest evacuation in American history. I don't know. That is a lot of people on the road, and they are all headed north to get away from the wind and the rain and the flooding that is taking place.

What people were listening to in the car was local radio stations that were on the air broadcasting, not just the weather, but the traffic that was taking place. Eventually, the freeways, the interstates all allowed traffic to move on all lanes north.

The way the folks found out about that was on the radio, the announcements being made by the Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas highway department, that the lanes had been shifted so that everybody could travel in all of the lanes that took place, so that information was so vital.

It is not just important during hurricane season. As already stated by the gentleman from Arkansas, it is important during even normal weather, if we can call what is taking place here in Washington normal weather, but the snow and the ice. People want to listen to local radio to find out—and local television.

Also, even go back to Katrina. We all remember Hurricane Katrina. Folks in Louisiana left Louisiana, and they came to Texas, and as they were getting to Texas, guess what, Hurricane Rita hit Texas.

Houstonians, primarily, when those folks from Louisiana were coming our way, were told by local media on where they could go to take things for those neighbors from Louisiana, everything from food and blankets, and go volunteer to help out to find shelter for these individuals.

Local radio, local television is broadcasting how that can be done, how that can be help to those individuals. That couldn't have been done if we didn't have our local broadcasters who know the area, know the people.

We have AMBER Alerts. That is throughout the country. 206 Texas children that were abducted had been rescued because of the AMBER Alert system that was created in 1998 by the Dallas-Ft. Worth broadcasters.

The other issue that I want to mention is our—well, there are two more, and they are just as important. Local radio and television has local political issues and debates on our community, from the local politicians, the local officeholders, and even others. That is all done locally by our broadcasters on television; it is done on radio all the time. There is political argument and debate by our local media.

Something that is important to us—I don't know about the Dakotas, but it is important to us. We like football in Texas. We like high school football. Let's be a little specific. On Friday night, everybody is playing football at the high schools, at the stadiums.

Our local broadcasters, yes, they are out there at the stadiums, and at 10 p.m. news, they have a little bit of news, and then they have a little bit of weather, and then they spend most of the rest of the news broadcasting tapes from the high school football games in the Houston area.

They are very important, Mr. Speaker, to know exactly who won the game, who the visiting team was, high school football. We are not going to see that unless we have local broadcasting. Of course, high school football is on the radio as well. I do want to mention that important service that local broadcasters give us.

We have a lot of great broadcasters in the Houston area, both on radio and on television. I would like to mention some of them. Channel 13 has Dave Ward. I think he has been on television, nightly news—I don't know, I would hate to say 30 years, but maybe it has been that long or more—along with Gina Gaston.

On channel 26, we have got Jose Grinan; channel 2, Bill Balleza and Dominique Sachse; then channel 11, Greg Hurst and Lisa Hernandez.

Years ago, there was this local television celebrity that worked for channel 13. He turned out to be a celebrity named Marvin Zindler. He is an icon in the Houston area.

He is a local broadcaster, and he spent time going around in the Houston restaurants examining restaurants and, as he said, looking for slime in the ice machine. He did a nightly broadcast on restaurants that just weren't up to the health standards of the city of Houston.

Other investigative reporters are doing something very similar on the local basis as well, but it is all local. It is the local broadcasters that are doing it.

I commend the gentleman, Mr. CRAMER. I am sorry I talked so long. The local folks, we certainly couldn't exist without them. Radio, television, we appreciate what they do, not just for football, but for the other things as well.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I especially thank him for raising the football illustration, just because it is an opportunity—while he wondered if it was important in North Dakota, North Dakotans have become very accustomed to coming to Texas for football games because, for the last 4 years, the North Dakota State University football team has won the national FCS championship game in Frisco, Texas.

Thank you for reminding us of that, and we look forward to a trip next year, perhaps.

That said, I appreciate what you raised about how many broadcast stations really—they are tools of the First Amendment, and they are also, obviously, an important part of the First Amendment because that is where they derive their rights to express and to broadcast.

Where would politicians be without broadcasting debates? So I appreciate that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), just to let everybody know this is obviously a very important bipartisan Special Order because it a very important bipartisan issue.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for the time and for organizing this Special Order.

To be sure that folks do not think that local broadcasters are only important in the Midwest, I am here representing New England. We have many, many examples where our local broadcasters have really made a difference in Rhode Island.

□ 1730

I think sometimes the best way to illustrate that is to give real examples of where that happened.

So, for example, there was a documentary made about a homeless man finding help at Crossroads, which is the largest homeless services organization in the State of Rhode Island. WPRI-TV, a local broadcaster in the city of Providence, secured the rights to this documentary and took the opportunity to create a telethon around its airing. Viewers were asked to open their hearts and their pocketbooks and pledge by phone or online, and that effort raised $85,000 for the shelter, providing greatly needed funding as the housing crisis and economy created an ever-growing demand for the shelter services. So that is one example.

Another example is, while residents of our capital city, the city of Providence, waited for their electricity to be restored in their homes after Hurricane Irene cut off power to many in our State, WJAR-TV Providence simulcast the audio portion of its newscast on Clear Channel's WHJJ-AM Providence. This arrangement allowed locals to receive the TV station's around-the-clock coverage on battery-operated radios, which was obviously a very important service.

In our State, we have a wonderful facility, a school called Meeting Street, which is an organization that provides individual learning programs for thousands of children with developmental disabilities. And Meeting Street is really allowed to tell the story of its wonderful school to the community each year during its annual telethon on WPRI-TV. This 4-hour, commercial-free telethon preempts prime-time programming, and all production for the event is done in-house by the station. Last year, the telethon generated $500,000 from phone donations and long-term corporate commitments tied to the event, and it has raised billions of dollars over the years.

The local newspaper and WNRI-AM in Woonsocket, Rhode Island, carry on the Milk Fund, which is a local tradition that started in 1936 as a way to help struggling families. Each year through the month of December, multiple fundraising efforts in Woonsocket raise money toward the purchase of milk vouchers.

Another example: this past fall, listeners tuned in to WKKB-FM in Providence for its 2-day Promesa y Esperanza—Promise and Hope—Radiothon, which raises funds for St. Jude Children's Hospital. The broadcast is carried out in partnership with 15 sister stations throughout the country to raise awareness of childhood cancer within the Hispanic community and to help St. Jude continue to offer treatment to all children, regardless of their family's ability to pay. This year's effort raised more than $100,000 in WKKB's listening area alone, and more than $630,000 between the 16 stations combined.

And just one final example: LIN Media, which owns WPRI-TV in East Providence, established the Minority Scholarship and Training Program. Each recipient will receive a 2-year scholarship for up to $10,000 per year, which can be used for school expenses. In addition, LIN Media will provide each student with hands-on training through a paid internship program at one of its television stations around the country. Minority Scholarship recipients are assigned full-time positions at LIN Media upon graduation and successful completion of the training program.

So these are just some examples, and I know there are examples like this all across the country where local broadcasters are really making a difference, not only helping raise needed resources for nonprofit organizations, getting information to listeners and viewers during emergencies, but really helping to strengthen our communities. And I, for one, want to acknowledge the local broadcasters and to say thank you. I hope these examples help illustrate the value of our local broadcasters.

I really thank the gentleman for organizing this Special Order hour and for yielding.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's recognition of that and the very thorough list of examples of the incredible public service that our

broadcasters do in the Northeast. Thank you very much for that.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, as I listen to my colleagues talk about the importance of local broadcasters that they really have multiple public service roles.

Certainly it is a public service to be able to give the news, to deliver the sporting games, to deliver the weather, to deliver emergency information for public safety, to let people know what is going on in the community. That is an important service. But the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) brings up, of course, many other charitable things.

I have participated in many charitable events that were good, that raised decent money for important causes. But when a broadcaster gets involved, it adds value; it raises awareness; it sometimes brings celebrity to it. And you can see a charity lifted up by virtue of the fact that a local TV station or a local radio station or, in some cases, multiple stations took on the cause—not because there is anything in it for the broadcast station, not because there is anything in it for the managers. Sure, sometimes there are programs that have a sales component to it that you can go out and sell, but by and large, these are pure acts of public service, pure acts of charity that with just a little bit of airtime, just a little bit of local personality that is attached to a cause can validate the cause, elevate the cause, bring awareness to the cause, and create momentum for a cause that generates all kinds of other private sector involvement, whether it is volunteers or money—in most cases, both. We can solve a lot of problems when we get a broadcaster involved.

I have had the opportunity to be part of a very special program that I know a lot of my colleagues have been a part of, whether out here or back at home, and that is Honor Flights. It was a local broadcaster in Fargo, North Dakota, that saw a national story about the Honor Flight program that flies World War II veterans to see the memorial built in their honor.

So WDAY radio and television took it on in Fargo and created the Red River Valley Honor Flight and flew four flights of veterans. During that time, they broadcast leading up to it to bring awareness so that the veterans, themselves, could sign up. Then they broadcast the trips themselves to bring awareness and to honor these men and women, these heroes of the Greatest Generation and then, of course, brought the celebration home in a way that you couldn't do without that involvement.

That resulted in another Honor Flight chapter being raised up in Bismarck, where I live, and I became the chairman of the Roughrider Honor Flight. We had five flights out of Bismarck.

The KX television network in North Dakota became our broadcast partner. Not only did they help by raising awareness, which helped me raise money, which helped us get more veterans signing up, but it got the whole community involved. At the end of it all, they provided a video documentary of the experience so that every veteran and their families who participated had that wonderful memory in a DVD that they could watch for the rest of their lives.

Just this last weekend, I was on a radio show in Fargo called ''Heroes of the Heartland.'' It is on for an hour every Saturday, where a local veteran hosts the show, and it is all about veterans. I hope the show wins an award for what it does for veterans.

While I was on the show answering questions about legislation dealing with veterans' issues, people would call in and say: Did you know that the VA in Fargo is holding a public information meeting in a neighboring city on Saturday at whatever time, where veterans can come and air their grievances or give their appreciation or learn about the VA? And I thought: Wow, how cool is this, that because somebody knew of something, not only was the radio station there able to spread the information, but the listener became the newsmaker. They became the broadcaster.

That is the other neat thing about local radio, especially: it provides an opportunity where everybody is a broadcaster. If you see an accident or you find bad weather or you see something happen that you want to alert the public about, you have that opportunity now with new media, meaning broadcast media. So it was an honor to be on ''Heroes of the Heartland.''

I have the great privilege of representing the entire State of North Dakota. That is a big congressional district. Now, it is not as big as Montana or Wyoming or Alaska, but it is pretty big. I try to have a lot of town halls, like many of us do. We have a lot of town halls. But I have the opportunity, working with broadcast partners now, where every week I have a 1-hour talk radio town hall on multiple stations. KFYR-AM 550 in Bismarck was sort of the flagship station. KPLC out in Dickinson carries it. AM 1100 The Flag is really where it was birthed, in Fargo. KTGO up in the Bakken, the heart of the Bakken, in Tioga, carries the talk radio town hall.

People have the opportunity to either call me live on the air and ask a question or call on an 800 number and leave a message for me if they can't call during the show itself. It is broadcast statewide, and then it is broadcast again in the evening on delay. It provides a great opportunity for me to be in touch with my constituents and for them to talk to me and for me to be able to talk to them.

As you can tell, Mr. Speaker, I am a big advocate for free over-the-air broadcast media, whether it is radio or television—or certainly both. And I think that even in the new media era, and I appreciated the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. CRAWFORD's thoughts on this, that we have this opportunity still, but that there is still an important role for free broadcast radio and television, that even with all the new media, that it only, in fact, enhances the importance of free over-the-air broadcasts.

With that, I yield to another Member from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much. It is an honor and a privilege to be here to speak about the value our local broadcasters bring to our communities.

I am a long-time radio guy. At 15 years old, I started hanging around the radio station and ended up getting a job there through high school and college and have worked on and off in radio ever since.

I can tell you, our local broadcasters are such a value to our community. We have got a market now with all sorts of new technology for people to get music and entertainment—there is satellite radio; there is the Internet; there is Pandora—but nothing compares to what the local broadcasters can bring. Actually, all this competition, I think, is bringing a resurgence to local broadcasters. You are going away from lots of syndicated programs to more locally created programs that are more in tune to the needs of the community than something coming out from a central location piped over a satellite.

You have got great opportunities. Local businesses now have more opportunities to advertise, targeting local audiences. You have got news departments that are beginning a resurgence in local radio and television stations as people realize they need local news in addition to the national news. And in times of an emergency, nobody comes to the aid of a community like the broadcast facilities. Typically, they will suspend programming in the event of a hurricane or some other disaster. It is your first source for information, where you can go to get fresh water, other disaster and emergency aid. It really brings out the best.

Local broadcasters are committed to their community. Much like people who run for elected office, in order to get people to know you, to like you, to listen to you, and to watch you on a TV station, they have got to be out in the community, too. They have got to be at the local events, the chamber of commerce events. They have got to sponsor the charitable events. Broadcasters I know spend and donate millions of dollars in airtime just to support local charities and community activities. It is the backbone of America.

We have got to be careful up here in Washington. We have got lots of stuff on our agenda here that could potentially adversely affect broadcasters. We have got to strike the right balance.

We have got copyright reform on the agenda. We have got to find the right balance, where content creators are

properly compensated for their creative works but broadcasters aren't penalized such that they have got to shut down news departments or lay off employees in order to meet those demands. We have got to make sure that we have got licensing and the Communications Act reformed.

Our Communications Act is very old. We have got to take a look at it and bring it into the 21st century. But we have got to be careful that we don't cripple our local broadcasters, many of whom live in the communities and are valuable parts of the community and are basically, in some cases, the heartbeat of the community.

I do want to reiterate that I think we are at a time where we really can see a resurgence in local broadcasting, local content, the return of more full service. It is not just wall-to-wall hits on the radio now.

In order to garner a market competing with XM, our local folks have to be out in the community. They have to be out with live remotes. They have got to be at community events. They have got to be bringing local news and local content and stuff that is relevant to people's lives. They have done it for decades, and it is really great to see that resurgence and to be a part of it. It is a great time for broadcasters in America right now.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman from Texas would yield, you raised an important point that I hadn't thought about that is sort of natural and obvious, and that is, if you are going to be a good local broadcaster, obviously you have to be a good local citizen.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Absolutely. You have got to be out at the events. You have got to say ''yes'' to the folks that come in and say: Could you give us a public service announcement for our cancer walk? Could you give us a public service announcement for our whatever event?

The community bulletin boards that you used to hear on the radio all the time are coming back, and that is something XM or satellite providers just can't do.

□ 1745

Sure, they are getting the technology to localize some of the ads by downloading them into your devices. But it is not like the local broadcaster who is a part of the community.

Mr. CRAMER. You raise very important points.

Again, I appreciate the reminder that, while we are, today, educating, informing, and celebrating local broadcasting, it is at risk; that we can take our eye off the ball, that we can assume or presume some things and wake up one day and find out that when that accident happens on the railroad tracks or the storm is coming that suddenly there is nobody there to tell us about it.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. You need somebody that has a local news presence. You don't need somebody that has to bring a satellite truck in from a few hundred miles away and can't get there immediately. Sure, The Weather Channel will send Jim Cantore down. I think they want to kill him because they send him to all the dangerous locations. But he doesn't know the community like the local weathercaster.

We have got Dale Nelson in Corpus Christi. He has been doing the weather on our NBC affiliate. We jokingly call him ''Dead Wrong Dale.'' What other profession can you be in besides being a TV meteorologist and get it wrong half the time and still keep a job? But Dale knows the community, and he gets it right a whole lot more than he gets it wrong. We just like to rib him. But he knows the places that are going to flood. He knows the areas in the neighborhoods that are most susceptible to damage. Those out-of-town reporters don't.

The members of the media in local broadcasting are citizens of the community, and what they do improves the lives of everybody in the community. They know the people. They shop at the grocery store with the folks. Their children are in school in the community. They know what is going on, and they can reflect what is going on and can react to what is going on in the community and really be a valuable asset for good.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, you are a very articulate spokesman and advocate on behalf of local broadcasting, and I appreciate your taking the time and your expertise. By the way, you did pose it in the form of a question. I suppose some people can look at Congress and say: There is a group that can be wrong more than half the time and keep their jobs too. But at any rate, I have noticed that if you stay in good contact through your broadcast community with your constituents that helps as well.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I appreciate your yielding the time and organizing this wonderful Special Order.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, it is very important because as I said, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, over 600 broadcasters are in town today calling on the Members of Congress, calling on us, reminding us of the important role that they play in public safety, in public information, in public service, in many ways, in many ways, not just in delivering the news, weather, and sports and being active in our communities and elevating those important causes that make for a quality community, contributing their talent, contributing their, of course, their broadcast spectrum, which is really the people's. I think that is really an important point that we sometimes forget—that there is a reason that broadcasters have this legal obligation to public service because the people own the airwaves, and we rent them, if you will.

It is important that broadcasters and Congress stay in close touch because, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, this is a fragile relationship, and we can sometimes take them for granted while presuming that there will always be other ways to communicate when we know, in fact, that when the lights go out, when the electricity goes off, when a storm hits, whatever the case may be, as long as you have a car radio and a good battery, or you have a battery-operated radio and the broadcasters are on the air, you can always get that information from your local, reliable, familiar, friendly broadcasters.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and I appreciate my colleagues from both sides of the aisle from across our country who have taken the time today to help inform, educate, and celebrate the American broadcaster.

THE FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, tonight is the inaugural Special Order hour of the Future Forum. Today young people across America are asking themselves how they are going to afford their education. And if they are even lucky enough to get an education, how they are going to be able to afford to pay off that education, how they are going to find a well-paying job that can help them pay off that education, buy their first home, start a family, and send their own kids to school. That is the issue that the Future Forum is going to address. We are going to address this issue, the American Dream of homeownership, and something very important to millennials, diversity and equality.

Millennials make up about 75 million people of the American population. It is the most diverse generation in America's history. We believe in the Future Forum that we are uniquely suited for this because we are a part of the future too, and it is time that the party of the future starts talking to the future. We will be taking time on the House floor and at events around the country to meet with and listen to younger Americans about how we in government can better ensure that younger Americans have the opportunities that will allow them not only to dream but to achieve. This is a two-way conversation. We will use technology and a collaborative approach in our communications and in our outreach.

Our policy priorities are very simple: college access and affordability, job security and entrepreneurship, and equality and diversity. Many of the members of the Future Forum were called to public service because of what happened on September 11. A recent Center for American Progress survey found that the defining issue for millennials is September 11.

As I stand in this well, we are just 3 days from the Department of Homeland Security being shut down. I have invited members of the Future Forum to share their own personal story about how they were called to service and what homeland security means to them and their constituents.

I would first like to invite down a freshman Member. I yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous speaker for exercising tremendous leadership in helping to forge this, the Future Forum. I am proud to join him in being a founding member of this important caucus, one that I hope will go out and touch the lives of many young people throughout the country.

In having a conversation with the previous speaker about what brought him to public service and what brought me to public service, I was relaying my personal story, and that happened to involve September 11. I was not one of the heroes by any means, just one of the ordinary Americans working in the private sector straight out of college, attempting to pay off a ton of student loans, and right here in the Washington, D.C., area, just a couple miles from the Pentagon, that bright blue-skied beautiful morning when the world suddenly changed.

Mark Twain had said a long time ago that America's two best friends in the world are Miss Atlantic and Mr. Pacific. September 11, 2001, proved that that was no longer the case, that we were not a separate fortress unto ourselves and completely removed from the problems around the world. That was, as the previous speaker mentioned, such an important event in my life and in the lives of so many people in their thirties and younger.

As a member of this September 11 generation, I decided right then that I would devote my life to public service. The very next year, actually, on September 11, 2002, I began my graduate program in public policy and embarked on a path that about 14 years later has led here to serving in the Halls of the House of Representatives, attempting to make a difference, solve problems, and do so on a bipartisan basis.

I know there are many people on the other side of the aisle, good Republicans, who feel the same way I do; that we can have our legitimate debates, that we can have our debates on public policy, but that when it comes, of all things, to the security of the American people, we need to put the nonsense aside and actually focus on protecting our people.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we had come down here and planned to speak about the Future Forum, I had expected that my speech would be about the student loan debt crisis, something that is deeply affecting our generation, a generation that is more indebted than any other in our Nation's history. But, instead, we are here to talk about the fact we are just 3 days away from seeing the Department of Homeland Security completely shut down, seeing the furloughing of 35,000 employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

On the very same day that information was released, three American citizens attempted to join ISIS, which should be called Daesh, the so-called Islamic State, who truly are evil and would do whatever they could to harm any one of the 310 million of us living in this country.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you talk about your call to service and after September 11, and you think back to that day, and I don't know if you remember, but I remember Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, standing on the stairs of the Capitol, on the steps of the Capitol and singing ''God Bless America'' and ''America the Beautiful.'' It was such a moment of collaboration. Every day since that day, up until now, homeland security and our Nation's security has always been about collaboration and bipartisanship. I just wonder, to hear that the Department of Homeland Security could be shutting down, hearkening back to what you thought about collaboration back then, does that gel, is that the collaboration that you had in mind and you always thought of around our Nation's security?

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman asks a great question. Actually it is the exact opposite of the sort of spirit that was invoked on September 11. I remember seeing the pictures of—I believe it was a spontaneous gathering of both Democratic and Republican Members serving in Congress at that time who came together on the Capitol steps to sing ''God Bless America.''

I think it is a sad commentary that just a decade and a half later that we are here at an incredibly dangerous time, mind you, in some ways actually more dangerous than the days immediately following September 11, and instead of talking about how we can come together in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, pass this what should be noncontroversial bill to fund our Department of Homeland Security, the fact that we are right here caught up in a partisan fight over this is deeply disappointing and does not at all jibe with the spirit of September 11, and I think the spirit of a generation that was called to serve in the wake of those events.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), someone who has served our country not just in California's Legislature and not just in the Congress but also in our armed services, and is currently serving in the Air Force Reserves.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, let me start off by saying elections have consequences. I respect the American voter. I respect what the voters in our Nation did last November when they gave Republicans control of the United States Senate and control of the U.S. House of Representatives. My sincere plea and request to my Republican colleagues across the aisle who control Congress is: Please do not shut down the Department of Homeland Security.

The Republican leader in the U.S. Senate is now poised to delink the issue of funding for security for our homeland from immigration reform. I hope my colleagues across the aisle will do the same. That is because immigration reform has very little to nothing to do with protecting our homeland. I would love to have a debate on immigration reform. I think we need to do that. I would love to vote for bills on immigration reform. But they are not linked to funding for Homeland Security.

Let me just give you an example. Let's talk about DREAMers who came as children to our Nation and who can serve in the United States military. I served in Active Duty in the Air Force, and I am still in the Reserves. So DREAMers can serve in the U.S. military. To say that we are going to deport them because they are a homeland security risk and we are not going to fund Homeland Security because of that is ridiculous. There is no reason to link those two issues. If you don't like DREAMers, if you want to deport DREAMers, fine. Let's have a debate on that. But they are not a homeland security risk. To link these two issues doesn't make any sense. The Republican leader in the United States Senate has figured that out. I hope that this House does it as well.

There are some grave consequences to this. In my State of California alone, nearly 27,000 employees of Homeland Security will either be furloughed or will get no pay and cannot come to work.

□ 1800

These folks are folks that protect our homeland. It is unacceptable that this is going to happen.

The other way Homeland Security works is they provide grants to local first responders across the Nation to law enforcement, to firefighters. On Friday, if Homeland Security shuts down, those grants stop, and these local responders stop.

This is a very real issue, and we, in Congress, our first priority is to protect the American public. Shutting down Homeland Security will be the exact opposite of that. I really hope that the Republicans who control both Houses do not shut down Homeland Security.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I also wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from California thinks, as somebody who is serving in the Reserves right now and serving shoulder to shoulder with some young DREAMers, what would it do to the morale of

the ranks if DREAMers who are putting themselves on the front lines, willing to go serve the country they call their own, the United States, in battle, if the House GOP had their way and those DREAMers were removed and deported from our country?

What would that do to the morale of our troops?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a great question. Let me just explain a little bit what are some of the professions that the DREAMers do in the military.

Because of their language skills, the U.S. military needs some of these language skills, so that the U.S. military knows what these terrorists are doing in other parts of the world.

To have the language skills that DREAMers possess, that is one reason that we have them serve in the U.S. military. They have a direct effect on trying to prevent terrorist attacks into our homeland. To say that ''we are not going to fund Homeland Security because we want to deport you'' is ridiculous.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

There are a few categories that the DREAMers are able to serve in the military. You mention their language talent.

As somebody who, himself, is in the military, don't you think we are missing out on a lot of potential among kids that have already gone through the DACA program, but we are still not admitting as regular enlistees or no less given the chance to become officers?

I know a kid in my district, his whole life, he wanted to be in the military. He didn't even find out that he wasn't American until he was 15. He went through DACA, he did everything right, and they are still not letting him join the military.

What kind of talent are we missing out on by not letting these DACA kids enlist in the regular manner?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a fantastic question. Having now been in the military for 19 years, it is very clear that their main criteria for military service is: Can you complete the mission?

How good you are at completing the mission has nothing to do with whether or not you have a piece of paper that says if you are documented or not. The U.S. military is losing out on a significant amount of talent, people who otherwise would do great things for our military to protect our homeland and so on.

Again, it makes very little to no sense to link these two issues, which really shouldn't be linked; really, that is what this is all about. Let's just have separate debates on both issues. The U.S. Senate is about to do that.

I hope the House can do that as well.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to join our conversation another freshman Member from Massachusetts, somebody who has also served our country very honorably in the Marines, SETH MOULTON.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SWALWELL.

I think our Republican colleagues have a point, which is that we need to have a debate about immigration. This is an issue facing our country, it is a serious issue, and in many respects, it has reached crisis proportions. We need to talk about it, we need to have that debate, but it cannot be at the expense of our Nation's security.

I just returned from a weeklong trip to the Middle East—to Iraq, to Afghanistan, to the UAE, to Kuwait, and to Jordan—to try to understand the situation on the ground and especially the threat that ISIL or Daesh poses to the United States of America.

I can tell you that that threat is serious and severe. There are those who think that this will just be a Middle Eastern problem, that it won't ever come to infect our homeland. I don't share that view. I think it is a serious threat. ISIL has brutally killed Americans abroad and made clear their intentions to kill Americans here at home.

That is the kind of protection from threats like that that the Department of Homeland Security provides. We cannot put our Nation's security at risk for a debate that is critical, that needs to happen, but that is separate from keeping Americans safe.

Our most sacred responsibility as Members of Congress is to protect our homeland. Right now, the partisan brinksmanship around funding the Department of Homeland Security is putting that safety at risk.

I served my country for four tours in Iraq. I was proud to serve, I was proud to go every time, but I don't want to see Americans have to keep going back to that part of the world because we can't provide for our security here at home.

We have a lot of work to do in this Congress, and a lot of it requires bipartisan cooperation. Immigration is one of those issues. It is an issue that we need to debate on the floor of the House.

We need to take up the Senate bill for comprehensive immigration reform, debate its merits, and decide whether it does enough to ensure the safety of our borders and the future of those who aspire to be Americans, but none of that should happen at the expense of our Nation's security.

The crisis that we are facing today is the result of partisan politics that places the safety and the lives of the American people at risk.

Last week I returned from a trip to the Middle East, and I learned that the threat of a terrorist attack on the United States is real. Terrorist organizations including ISIL pose a serious national security threat and have made clear their intentions to commit acts of terrorism both abroad and here at home.

Our number one responsibility as members of Congress is to prevent that from happening and keep Americans safe.

Holding hostage the funding for the Department of Homeland Security over the President's executive action on immigration is a disservice to the men and women who put their lives on the line everyday both at home and abroad to protect us all.

There is no doubt that Congress needs to address immigration reform. It is an issue that is deserving of a debate and I look forward to participating in that discussion with both Democrats and Republicans. However, attaching immigration policy to this appropriations legislation is simply irresponsible and hijacks the intellectual debate that should take place on this Floor.

If you disagree with the President's actions, then let's have that debate.

However, with such threats to the security of the American people, now is not the time to play political games with an agency that is charged with protecting the homeland from acts of terrorism.

If Congress fails to fund the Department of Homeland Security, agencies and grant programs critical to the safety of Americans will no longer be able to carry out the responsibilities that they were created to uphold, including the TSA, U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the United States Coast Guard. 85% of all enlisted Coast Guard personnel do not live on base—they cannot afford to miss a rent or mortgage payment on their homes. Many Americans don't realize this, but not only are Coast Guardsmen important to the safety of fishermen in my home state of Massachusetts and to all coastal states, but they are also deployed globally alongside our military in support of critical national security missions.

When I was in Iraq, I needed to focus on the mission. For Coast Guard personnel performing high-risk drug cartel interdictions or patrolling the Persian Gulf, we needed their 100% focus on the mission at hand. So last summer when an Iranian boat aimed a 50 caliber machine gun at American Coast Guardsmen deployed in international waters in the Persian Gulf, those are the American men and women in harm's way who would still be required to put their lives on the line despite not receiving a paycheck so that their families at home can put food on the table and pay rent.

In my home state of Massachusetts, we recently experienced a series of historic snow storms that resulted in record-breaking snow accumulation and caused millions of dollars in damages to homes, business and roadways. Without the support of funding from FEMA, Massachusetts will have to bear the brunt of the clean-up and repair costs in spite of the likelihood that Massachusetts will be eligible for federal disaster aid relief.

Further, failure to pass an appropriations bill for DHS would furlough or deny payment to the 4,735 law enforcement officials, disaster response officials and many other homeland security personnel in Massachusetts.

Republicans know that the right thing to do is to fund the department. This is why, earlier today, the Senate passed a clean bill to fund the department.

This is not a partisan issue. This is an American issue. I implore the Republicans to have the debate on immigration, and have it soon. Talk about our differences there, but let's not put our citizens, our country, and our allies at risk by holding funding for the Department of Homeland Security hostage.

I'd like to thank my friend from California again for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Actually, I have a question for the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know you are active on social media, I follow you, and I see you are very in touch with your constituents, particularly those on social media.

I am wondering: What are you hearing from young people about the House GOP's inability to fund the Department of Homeland Security? What do young people think about the inability to separate an important immigration issue, as you talked about, and something so critical and as important as homeland security?

Mr. MOULTON. What I hear from young people is they want the Congress to get things done for the American people. Our job is to come here and debate the important issues of the day, but, ultimately, it is to get things accomplished, it is to pass bills, it is to make laws, it is to fund important institutions of our government.

What people say is they want us to get it done. They want us to have that debate on immigration reform, they want us to do that, too, but they need funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

My generation has grown up under the threat that we came to face on September 11. Many of my friends were in New York on that perilous day and watched the planes crash into the World Trade Center towers. It is a remarkable testament to the success of the Department of Homeland Security that, over the past decade, we have not had another attack. It is a remarkable achievement. We should not put that achievement at risk.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I invite to join the conversation a leader in our party, someone who serves on the House Rules Committee and also the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for getting this time for this important message and to just talk with people. That is really what this body, at its very best, does: we talk amongst ourselves, we solve problems.

What you are hearing about today, namely, that we are 3 days away from shutting down our own national security, is an example of this body not solving a problem—in fact, causing a problem.

You think: Who is causing this? Why is our security going to shut down in 3 days? Who is doing this? Who is shutting down the Department of Homeland Security?

The sad answer is that we are doing it to ourselves. There is no reason for this manufactured crisis.

I want to share my story from 9/11. 9/11 is something that, in our generation, we all remember where we were. It is like the Kennedy assassination to our grandparents' generation or like the Moon landing. Everybody knows exactly where they were and what they were doing when we heard about the Twin Towers.

I was at a conference near Washington, D.C., here. Like anybody who was near one of the sites, it was scary because we didn't know what was going on. The rumor was: all planes are flying into buildings, we are under attack.

They thought there were bombs at one point. It was a madhouse to try to escape the area and get out of the city. We drove all the way back to Colorado, and I never got to see what was happening to the towers in realtime or the immediate aftermath because, for the next 25 hours, I was just listening to it on the radio in the car, and my friend and I took turns driving.

That was a unique moment when people came together. It didn't matter if you were Democrat or Republican. Our petty differences melted by the wayside as we came together around a national response.

In many ways, it is sad to see our Nation go back to those same kind of partisan divisions which, unfortunately, reduce our national security. When we are talking about the Department of Homeland Security—which I would point out was set up after 9/11. That was set up to ensure that something like 9/11 doesn't happen again.

It coordinated agencies in a new way that didn't occur before, encouraged intelligence sharing among the agencies about domestic threats, and now, a lot of that work is just 3 days away from being defunded over a totally different issue, one that we are happy to talk about, by the way.

I mean, we talk about DREAMers and what a pathway to citizenship could look like and immigration reform and what the President can do and can't do, and those are all important discussions, and there are many diverse opinions in this body about them.

I would hope nobody with any opinion, no matter how extreme, would hold our national security hostage over this. I am reminded of what one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, disappointed in his own party over this particular strategy.

He said: ''Unfortunately, we have taken a hostage that we don't want to shoot.'' I think that is very much the case. Yes, they are taking our own security of our Nation and the Department of Homeland Security hostage. Do they actually want to shoot that hostage?

Our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they are not bad people. They believe in protecting our country. I hope they don't go through with it, but they have gotten themselves into this predicament over rhetoric that threatens to jeopardize our national security.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I would ask my colleague, knowing that, as we speak—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed this out, Mr. BOYLE—three Americans are in custody right now because of their intent and the steps they took to want to join ISIL. As we speak, our enemies are plotting against us.

Although my colleagues across the aisle, the House Republican leadership, wish to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, our enemies do not intend on shutting down their efforts to attack America.

What do you think, knowing that Colorado is home to a large airport, Denver International Airport, what is going to happen to the TSA officers who are charged with detecting these hidden bombs that al Qaeda has put out there that they would like to put on our airliners, detecting people who are trying to come back to the United States after fighting alongside with ISIL, what is this going to mean in places like Denver and across Colorado?

Mr. POLIS. We had a young lady from our district—you mentioned people—we had a young lady from our district, 19, from Lafayette, Colorado, who tried to get over to Turkey and then to Syria to join ISIS.

Fortunately, for her parents, for her family, frankly, for her own life, thanks to the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security, it was interdicted. Her travel plans were detected, and she was detained at the airport and not allowed to join ISIS.

Thank goodness we had the Department of Homeland Security connecting those difficult-to-connect dots. I don't even know how they did it to this day because, obviously, people go to Turkey on tourism all the time, but they used several points of information to figure out that this young lady was trying to join ISIS, and, thankfully, they were able to return her to her family.

That is the kind of thing that, unfortunately, happens every day across our country. If in 3 days this Congress doesn't take action, we are tying our own hands behind our back in our fight against terrorism, which makes absolutely no sense.

Look, you and I, Mr. SWALWELL, I am sure, were equally passionate about our views on immigration. We would love to see DACA expanded, and I would love to see a pathway to citizenship, but it would never cross my mind, no matter how I want to see those things, that I would shut down the security of the country just to get it.

I think most Americans don't think that way. I mean, here we are as some of the young Members, I think that perhaps some colleagues on the other side are acting even younger, like preschoolers and kindergartners here, where they either get all the toys or they are not letting anybody else play with them.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We haven't named that generation yet.

Mr. POLIS. We haven't named them yet.

That is the approach here. If they don't get their exact way, well, fine, we are not going to keep the Nation safe. I mean, that just doesn't make sense in any deliberative body, like we all grew up thinking that Congress was the lofty deliberative body.

That just doesn't make sense, that kind of reasoning.

□ 1815

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. SWALWELL, I would just take issue. My wife, as you may know, is a kindergarten teacher and is teaching that generation, and I think she would take issue with you comparing Members of Congress to the kids she teaches. I think she would say the kids she teaches are much better behaved than many of us here in Congress.

But, you know, I do want to just circle back to a point that Mr. POLIS made, Mr. SWALWELL made, a number of the speakers here tonight have made. This is a false choice. We can have the necessary debate on immigration and immigration reform. There has been a great American tradition going back to the very beginning of, on the one hand, praising the immigrants of yesteryear while simultaneously expressing concern about the immigrants of the present day. That was the case in the 1840s and in the 1880s and in the 1920s, and so it is today.

That debate will always be a part of who we are as a nation of immigrants and as a nation of laws. I think that debate needs to happen, and we need to have that here on the floor of the House, the same way they did in the Senate where they passed the bill with 70 votes on a bipartisan basis.

So let's get to that debate. Let's not allow this sideshow over holding up a Homeland Security bill that I think all of us agree here, all 435 of us agree that we need. These are real, dangerous threats we face, people who actually thought that al Qaeda was not extreme enough so they wanted to go, instead, join an even more murderous, more barbaric group. As the sign that Mr. SWALWELL had up was showing, our enemies are certainly not shutting down their efforts, nor should we.

I do want to ask Mr. SWALWELL a question—and I think this is important whether you are near the Denver Airport or the Philadelphia Airport or the bay area—and that is: What message do you think it sends to ordinary citizens who are looking to their Congress to just get things done and protect them, the people who aren't necessarily strongly ideological one way or the other, who just want to believe that their government can work, what kind of message do you think we are sending to them this week with this sort of behavior?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. It is a message of dysfunction.

And I know Mr. POLIS, just like Mr. MOULTON, is also very much in touch with the doers and DREAMers who are defining the innovation economy, whether it is in the bay area or Colorado or Philadelphia or Boston and Cambridge. These folks, they see the shortest distance between two points as a straight line. They don't see it as a partisan line. They are problem solving by nature, and they can't understand why politics would get in the way of something so simple as funding the Department of Homeland Security.

My own personal September 11 story, as Mr. POLIS was saying, is: I was headed to Capitol Hill that morning. I was an intern for Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher. I remember the gray suit that I was wearing was the one I wore every day at that time as I was wracking up my own student debt. As I got to the Capitol, I was turned around because the building had been evacuated. What I do remember, though, in addition to the color of the suit I wore and the phone call that I got from the staff assistant telling me to go home, I remember those Members of Congress singing ''God Bless America.''

I remember in the weeks and the months and the years afterwards the bipartisan 9/11 Commission Report. I remember the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, and I felt so honored when I was elected to come to Congress to be asked to serve on the Committee on Homeland Security. I felt so honored in my second term to be asked to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I cannot believe that just 14 years later, after all this bipartisanship and collaboration, while every other issue around us seems to be mired in gridlock, we have always agreed that we fund the Department of Homeland Security that was created out of September 11. Today, to think that we are so close to shutting down that Department, it really does defy the collaboration that came out of September 11.

I would ask my colleague from Colorado, who is in the Future Forum, but he is one of the more senior Members of Congress in the Future Forum—I think he is now serving his fourth term—what do you think about the collaboration that we have seen around Homeland Security up until now?

Mr. POLIS. As I like to remind my friend from California, there is not really a strict age limit, per se, of the Future Forum, but I am very proud to still be under the 40 number, at least for another half year.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are all in our thirties here.

Mr. POLIS. Good. Good. We are all still in our thirties.

But look, I think that what is happening is that when people of all ages, but particularly young people look at Congress and they look at this kind of thing with, ''Well, you, yourselves, are shutting down security?'' when they look at that, when they look at when the whole government shut down, again, do we remember why? Not really. I don't remember why the Republicans shut down government. There wasn't really a reason. They gave up, and they reopened it. It didn't make sense. When people see that, they lose faith in this institution; they lose faith in democracy; they lose faith in themselves. We can't allow that to happen.

The only way for this body to change, for the quality of government to change, is for people to be invested in that change, to have that same sense of solidarity that came after 9/11, not just around disasters, but every day; when it is election day, to make sure to vote; when it is time to write and call your Congressperson, if you have a Congressperson who thinks it is okay to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, call that Congressperson, show up at their town hall meeting. Guess what. It is not okay to play games with our national security.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, many kindergartners are more mature than somebody who either wants to have it their way or not at all and to send all the toys home. That is really what we face here in this scenario. I think we have really hit upon one of the reasons that people of all ages, but particularly younger people, are losing faith not just in this institution, but as a part of the democracy it represents and how it really is our role to try and reinfuse that hope in not just, again, the competency of this institution, but the institution of representative government and the vision that our Founding Fathers put in place through the Constitution.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Something we haven't really talked too much about yet, and we have alluded to the fact that we are charging these transportation safety officers with detecting these hidden bombs that al Qaeda is determined to put on our airplanes, we are charging the Border Patrol agents to protect our border and make sure that is secure, but if this shutdown happens, they still have to do that job. The threats continue to elevate and escalate, but those employees will not get paid.

I wonder what my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, someone who flies home, logs a lot of miles going back and forth between Washington and his district, flying into Logan, you look those transportation safety officers in the eye every week when you are coming to Washington and getting off the plane in Boston, what is the morale going to be among our TSA workforce, among our Border Patrol workforce if they still have to do the job as the threats escalate but we are not going to pay them?

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Mr. SWALWELL.

There is no question that their morale and their mission effectiveness will be hurt. In fact, it will hurt my own morale because I am very proud to serve in the United States Congress, but I am not going to be proud to walk through that security gate and have to

look them in the eye when they recognize that I am partly responsible, as a Member of this body, for not giving them the basic pay that they need for their families.

You know, another element of the Department of Homeland Security is the U.S. Coast Guard, and many of us know that the U.S. Coast Guard protects our shores. I represent the fishing community of Gloucester north of Boston, and Gloucester has gone through some hard times and has often had to rely on the Coast Guard to save its fishermen in the worst storms. Those Coast Guardsmen not only protect fishermen in Gloucester. They also work with our military and Department of Defense overseas. There are Coast Guardsmen and -women stationed in the Middle East today.

Can you imagine having to do such a difficult mission, to be in the Persian Gulf defending American ships against the threat of an Iranian attack and yet not knowing whether your rent will be paid back at home? That is an unacceptable risk for us to take, and it is an unacceptable burden for us to ask them to bear. You are absolutely right, sir, this is going to severely impact their morale. When morale is impacted, it hurts their ability to do this incredibly important job.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. While the workers are going to still have to do the job and not get paid, much of the Department will shut down, and an important part that will shut down will be Department of Homeland Security grants.

I have had the opportunity in just the last few weeks to go and visit about a half dozen firehouses. I call them firehouse chats. I just pop in and meet with the brave men and women who are serving as firefighters in our community. If this shutdown happens, for example, we will see all of the assistance to firefighters' grants stopped. So the men and women who are responding to car accidents, building fires, God forbid, if a terrorist attack occurred, the people who are going to run into the burning buildings, who rely upon these grants to hire firefighters, to give them the equipment they need, that is all going to be stopped.

So I am wondering if you have heard in your district or if you have talked to your law enforcement and public safety officials about the grants they depend upon and what it would mean if that funding just went cold.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. It would be, in a word, devastating.

I am proud of the fact that a part of the district I represent is the city of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Fire Department, one of the largest and oldest in our Nation, also a number of volunteer fire departments in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. There are so many of them around the country. To put them in this position is just deeply unfair.

I am also thinking, as I am looking to my friend to the right, fellow freshman, Mr. MOULTON, he happens to be from Massachusetts. They right now are devastated with mountains of snow that fortunately most of us in the rest of the country, while we have had snow, not nearly the way they have had it in New England. It is important to note that a number of those who work in FEMA are the officials who receive those grant applications, those emergency applications that so many in Massachusetts and Vermont and other parts of New England and other parts of the country are applying for right now because they have been so overstretched, given this incredible winter that we have had and record breaking in terms of snow. So they can keep on doing the applications and applying for assistance. The only problem is, come Saturday, we shut down the Department of Homeland Security, there will be no one on the other end to receive them.

I want to make one final point, and I think that this really strikes at the heart of why we are here and why the Future Forum was created.

This is my first year in the House. I might end up serving one term, might end up serving 10, who knows? For anyone who serves here, they all talk about the fact that it goes by extremely quickly. We, right now, are Members of a body with an approval rating of approximately 9 percent. I don't want to dedicate my life to public service in an area that is so poorly regarded by the American people. That is not something I want to do. I don't think that is something that other Members on the other side want to do.

It is important to our American democracy that whatever your ideology may be, whatever political positions you may have, we have to show the American people that their institutions of government can work. The American people, the overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans, have lost confidence in us, in all of us. I don't think this kind of a political fight, frankly, benefits either side. I think it is only a race to who loses less. We can end this now. Let's do the responsible thing, the mature thing, the right thing. Fund Homeland Security, and then get on to the important debates that we must be having.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right, Mr. BOYLE. Mr. MOULTON talked about this. We are taking an issue—immigration—that there are two sharply different sides on in this House, and that is fine. That debate needs to happen. Most people on our side, almost everyone on our side wants a pathway to citizenship. But that debate must happen.

Because of that debate, what we are seeing is the one issue that we have always agreed on since the Department of Homeland Security was created is now as divisive as the immigration issue, meaning that the Republicans would like to politicize an issue that has always had bipartisan support and make that just as divisive as they have made the immigration issue. I think that is, frankly, unfortunate.

Mr. MOULTON, I would invite you to close here on just your overall perspective on why we should or should not tie immigration to Department of Homeland Security funding.

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Mr. SWALWELL.

You are absolutely right, because immigration is a debate that we need to have. It is a national security debate in and of itself. We cannot hold the Department of Homeland Security hostage to that debate. It needs to occur. We ought to have that debate. We ought to have it here on the floor of the House. But our most sacred responsibility and the present threat here is to make sure that our people are safe.

□ 1830

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend and colleague, Mr. BOYLE, for bringing up the issue of FEMA grants. We have been faced with unprecedented snowfall in Massachusetts, and it has put our first responders to the test. They are providing for the security of the people of Massachusetts right now, and we are all banding together to make sure that we get the FEMA grants that we need and deserve. In fact, it is a great example of a crisis that is bringing Republicans and Democrats together. The Democratic delegation of Massachusetts is working hand in hand with our Republican Governor to make sure that we get these applications in so that we can get this funding that we desperately need. Yet that is all going to grind to a halt if the Department of Homeland Security is not funded.

Right here, today, we can see the effects that failing to fund the Department, shutting it down, will have. Even worse would be if we had to see the effects of another attack on our homeland. Having been to the Middle East in the past week, having seen the unprecedented challenges that our first responders face at home, we cannot afford to put our Nation's security at risk. All of the young people out there—those who are our age in the Future Forum—want a government that works. They want a government they can believe in, and they want a government that will make them safe.

Let's pass a clean funding bill. Let's fund the Department of Homeland Security. And let's show the American people that our Congress can do its job.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I thank my colleagues from California, Colorado, and from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying, as Mr. MOULTON alluded to, our principal responsibility can be found in, literally, the first sentence of the Constitution, which is: We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union . . . to provide for

the common defense of the United States.

There is no agency that has a harder job or a job that is more important in protecting our homeland than the Department of Homeland Security. We should be here today, on our first evening of the Future Forum, talking about the rising amount of student debt that millennials carry. We should be here today talking about how hard it is to get a job if you are a young person and if you have just finished college. We should be here today talking about how hard it is to buy a home if you are carrying all of this student debt. We should be talking about the need for diversity and about having a pathway to citizenship for immigration.

Instead, bizarrely, we are here talking about the real possibility that the Department of Homeland Security, created out of a bipartisan coalition in the early 2000s, could shut down and leave us more vulnerable.

I hope that our better angels will guide us. I hope that the spirit that those House Members had when they stood on the steps of the Capitol after September 11 prevails, that we work more collaboratively, and that we remember, at the end of the day, we are charged with protecting the people.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

THE PRESIDENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL OVERREACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House this evening, and I appreciate the opportunity to continue the conversation that was started by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tonight.

Listen, there is a future in this body that, hopefully, is going to look a lot different than what it has looked like in past decades. I would fully concur that government should work and that we should keep the government open, but we must also defend the Constitution, and that is the paradox that we are faced with this week. I rise with some frustration from my side of the aisle and from what I have seen from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in recent days.

I have seen speeches upon speeches upon speeches about a partial shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. I have seen big signs in the well of this House, scaring the American people about a potential partial shutdown. I have seen press conferences across the country, including in my hometown of the Tampa Bay area, scaring the American people about something that has not yet happened. Recognize that all of these speeches, all of these signs are coming not from members of our community, not from the people who elected us; these speeches, these signs—the ''sky is falling'' mentality—are coming from our elected leaders, from Members of this body.

Why does that matter? Why do I rise tonight to continue the conversation started by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

It is this: all we are hearing are speeches, and all we are seeing are signs. We are not hearing solutions.

To this entire body—to both sides of the aisle—our constitutional authority was infringed upon when the President signed his executive order. That is not a partisan issue. We have a responsibility to confront that constitutional overreach. Yes, one mechanism we used to do that was the power of the purse. That is a fundamental power of this body, the power of the purse, and it was appropriate that we responded to the President's unconstitutional overreach by exercising our constitutional privilege, that of the appropriations process.

Here is what I would point out to the American people tonight about the speeches that they hear from my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Recognize something very important: what is being presented in the midst of this debate over the constitutional overreach of the President is merely an ''all or nothing'' approach. It is either we pass a clean bill—and as the leader on the other side said, he will deliver 188 votes if we pass a clean bill—or it is nothing. Friends, colleagues, that is not legislating. That is using the bully pulpit. That is politics. That is not legislating.

So what I would ask tonight is: Where are the solutions? Where is the conviction on the other side of the aisle? Where are the efforts to pass a bill that accommodates all Members of this body, Members on the other side, and, yes, something the President can sign?

You see, I am actually a Member of Congress who thinks that the first priority of this body is to fund the government and to fund the Department of Homeland Security. I am looking to work with colleagues on the other side of the aisle to say: How do we do that? We have a responsibility to do that.

I have three Coast Guard installations in my district. They are men and women—it is absolutely true what is talked about—who will have to go to work on Saturday morning with only the promise to be paid later. That is wrong. That is a failure of this Congress if we let that happen.

We do have until Friday evening to solve this, and I believe we will, but I am asking, actually, for accommodation and cooperation from the other side of the aisle. What will it take? What will it take?

Think about this: Rather than putting signs on the floor, rather than condemning our side of the aisle for trying to respond to the constitutional overreach of the President, what if we talk about provisions that will actually build consensus and get a majority of this body, regardless of Republican, Democrat, Independent—whoever you are—to fund the Department of Homeland Security and to also respond to the constitutional overreach of the President? I think we can get there.

Do you know what I have never heard from the other side of the aisle? I have never heard: What if we remove the funding prohibition in the original House bill that prohibited the implementation, the further exercise, of DACA? They criticized it. If we remove it, does that get us the votes to pass a bill?

I understand there is disagreement over the President's executive order from last September. I think it was wrong. Members on the other side don't. A Federal judge has said it is unconstitutional. The President of the United States said over 20 times he didn't have the authority to do it. Yet he did it. What if we allowed 6 months to let the courts work their will? It is perfectly reasonable.

If you are a Member of this Congress who stood up on opening day and took the oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, to defend and protect the obligation of your office, why don't we agree upon a 6-month delay in the implementation of the President's executive order, an executive order a Federal judge has already put a hold on? Does that get us there? Does that get us the votes necessary?

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tonight said is absolutely true: Congress should work, Congress should govern. The American people should expect that of all of us.

It doesn't matter our partisan affiliations, but it does matter whether or not we truly exercise the convictions about which we pontificate on the floor here tonight. It is not about signs. It is not about the bully pulpit. It is not about press conferences.

Any Member who stands up here tonight, Republican or Democrat, and says that we will be worse off as a nation on Friday night if we have not funded the Department of Homeland Security is absolutely right. We must fund the government. But where is the effort on the other side of the aisle to actually reach a compromise? It is not there.

I promise you that I have watched my colleagues from the time I got here this week—every speech. The leader on the other side of the aisle made an impassioned speech about the importance of funding Homeland Security, and he is right.

My question is this: When will you abandon your ''all or nothing'' approach? Because exactly what you criticize this side of the aisle for is exactly the type of behavior that my colleagues on the other side are engaging in as well. We have failed the American people if we let that lack of cooperation overtake this body and lead us off a cliff on Friday night.

The question to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is: Who is willing to step forward with a proposal that gets us there as a body?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time this evening. I look forward to ensuring that our Department of Homeland Security is fully funded come Friday night.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–12)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency declared on March 1, 1996, with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, as amended and expanded on February 26, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2015.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 2015.*

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 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2156

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO) at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–29) on the resolution (H. Res. 125) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WILSON of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business with POTUS.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 26, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

537. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0253; FRL-9919-59] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

538. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; PSD Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead, 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO2, and 2010 SO2 NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0888; EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0969; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0991; EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0435; FRL-9923-48-Region 5] received February 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

539. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Transportation Conformity [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0662; FRL-9923-45-Region 5] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

540. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0698; FRL-9923-55-Region 4] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

541. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0694; FRL-9923-56-Region 4] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

542. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Direct Final Approval of Other Solid Waste Incineration Units State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0554; FRL-9923-35-Region 5] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

543. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0885; FRL-9917-29-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR34) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

544. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Oklahoma [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0063; FRL-9923-22-Region 6] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

545. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Louisiana [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-1054; FRL-9923-11-Region 6] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

546. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Promulgation of State Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming; Negative Declarations; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0811; FRL-9923-40-Region 8] received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

547. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protection System Maintenance Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM14-8-000; Order No.: 803] received February 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

548. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sudanese Sanctions Regulations received February 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

549. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD709) received February 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

550. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) Out Performance Requirements To Support Air Traffic Control (ATC) Service; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29305; Amdt. No.: 91-334] (RIN: 2120-AI92) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

551. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Immediately adopted final rule — Removal of Special Federal Aviation Regulation No. 87 — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Territory and Airspace of Ethiopia [Docket No.: FAA-2000-7360; Amdt. No.: 91-335] (RIN: 2120-AK59) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

552. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories (2135-AA36) received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

553. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0146; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-243-AD; Amendment 39-18094; AD 2015-02-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

554. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0750; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-18097; AD 2015-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

555. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0079; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-18085; AD 2015-02-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

556. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0624; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-18072; AD 2015-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

557. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0142; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-18093; AD 2015-02-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

558. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Technify Motors GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by Thielert Aircraft Engines GmbH) Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0683; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-18065; AD 2015-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

559. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Type Certificate Currently Held By AgustaWestland S.p.A.) (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0465; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-044-AD; Amendment 39-18089; AD 2015-02-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

560. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0230; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-242-AD; Amendment 39-18070; AD 2015-02-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

561. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0096; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-040-AD; Amendment 39-18077; AD 2015-02-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

562. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam srl Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0876; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-032-AD; Amendment 39-18076; AD 2015-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

563. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0087; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-234-AD; Amendment 39-18098; AD 2015-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

564. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0078; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-18084; AD 2015-02-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

565. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1088; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-76-AD; Amendment 39-18091; AD 2014-12-11 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

566. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (formerly Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0133; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-066-AD; Amendment 39-18088; AD 2014-22-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–29). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1055. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, and Armed 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. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1056. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1057. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for an exception from infringement for certain component parts of motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1059. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from asking taxpayers questions regarding religious, political, or social beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1060. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to support non-Federal investments in water infrastructure improvements in the Sacramento Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1061. A bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 1062. A bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 1063. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to eliminate tariffs on technological goods providing educational value for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1064. A bill to reinstate year-round Federal Pell Grants under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1065. A bill to require that States receiving Byrne JAG funds to require sensitivity training for law enforcement officers of that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 1066. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to promote the use of adaptive trial designs, Bayesian methods, and other innovative statistical methods in clinical protocols for drugs, biological products, and devices, and with respect to the requirement to conduct post-approval studies and clinical trials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1067. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the temporary expansion of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, to ensure that judges of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims may enroll in the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1068. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a tribal transportation self-governance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1069. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1070. A bill to provide for adequate and equitable educational opportunities for students in State public school systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1071. A bill to amend section 1120A(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assure comparability of opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 1072. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal agencies and programs and to recommend the elimination or realignment of duplicative, wasteful, or outdated functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Appropriations, 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. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1073. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to secure critical infrastructure against electromagnetic threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. TAKAI):

H.R. 1074. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to exempt certain flights from increased aviation security service fees; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1075. A bill to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the ''Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1076. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 1077. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1078. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to exempt from sequestration certain user fees of the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 1079. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to States to establish a comprehensive school counseling program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 1080. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in order to limit the penalties to a State that does not meet its maintenance of effort level of funding to a one-time penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 1081. A bill to assist coordination among science, technology, engineering, and mathematics efforts in the States, to strengthen the capacity of elementary schools, middle schools, and secondary schools to prepare students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce,

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1082. A bill to strengthen Indian education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1083. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to apply the Medicare restriction on self-referral to State plan requirements under Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1084. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify the criteria for selecting communities to participate in the Small Community Air Service Development Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1085. A bill to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 1086. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1087. A bill to ensure that methods of collecting taxes and fees by private citizens on behalf of State and local jurisdictions are fair and effective and do not discriminate against interstate commerce for wireless telecommunications services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1088. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1089. A bill to help fulfill the Federal mandate to provide higher educational opportunities for Native American Indians; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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 Mrs. WAGNER (for herself and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1090. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1091. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to use negotiated rulemaking to develop a rule about agriculture quarantine inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1092. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the ''Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 124. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Res. 126. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to promote Israeli-Palestinian peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H. Res. 127. A resolution recognizing linemen, the profession of linemen, the contributions of these brave men and women who protect public safety, and expressing support for the designation of March 31, 2015, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 1053

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, of the Constitution

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution

Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, of the Constitution

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution which says, ''To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.''

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that ''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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 1059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that ''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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 1060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to regulate commerce between the states, and has previously been used to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation, which this bill addresses.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

''Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.''

General Aviation contributes $150 billion to the U.S. economy and supports 1.2 million jobs. This legislation will both protect the rights of over 400,000 general aviation pilots currently flying and encourage more to participate in this community.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 1063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''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 . . .''

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause, Article 1

Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power ''[t]o regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power ''[t]o regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 1072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which states ''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. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 1074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

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 Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 1077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 18 To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 1078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare fo the United States

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 1084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 1086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which reads ''The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clauses 1 and 3

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 1088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 1090.

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 Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3's authority to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 178: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 188: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 197: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 199: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 217: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 231: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 249: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 281: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 284, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 335: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 353: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 354: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 358: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 438: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 451: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 452: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 456: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 461: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 465: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 532: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 546: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 555: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 571: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 583: Mr. FORBES and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 584: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 590: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 594: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 600: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 609: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 620: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 654: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 663: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 674: Mr. BEYER and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 680: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 689: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 699: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 700: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 703: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 704: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 707: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 712: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 716: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 727: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 729: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 732: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 751: Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 756: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 757: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 767: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 774: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 797: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 803: Ms. FOXX and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 818: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 823: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 842: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. COLE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 843: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 850: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 855: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 864: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 867: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 880: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 882: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 887: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 894: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 902: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 903; Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 916: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 918: Mr. COLE, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 919: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VELA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 923: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 924: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 940: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 955: Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 963: Mr. POLIS and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 975: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 981: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 986: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 988: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 996: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1004: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1005: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1006: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1009: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1017: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1021: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1024: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SABLAN, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1026: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1031: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIMES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIND, Mr. VELA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HAHN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. WALZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MENG, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BASS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1032: Mr. COOPER.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. TIBERI.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 15: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 28: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COOK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. TAKAI.
H. Res. 45: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H. Res. 54: Ms. LEE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. COOK.
H. Res. 93: Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 112: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 122: Mr. MARINO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative KLINE, or a designee, to H.R. 5, Student Success Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015 No. 32

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

We acknowledge today, O Lord, Your power, mercy, and grace. We need Your power, for the challenges we face require more than human wisdom and strength. We need Your mercy, for we transgress Your law and fall short of Your glory. We need Your grace, for we cannot offer anything to merit Your favor or gain Your love.

Empower our Senators for today's journey. Lord, give them confidence to draw near to You, that they may find grace to help them in this time of need. In an unstable world, where freedom lovers are challenged to live courageously, guide our lawmakers to be models of courage. May they send the right signals to an unstable and dangerous world.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 5, H.R. 240, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday President Obama took the extreme step of vetoing good American jobs. He sided with partisan extremists and powerful special interests over the middle class.

It says a lot about the priorities of this administration. But if the White House thinks this is the end of the new Congress's push for American jobs, it is wrong. I will soon have more to say about this and what the Senate plans to do.

For the moment, the Senate is focused on overcoming another extreme idea: the Democrats' Homeland Security filibuster to defend Executive overreach.

Many Senate Democrats led their constituents to believe they would do something about the kind of Executive overreach President Obama referred to as ''unwise and unfair'' and ignoring the law. Those are the words of the President of the United States. We have since heard excuses from Democrats to cover for their refusal to do so. But the time for excuses has now passed. Democrats will soon have another chance to prove they were serious.

Later this week, the Senate will consider a bill from the senior Senator from Maine that is about as reasonable as you can get. Obviously, President Obama was right to refer to the kind of overreach he took in November as ignoring the law. Senator COLLINS' sensible bill focuses simply on preventing the most egregious example of Executive overreach from taking effect. It is as simple as that.

The Collins bill is not tied to funding of DHS, either. So there are no excuses left. Democrats should join us in voting for this commonsense legislation.

In the meantime, we have offered Democrats a chance to prove they were serious about something else, and that is funding the Department of Homeland Security.

It is really something to watch Democrats vote and block funding for this Department one day and then hold a hypocritical press conference the next. Democrats need to end their weeks-long filibuster of Homeland Security funding and end it right now.

We have continually offered them sensible opportunities to do so. Yesterday, we offered them yet another. But it will require their cooperation to achieve.

The dual-pronged approach I have outlined—allowing the Senate to stop unwise and unfair overreach on the one hand and to fund DHS through the fiscal year on the other—is a sensible way forward, but it can't be achieved without cross-partisan cooperation.

The onus continues to be on the Democratic Party to keep the Department of Homeland Security funded. Democrats can fund DHS now—not by holding more hypocritical press conferences but by ending their senseless filibuster and cooperating across the aisle.

That is what Americans expect. That is what Democrats can finally work together with us on to get done now.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are in morning business with permission to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, when I reran for the Senate in 2010, there were two major issues that dominated the campaign and that continue to dominate the discussion and debate in the Senate postelection. One was the Affordable Care Act, now called ObamaCare, which was pushed through without any bipartisan support. There was a lot of concern among the American people about the impact this would have on their lives. That was an issue of intense discussion and debate during that campaign.

The second was the plunge into debt at a level Americans had never seen before in the history of the country. It took nearly 200 years, from the beginning of our Nation until 1981, to reach the $1 trillion debt mark. That is a lot of governing. That is a lot of growth of America. But we were essentially on a path—including expenditures for war and so forth—that didn't take us deeply into debt relative to our gross domestic product.

All of a sudden, in 2010, there was the revelation that debt held by the public was rapidly nearing the $10 trillion mark—a tenfold increase in less than 30 years. It took 190 plus years to get to the first $1 trillion and only 30 years to add ten times that amount. That was a hot topic of debate during the 2010 election. During that election, the American people came out in significant numbers and said: Get to Washington and do something about this.

In the background, a debt clock was ticking away, and not only on my website but clocks around the country at different times, and people were astonished at how fast those numbers were churning.

That led to a pretty intense effort on the part of both parties and on the part of many organizations. I can remember Simpson-Bowles—a former Chief of Staff of President Bill Clinton along with a former distinguished Senator from Wyoming, a Republican and a Democrat together—Simpson-Bowles. The public was getting behind this—a $4 trillion, over 10 year fix to the problem. It was pretty dramatic, yet there was a lot of momentum for it. That was shot down, unfortunately, by the President when it was presented.

Following that, we had the Gang of 6, a bipartisan effort, and the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction—the group of 12, 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans working diligently to try to put something together, along with outside organizations, to fix the debt. There were any number of these—the Domenici Rivlin task force—proposals that were worked on together in a bipartisan way, realizing that as the debt was continuing to accumulate it was going to have major negative consequences to the future of our children and grandchildren and perhaps even our own generation.

We stand here today, having gone through all that—the Vitter committee, which I was a part of; eight of us agreeing with the President, with no staff and no press, closed room, months and months and months of negotiation—only once again to come up short. Ultimately, we sacrificed so many things we thought we needed to do just to get something going. But once again it was shot down in the end by a President who really wasn't willing to accept even the provisions he had proposed in his budget proposal that was publicly proposed. We took those and said: Can we at least do these, Mr. President? You have announced this is your initiative. But it was a no go.

Well, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I then tried to work with various agencies. They all had to come before us to make their requests known for the coming year. I asked them: Do you have a plan B in place? What do you mean plan B? What is plan B all about?

Plan B is the fact that mandatory spending is running away with our budget and the available amount of money for your discretionary spending is shrinking every year. So what is your plan B in terms of having less money available, whether it is for health care, for education, for building roads? All of the discretionary issues that fall under the discretionary spending that we are in control of, we no longer have control of. That is shrinking and you are going to have to do more with less. And I asked that they provide a plan B before they could get my clearance in terms of supporting their requests.

They never came forward. No, we have to stay with what the President's budget is and so forth. So here we are now, over $8 trillion more than where we were in 2010, and an $18 trillion-plus deficit.

Everyone knows this is unsustainable. Everyone in America knows we are careening toward insolvency, with an inability to cover even some of the most basic functions of government.

I talk to agencies about a policy of triage. I suggested they separate out what they absolutely essentially have to do and we will fund it. Then part B is what they would like to do if they had the money to do it. Part C is their asking: Why are we doing that in the first place or that program is long past its need, its existence or it hasn't worked. Let's start there, with part C, and let's get rid of excess spending that has no real function going forward or it is duplication or fraud or waste or whatever.

That leads me now to this poster. I have kind of gone from acting like the President's Chief of Staff to the co-chair of the ''go big guy'' in terms of what we need to do. We can't go there, but maybe we can go a little. And we are all the way down now to what I call ''waste of the week.''

Let us at least identify those things that the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office have identified as those things we know don't work, that we know are a waste, that we know are duplication, and let's see if we can get at least some start in terms of dealing with this debt.

Senator Coburn took the lead on that in the last several sessions of Congress. We are going to miss him because no one can do it better than he did in pointing out and really embarrassing a lot of us in asking: Why are we funding that? I am not trying to take his place. But I did, with my staff, come up with the idea to at least let our colleagues know—those who say we can't cut a penny more, we have cut too much—that, yes, we can cut more. We can at least do something to address this debt or have money to offset a needed funding program.

So we are going to inaugurate ''waste of the week'' today. In its debut, I will go back to something I tried to amend when we were addressing the unemployment insurance issue. Ultimately, I was not able to offer the amendment thanks to the majority leader's filling of the tree and not allowing any amendments. I made a big stink about it. I didn't understand why we could not at least take that up.

So waste of the week this week is the cost to the taxpayer for those in the safety net receiving Social Security Disability Insurance or unemployment insurance and getting checks from both agencies.

Now, if you can prove to the appropriate government agency that you can't work, you can be eligible if you go through the process for Social Security Disability Insurance. But if you go to the Social Security Disability Insurance agency and make your claim, you can't then go to the unemployment insurance agency and say you can't work, that you can't find work, that you are able to work but that you need to get that check from that agency. What has been documented now is the fact that there are very significant numbers of people who are gaming this issue and receiving checks from both agencies.

Either you can work or you can't work. You are eligible for one safety net program or the other, but not both. That totals $5.7 billion of duplication.

My amendment that I had offered under the unemployment insurance extension in the last Congress was simply to say you can't do both, and we are going to put procedures in place so we can find out who is doing both.

One would think this would be pretty simple, even in the paper age, but we are in the digital age. I don't understand why the people administering

this can't simply take the Social Security number and plug it into unemployment insurance and say: Do you have this person's name with this Social Security number? Are they receiving unemployment insurance? Or vice versa. It ought to be the push of a button on a computer so that it is not all that costly and makes a great deal of sense.

The worst they would have to do is pick up the phone and say: I have John Doe here whose Social Security number is X. He is applying for Social Security Disability Insurance. Do you have him on the unemployment role? Or vice versa. I am sorry, Mr. Doe, but you can't do both, and you are gaming the system. This duplication of benefits costs $5.7 billion. That is a pretty good savings.

This is the first of what will be a weekly presentation of programs that are no longer needed, that are duplicative, where there is fraud or waste involved. I am going to bring this forward every week, and we are going to try to add it all up.

We start here with $5.7 billion, and I have my spending thermometer going up to $100 billion. I think we can go much higher than that. Tom Coburn said we could, through his Wastebook and the work he has done.

So we have already inked it in here. We are going to start filling this in by coming here every week.

People may say: Well, that is small change. Look, $5.7 billion is not small change. In comparison to our debt, does it solve the problem? Absolutely not. It is at least a start. Can we at least not come together in sensible things such as this and at least get started in the right direction?

In the meantime, I think we are still going to be pushed into situations by crisis, when no longer the countenance of the investment world in America in terms of the rate of return is acceptable, because the debt continues to accumulate.

So here we are, back to 2010, back to where we were. I know it is not talked about very much at this stage. We have foreign policy issues and domestic issues we have to engage in. But the clock is ticking away, minute after minute, second after second, and it is a continued plunge of the deficit spending—borrowing money we don't have in order to pay for things we need, but also paying for things we don't need.

So I will be here every week with a new proposal. We will be filling in this chart, and hopefully at least start us on the process once again of getting through to one major challenge we have here in this Senate, the Congress, and the executive branch, and that is dealing with our debt. It is generational theft. It is putting the burden on our children and grandchildren, and even on workers here today. It is holding down our economy. It is one of the major challenges this Congress has not successfully addressed and which this administration has not successfully addressed. It is kicking the can down the road to the extreme, and we do not need to forget that. We need to emphasize it. This is my small step, after many large steps that have failed, to try to continue to alert the American people and alert my colleagues that there is money we can save and spend and run a much more efficient, effective government.

I yield the floor.

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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINCIPLED STEWARDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN WEST

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, over the past week while I was home in Wyoming traveling around our State, I had a chance to talk with students about their hopes for the future, and I talked with many small business owners about their efforts in trying to create jobs.

The people of Wyoming work hard and take seriously the Western values of family and community. They are committed—they are committed—to preserving the West's role in providing natural resources that improve the lives of millions of people all across America.

This commitment is shared by the Senate Western Caucus—a caucus which I chair in the Senate—as well as is shared by the Congressional Western Caucus under the leadership of Wyoming Congressman CYNTHIA LUMMIS.

Recently, we released a joint report titled ''Principled Stewardship of the American West.'' This new report has details about specific things we should be doing right here in Congress, specific things Washington should let the people in the West do for themselves. The whole report is available on my Web site, Barrasso.senate.gov.

Now I want to talk about four specific principles that guide the work of the Western Caucus that are contained in this very report. These principles are based on the idea that the people who live on the land are the best stewards of the land. Our main goal is to empower the residents, the workers, and the leaders in the West and local leaders throughout the country to make the decisions that best serve their families and their communities. These principles stand in stark contrast to the failed approach Washington has taken for far too long.

The first principle in our report has to do with energy. The members of the Western Caucus are united. We will promote access to our Nation's abundant, affordable, secure, diverse, and reliable energy and mineral resources. That means increasing energy security for the United States. We can do that by producing more energy responsibly right here at home. It also means opening access to international markets so we can help the energy security of our allies as well.

The second principle we talk about in the report ''Principled Stewardship of the American West'' focuses on environmental stewardship in the West. We take very seriously our commitment to ensuring the health of the land, the wildlife, and the environment. Thousands of people are working across the West to protect our communities. These are people who live in the West, not bureaucrats in Washington, DC. Nobody is better qualified than the people who actually walk the land and breathe the air they are trying to protect.

Our report encourages locally led conservation partnerships to build on the work being done by people who rely on the health and the safety of the land. This means making sure regulators base their decisions on science, not on personal ideology, and that their work is done out in the open. On this front I will be introducing legislation to stop the Environmental Protection Agency's takeover of the waters of the United States.

The third principle in this report focuses on agriculture and forestry. As an environmental stewardship, the Western Caucus believes the States are better equipped than Washington to develop good farm policies. Crops, breeds of livestock, soil types, and the growing seasons vary greatly across this country. These factors come together in the West very differently from what might be seen in the Northeast or in the South. A bureaucrat in Washington simply cannot write regulations that cover every part of the country with any hope of success. Western States must be allowed to make these decisions for themselves to help the farming and ranching way of life continue to thrive in America.

One task we can do at the national level is to promote active management of our forests to ensure that our forests remain healthy. As many as 82 million acres of our National Forest System need treatment to deal with the threats of fire, insects, and invasive species. When forests deteriorate, they are more vulnerable to wildfire. Fires cause erosion and threaten water quality. When forests get overgrown and unhealthy, they stifle habitats critical for deer, elk, wild turkeys, and other animals. The members of the Western Caucus know how important it is to responsibly manage our national forests, and we will push for legislation to make sure that continues to happen.

Finally, the report focuses on a Western approach to judicial and regulatory reform. This includes stopping the lawsuit abuse that special interest groups have used to set public policy without the public actually being involved. It includes protecting private property owners from excessive Washington regulations.

Agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Forest Service have a history of interfering with the use of private property. These agencies have fined and bullied landowners throughout the West. Too often the goal of the bureaucrats is to protect their own turf, not to protect the land or to serve the people. Honest, hard-working taxpayers get crushed beneath the resources of a Federal legal system that operates without oversight. The Western Caucus favors conservation through local cooperation and partnership, not through intimidation and an attitude that ''Washington knows best.''

This report's four principles and the ideas it discusses are based on what members in the Western Caucus hear back home. These are the topics I hear from people as I travel around Wyoming. These principles promote responsible energy, food and timber production, while preserving what makes the West a unique place in America.

Last year more than 10 million people from around the world visited Wyoming. They are drawn by its beauty and natural splendor. The people of Wyoming and all Western States know they have a responsibility to manage and protect the land and waters in a way that allows all of us to enjoy them. The goal of the Senate and Congressional Western Caucus is to preserve and protect everything that is special about the West so that families who have lived there for generations can continue to live there for generations in the future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AIRLINE SMOKING BAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today marks the 25th anniversary of a law that has affected millions of Americans. It was a law that came about because of a dare. It happened in an airport in Phoenix, AZ. I was catching a flight from Phoenix to St. Louis—I think to Chicago—and I was late. I ran up to the United Airlines counter, and the ticket agent started processing my ticket to get on the flight.

She said to me, ''Here is your boarding pass,'' and I looked at it and noticed she had put me in the smoking section on the airplane.

I said to her, ''I don't want to sit in the smoking section. Isn't there something you can do about this?''

She said, ''You came here too late. And incidentally, Congressman, there is something you can do about it.''

I got on that airplane and got stuck in the middle seat in the smoking section in the back of the plane, surrounded by smokers, wedged in there, and I looked around the plane and thought: This makes no sense at all. There is an older person who may have a pulmonary problem. There is a mother with a baby sitting in a nonsmoking section two rows away from me. And I thought to myself: I am going to do something to change this.

I went back to the House of Representatives. I was a relatively new Member of Congress. I introduced a bill to ban smoking on airplanes. My staff thought it was crazy. Nobody had ever beaten the tobacco lobby at anything. To take them and most of the airline industry on was a fool's errand, but I did it anyway. I got a lot of help along the way from some amazing colleagues. I finally got a chance to bring it to the floor for a vote, and to the shock and surprise of the tobacco lobby, we won. We banned smoking on airplane flights of 2 hours or more.

I called my friend Frank Lautenberg, who was a Senator from New Jersey, and I asked him if he would take up the cause in the U.S. Senate. He agreed to, and he passed the same measure.

So this day marks the 25th anniversary of the signing into law a ban on smoking on airplanes. It is obvious why it passed. Members of Congress are part of the largest frequent flyer program in the world, and they hated it as much as I did on that flight from Phoenix to Chicago. But it did something I never imagined. Malcolm Gladwell wrote a book called ''The Tipping Point.'' It turns out that moment was a tipping point because people all across America 25 years ago started asking a very basic question: If secondhand smoke is dangerous in an airplane, isn't it dangerous in a train, on a bus, in an office, in hospitals, in restaurants, in a tavern, in a bingo hall—and the list went on and on. All across the United States, States started changing laws and banning smoking.

Today, if you walked into the doors of the Capitol here smoking a cigarette, somebody would stop you and say: Wait a minute, we don't do that here. In the old days, nobody would think twice and there were ashtrays all over.

When I first came to the Senate, there were no rules when it came to smoking—none. We developed them after I made a few points to those in charge. But that was the culture and the situation 25 years ago.

I think that effort to take smoking off airplanes has led to a lot of other dramatic efforts to protect Americans from secondhand smoke and from dangerous situations. I think lives have been saved. There are so many of us who can tell family stories about losses related to lung cancer and pulmonary disease. I can tell my story.

I was 14 years old when my father died of lung cancer. He was 53 years old and smoked two packs of Camels a day. He died an early death. I didn't stand by his bed at the hospital and say ''I will get even with that tobacco lobby,'' but I remembered him as I started this ban.

So I just wanted to make a note in the RECORD today in the Senate to salute the memory of my friend Frank Lautenberg, who was my partner in passing this important legislation, and to remind us there are other things we can do to make this world a little better and a little safer. One of those things relates to e-cigarettes, a new invention tobacco companies are jumping up and down to market to children in America. We have seen in a short period of time the number of kids using these electronic cigarettes double. It has a chemical in it, the same one that is in cigarettes—nicotine—that is addictive. Tobacco companies know that if they can lure children into cigarettes or e-cigarettes, they are going to create an addiction in these young people that will be tough to break and won't be healthy at all.

I hope the Food and Drug Administration will step up and do their job and regulate these products and these e-cigarette products to protect the children across America.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week we are deciding whether we are going to shut down the Government of the United States of America again. Again. I think it was about a year and a half ago that the Senator from Texas on the other side of the aisle took to the floor and called for shutting down the Government of the United States of America, protesting President Obama's Affordable Care Act. He did it, and the hardship that created for people all across the United States who relied on essential government services is well documented. The impact it had on the men and women who work in our government was also documented. It cost our economy. It was a bad thing to do. It was a political strategy which on reflection was the absolute worst, to shut down our government.

Well, this week we face another shutdown, and this time it is the Department of Homeland Security. This Department is the one Department that is charged with keeping America safe from the threat of terrorism. It was created after 9/11 because we wanted to make sure we put together 22 agencies that worked together to protect us. You see them in so many different places. This agency runs the Coast Guard. Its cutters are patrolling Lake Michigan and our coastline—the Atlantic and Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico as well. You see them when you go to the airport—TSA is under the supervision of the Department of Homeland Security. You may not know it, but your local fire department is depending on grants from this same agency so they can buy new equipment and train the people who are responding to fires in their community.

Over and over again the Department of Homeland Security invests in the safety of America. So why in God's name would we have a political strategy to stop funding the Department of Homeland Security? That is exactly

what we are faced with—exactly. Come the end of this week, this Department will basically lose its funding and be on emergency status. Why would we do that at a time when we have been warned about terrorist groups attacking malls across America? We are going to shut down the agency, stop funding the agency that protects us against terrorism in the streets of America.

At a time when ISIS is kidnapping people from all over the world, beheading them, burning them to death, killing them by execution, we are going to drop our guard and say: Well, we are not going to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Why in the world would any politicians in either House of Congress think this is a wise tactical move?

It turns out this funding bill was sent to us by the House of Representatives on the condition that we take up the debate over immigration policy in America. I think we need to debate that policy. I have no objection to it. I feel very strongly about some aspects of it. But why would we make the Department of Homeland Security play the role of hostage over this debate on immigration? The right thing to do to protect America and the people who live here is to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

I offered a unanimous consent on the floor 2 weeks ago asking the Republicans to join the Democrats in funding this Department. Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, objected. I think that was a mistake. Now I think we understand, as we reach this deadline of shutting down this valuable agency of our government, that we cannot let this happen.

What is it about this immigration debate that has driven some politicians in Congress to the point where they are threatening to shut down this Department, to cut off its funding? It turns out they object to some of the Executive orders issued by the President on immigration.

Remember, it was the Senate that passed a comprehensive immigration bill 2 years ago. I was part of the group that wrote it. We passed it on the floor with 68 votes, and the Republican House of Representatives refused to even call the bill, or any bill, on the subject. And when they failed do anything to fix our broken immigration system, the President said: I am going to issue some Executive orders to deal with this problem if Congress refuses to act, and he did.

The Republicans hated those Executive orders by President Obama like the devil hates holy water. They hate them so much that they would shut down the Department of Homeland Security in protest over the President's action. One of the things that troubles them the most is something called DACA. DACA is a shorthand description of the President's Executive order which allows those who would qualify under the DREAM Act to stay in the United States and not be deported.

The DREAM Act is a bill I introduced 14 years ago. I introduced it because I learned there were children brought to America by their undocumented parents, who grew up in this country, went to school in this country, were good citizens in America, but had no future because they had no home. My DREAM Act said if you were one of those children brought here by your parents, we are not going to hold you responsible for your parents' decision. We will give you a chance to become legal in America. That is what the DREAM Act said. That is all it said. The President's Executive order said: We are not going to deport these young children now growing up in America. We are going to give them a chance to stay here, to study here, and to work here. Many of the Republicans hate the idea of giving these young people a chance. Sadly, what they are doing is turning down an opportunity for America to benefit from some of these extraordinary young people.

Time and again I have come to the floor of the Senate to tell the stories of these young DREAMers, and I will tell another one today.

This lovely young woman is Mithi Del Rosario. Her parents brought Mithi to the United States from the Philippines when she was 5 years old. There was no question about whether she was going to come; she was part of the family.

She grew up in California. She was an excellent student and her lifetime goal was to be a medical doctor. In high school she was on the principal's honor roll and an AP scholar. She received a Golden State Seal Merit Diploma and a Governor's Scholar Award. She was quite the student.

Mithi was admitted to the University of California at Los Angeles, one of the Nation's top universities. At UCLA she volunteered as a research assistant. She wanted to get into a lab that studied the high risk of infants to develop autism.

Mithi also volunteered, while a student at UCLA, as a crisis counselor for their peer helpline, advising students who were the victim of rape, child abuse, and substance abuse. She eventually became a trainer for new counselors. Mithi also volunteered as a mentor and tutor for at-risk middle school children in the city of Los Angeles.

She graduated from UCLA with a degree in psychology. Her options were limited in terms of medical school because she is undocumented. She was unable to pursue her dream to become a doctor. Then in 2012, President Obama issued an Executive order establishing the DACA Program, allowing students such as her a chance to stay in America and not be deported. Her whole world changed.

She began working as a research assistant at the UCLA School of Medicine, and she has applied to attend medical school. She still volunteers at the autism research lab where she started her research career 7 years ago. Her ambition is to be part of the treatment and research effort to help children with autism. She also has served as peer mentor to 10 undergraduate students at UCLA.

She wrote me a letter and asked that I relay a message to the Members of Congress who are engaged in the debate on whether to shut down the DACA Program which gives her a chance to stay in the United States. These are her words:

> Please, please listen to our stories. This is my home, and the only country I know. DACA gives us greater opportunities to give back to the country we love.

This young lady, and millions like her, grew up in the classrooms of America pledging allegiance to that flag. It is the only flag they have ever known. They can only sing one national anthem—the national anthem that is closest to their heart for the United States of America. But now there is an effort underway by some politicians in Congress to deport her and send her back to the Philippines, and to say: Despite all you have done with your young life, despite all the talents which you bring to Los Angeles and to California, despite your promise to enter into the medical profession and to serve in a cause that all of us realize is so important, autism research—despite all of that, leave America. That is the message that comes through in this bill sent to us by the House Republicans.

They want to deport Mithi Del Rosario. They want to send her out of this country and toss her away despite all of the investment we made, and she has made, in her life. Mithi, and other DREAMers like her, have so much to contribute.

The Republican bill that is before us would deport hundreds of thousands of young people just like her, and it would stop the President's effort to give the parents of citizens—American citizen children—a chance to work temporarily and legally in the United States.

It is hard to imagine that so many on the other side of the aisle have lost sight of who we are as a nation. We are a nation of immigrants, and that immigrant spirit has made us different in this world we live in.

The people who risked everything to come to the United States, to a country where they may not have even spoken the language and gave up everything and came here—they are a special brand of risk takers, and we have a little bit of their DNA in our blood.

My mother was an immigrant. She was brought here at the age of 2, and her son now serves in the U.S. Senate. As I have said so many times on the floor, that is my story, it is my family's story, and it is America's story.

I cannot believe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have forgotten America's history and America's story and are willing to turn their backs on a young woman such as this and say:

We don't need you. You can leave. In fact, we are going to make you leave. We are going to force you out of this country.

America won't be a stronger country if we deport Mithi and others like her. We are not going to be a better country if we tear apart American families. We are not going to be safer when we should be deporting criminals, not those who aspire to be medical researchers.

Instead of trying to deport DREAMers and mothers and fathers, congressional Republicans should support a clean appropriations bill. Let's do that. Let's pass a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Let's get that done so once again we don't have a Republican shutdown of any branch of our Federal Government. Let's get that part done. And then if we are going to engage in a real debate on immigration, let's do it. The majority is controlled by the Republicans in the House and the Senate and they can do that any time they want. Let's engage in that debate and let's do it in an honest fashion. Let's do it in a hopeful and positive view of what America's future will be when young people such as Mithi Del Rosario have their chance to become part of an America that embraces talent and skill and thanks young people for the sacrifice they made to make a better life for all of us who live in this Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:27 a.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 10:29 a.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes the motion to proceed to H.R. 240 following morning business today, that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, Senators are permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed such time as I may consume as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND UKRAINE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, a lot of us are deeply concerned about the situation in the Middle East, in Ukraine, in China, to which we have paid very little attention to as they expand their territory.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, there is a huge credibility gap. The Washington Post probably said it better than I probably could, and it is entitled "A credibility gap," in the Washington Post, by Fred Hiatt, editorial page editor, February 22. He says: "If his negotiators strike an agreement next month, we already know that it will be far from ideal," talking about the Iranian nuclear deal.

He continues:

> The partisanship needs no explanation, but the record of foreign-policy assurances is worth recalling:

This is very interesting and I think deserves the attention of all Americans.

> In 2011, when he decided to pull all U.S. troops out of Iraq, Obama belittled worries that instability might result. Iraq and the United States would maintain "a strong and enduring partnership," Obama said. Iraq would be "stable, secure and self-reliant," and Iraqis would build a future "worthy of their history as a cradle of civilization."
>
> Today [as we know] Iraq is in deep trouble, with a murderous "caliphate" occupying much of its territory and predatory Shiite militia roaming through much of the rest.
>
> The same year, Obama touted his bombing campaign in Libya as a model of U.S. intervention and promised, "That's not to say that our work is complete. In addition to our NATO responsibilities, we will work with the international community to provide assistance to the people of Libya."

My friends, we all know what has happened in Libya and the reason is—despite what Senator GRAHAM and our then-former colleague Senator Lieberman said—we had to do some things in Libya to make sure there was stability in Libya. Obama then walked away.

Continuing from the article:

> Obama also said then, "Some nations may be able to turn a blind eye to atrocities in other countries. The United States of America is different. And as president, I refused to wait for the images of slaughter and mass graves before taking action." That was before Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad's barrel bombs, systematic and well-documented prison torture and other depredations of civil war killed 200,000 of his compatriots, and drove millions more from their homes.
>
> In August 2011, Obama declared that Assad must "step aside." In a background briefing a senior White House official added, "We are certain Assad is on the way out." In August 2013 came Obama's statement that "the worst chemical attack of the 21st century . . . must be confronted . . . I have decided that the United States should take military action against Syrian regime [military] targets."

As a personal aside, the Senator from South Carolina came over to the White House, and the President of the United States assured us that he was going to take military action and we were going to degrade Bashar al-Assad and upgrade the Syrian Army, and, obviously, the article states that "no military action was taken, and Assad remains in power."

Defeating the Islamic State is one we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years—successful in Yemen and Somalia that we have pursued for years. Just last month in the State of the Union Address, President Obama presented his Ukraine policy as a triumph of ". . . American strength and diplomacy. We are upholding the principle that bigger nations can't bully the small by opposing Russian aggression supporting Ukraine's democracy," he said.

We all know. We have watched Ukrainians slaughtered, slaughtered with the most modern equipment that Vladimir Putin has. That great national bloodletting is going on, and we are watching, thanks to the assistance of the Chancellor of Germany and the President of France—in the finest traditions of Neville Chamberlain—we are standing by and watching that country be dismembered.

What the Senator from South Carolina and I are trying to say is what General Keane said the other day:

> . . . al Qaeda and its affiliates exceeds Iran and is beginning to dominate multiple countries. In fact, al-Qaeda has grown fourfold in the last five years.

Radical Islam is clearly on the rise, and I think our policy of disengaging from the Middle East has contributed to that rise.

So there is no policy in Iraq, there is no policy in Syria, there is no combating or assisting even the Ukrainians as they attempt to defend themselves against the wholesale slaughter of their countrymen by Vladimir Putin.

My friends, we have had ample testimony before the Armed Services Committee, people who served this country with distinction for many years—Republican and Democratic administrations. All of them have said they have never seen the world in more turmoil, and these things don't happen by accident. It is not like hurricanes or earthquakes, it is a matter of a failed, feckless foreign policy that began in 2009 and the chickens are coming home to roost.

May I mention—my friend from South Carolina—this is where we are with the Islamic State. We are hearing from the administration, I believe, that we are gaining. Look at the Islamic State, January 10, of Syria in red—this is the Islamic State and contested places—and look at August 31. Obviously, there are significant gains. One more chart, please.

Looking at this chart, these are the areas of all of that part of the world that are now controlled or under attack by ISIS, including, by the way, we now see ISIS gaining a foothold in Libya.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

What I would like the body to recognize is that our Presiding Officer, who just left, Senator COTTON, was an infantry officer in Iraq, and I can't imagine how he must feel. Our current Presiding Officer is a reservist in the Marine Corps who has served in harm's way in battlefield areas, and he was a commander in the Marine Corps. It is great to have people in the Senate who have worn the uniform and they understand what is at stake here.

Senator MCCAIN and I have tried to be consistent, if nothing else, about this situation. Here is the first question America has to answer: Is this someone else's war? I have heard very prominent commentators on cable television say: I am tired of fighting other people's wars.

Does ISIL represent a threat to our homeland? I think it does. And more importantly, they indicate they mean to hit us here. The head of ISIL, the Islamic State and the Levant is what I want to call it, served time in a military prison in Camp Bucca in Iraq, where I did some reserve duty, and when he was released from the camp and turned over to the Iraqis he told the colonel in charge of his release: I will see you in New York.

They are recruiting foreign fighters coming in by the thousands. They hold passports that would allow them to go to Europe and come back to our country, and their goal is not only to purify their religion, to kill or convert every Christian they find, but also to attack us.

So to those who say this is not our fight, I think you are making a huge mistake, as we did before 9/11.

Regional forces have to be part of the mix. The goal to degrade and destroy ISIL is the right goal. The strategy will fail as currently being considered unless we visit this issue.

As Senator MCCAIN said, what you see on this map is not an accident. It is a predictable outcome of three things. The President's decision in 2011 not to leave a residual force behind in Iraq to secure our gains has come back to haunt us. The military command infrastructure of this country advised a minimum of 10,000 troops to be left behind as a residual force.

I visited Baghdad, along with Senators MCCAIN and Lieberman, to try to persuade the Iraqi political leadership to enter into an agreement to allow us to have a residual force. Prime Minister Maliki said: I am willing to do it if the other groups in Iraq are willing to do it. They were all willing to do it. He asked me: How many troops are you talking about? I turned to our ambassador and our commander at the time, and they tell him and me: We are still working on that.

Press reports simultaneously were suggesting the White House, led by the Vice President, by the way, was driving the residual force to below 3,000—a number incapable of making a difference.

So when the President of the United States says he was willing to leave a residual force behind, that is not accurate. In a debate with Governor Romney, Governor Romney suggested he would support a residual force of 10,000, as President Obama was contemplating, and President Obama interrupted him and said: No, I am not contemplating that.

He held our departure in Iraq as the fulfillment of a campaign promise. He said: We can leave with our heads held high. We have accomplished our task.

Here is what I said on April 3, 2011:

> If we're not smart enough to work with the Iraqis to have 10,000 to 15,000 American troops in Iraq in 2012, Iraq could go to hell. I'm urging the Obama administration to work with the Maliki administration in Iraq to make sure we have enough troops—10,000 to 15,000—beginning in 2012 to secure the gains we have achieved. This is a defining moment in the future of Iraq, and in my view they are going down the wrong road in Iraq.

I am referring there to the Obama administration when I say ''they are going down the wrong road.''

No voice was louder than that of Senator MCCAIN. Senator MCCAIN advocated, above all others, the surge when Iraq was slipping away under the Bush administration. When Senator MCCAIN told President Bush his strategy was not working, President Bush, to his great credit, adjusted his strategy.

Senator MCCAIN, 3 years ago, was the leading voice in this country to argue for a no-fly zone in Syria so that Assad, who was on the ropes, could be taken down, and to train a Free Syrian Army at a time when it really would have mattered. The President ignored the advice not only of Senator MCCAIN and myself but his entire national security team.

So the President got the answer he wanted in Iraq. He pulled the plug on troops. And what we hoped wouldn't happen did happen. When he said no to a no-fly zone and the training of a Free Syrian Army, the vacuum that had been created in Syria was filled by ISIL. ISIL is a direct result of Al Qaeda in Iraq, which was on its knees in 2010, being able to come back because we withdrew troops and we allowed a safe haven to be formed in Syria.

So, President Obama, this map is the result of bad policy choices on your part, and you are doubling down on bad policy choices.

The third thing that was a huge mistake is drawing a redline when Assad used chemical weapons against his own people and virtually doing nothing about it. I am glad the chemical weapons have been taken out of Syria—at least we think all of them have been taken out—but 220,000 Syrians have been killed with initial forces by Assad, and Assad is stronger than ever. He is nowhere near going or leaving.

Between Assad and ISIL, they represent the dominant military force inside Syria. Syria is truly hell on Earth, and all of this is going to come back to haunt us here at home.

So the reason we are here on the floor today is to learn from the past. I have made mistakes. Everybody has made mistakes. But the key is to adjust when you make mistakes. The strategy President Obama is employing to degrade and destroy ISIL will fail, and let me tell you why.

If you could liberate Mosul with the Iraqi security forces and the Kurds, we are going to need more than 3,000 U.S. forces to accomplish that task, because they do not have the capability that our military possesses to ensure victory.

Once you liberate Mosul, you have to hold and build Mosul. Anbar Province has yet to be liberated. We have to convince the Sunni tribal leaders in Anbar to disassociate with ISIL and join us, and they are not going to do that unless we are part of a team on the ground. They don't trust the Iraqi security forces that are mainly Shia. So unless we get more capacity on the ground to ensure success, we will fail in Iraq. But Syria is the weak link in the chain.

Mr. MCCAIN. Before my colleague leaves Iraq, is it not true that the only real fighting being done now is the Peshmerga Kurds but also the Shia militia, who are inflicting human rights violations on the Sunni, and the same people we fought against during the surge that my colleague talked about before, which is Iranian backed and Iranian trained?

Mr. GRAHAM. Right. The Iraqi security forces have crumbled. The most

dominant power on the ground is the Shia militia, backed by Iran and the Kurds in the north. And by the way, the aid we are providing to the Kurds never gets up to Erbil, and we need to fix that.

Iran has inordinate influence in Baghdad. So to get the Sunni tribes to pull off of ISIL, they have to believe that Baghdad is going to be a better venue for them in terms of their political grievances, but they also need to see Americans on the ground to make sure this thing will work. They are not going to pull off ISIL unless we are there. They do not trust the Iraqi security forces.

As to Syria, Syria is the biggest problem of all. That is where most of ISIL resides. That is where their leadership resides. That is where they have the largest number of fighters. There is no ground game in Syria. There is no Kurdish presence that has the capability to dislodge ISIL. The Free Syrian Army are being killed as fast as we can train them.

Here is the flaw. The goal is to train the Free Syrian Army's young men throughout the region and send them into Syria to destroy ISIL. The problem with that is the moment we send them into Syria to defeat ISIL, Assad will attack them because he knows one day they will turn on him.

So we have asked the question, under the authorization to use military force that is being sent over from the White House, could we stop an air attack by Assad's forces so they will not kill the people we train to fight ISIL, and they said no.

So we are training people to go into Syria to fight ISIL who will be slaughtered by Assad if we do not have the ability under this authorization to protect the people we train. Senator MCCAIN said this over and over again. That is immoral and militarily unsound. There is no strategy indeed to deal with Syria that has any chance of success. And if we don't get Syria right, we can't hold the gains we make in Iraq.

So the President, after all these years, with 220,000 people being killed, having the largest terrorist army in the history of terrorism occupying a space the size of Indiana, with 30,000 to 50,000 fighters, depending on who you believe, still hasn't come to grips with a strategy that will protect this nation. He doesn't understand the mistakes he has been making for the last 3 or 4 years. He is not self-correcting. He is perpetuating what I think is a military fraud.

The longer it takes to destroy ISIL, the more exposed we are here. And at the end of the day, the Iranians are sizing us up and they see us as a paper tiger.

The last thing I would say about Ukraine is that Russia has invaded Ukraine. When they say they have no weapons inside Ukraine, when they say they have no troops, they are liars.

Russia has dismembered their neighbor, Ukraine. We in the Western world have sat on the sidelines and watched this happen. They have trampled all over the Budapest memorandum, where we persuaded Ukrainians to give up their nuclear weapons in the late 1990s and we would guarantee their sovereignty. When they need us to provide defensive weapons, we are absolutely absent at their time of dire need. The Iranians are watching our response to Putin. How could they feel we are serious about stopping their nuclear program when we seem not to be serious about anything else?

The reason we will not be more aggressive in Syria is because President Obama doesn't want to deal with Assad, who is a puppet of Iran. He doesn't want to jeopardize the negotiations we have ongoing with the Iranians regarding their nuclear ambitions. His desire to get a deal with Iran is preventing us from degrading and destroying ISIL, and we will pay a heavy price for these mistakes.

How would my colleague sum up where we are?

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I just mention to my colleague—and it has been made perhaps larger than it should have been, with all of the crises and the tragedies that are transpiring, but the President of the United States refuses to refer to this as radical Islam. Why that is is hard to understand because it is clearly radical Islam. It is a perversion of an honorable religion, but everything they are doing is based on their perverted interpretation of the Koran. They are Islamic. While we respect the religion and we respect the people, we don't respect radical Islam and we have to recognize it for what it is.

Let me read this, from February 24:

> Scores of Syrian Christians Kidnapped by Islamic State—Islamic State militants swept into several of Assyrian Christian villages in northeastern Syria in recent days, taking scores of hostages, including both civilians and fighters, according to numerous interviews with residents. . . . The attacks have displaced hundreds of families and sharpened Middle Eastern Christians' fears of the Islamic State.

Which the President of the United States refuses to recognize as radical Islam. When you don't even recognize it or identify it for what it is, how in the world are you going to be able to combat it?

Finally, I would say to my friend one more time, if he would respond, that the Ukrainians wanted to defend themselves. One of the richest and proudest aspects of American history is that we have helped people who are struggling for freedom, whether it be in Afghanistan after Russia's invasion or others. And others have helped us, going all the way back to our Revolution when the French and Polish and others came in and helped us. How can we rationalize our failure to give them weapons to defend themselves by saying: Well, they can't beat the Russians anyway.

Why don't we listen to their pleas for help? Why don't we listen to their cries? Why don't we listen to the fact they have lost 5,000; that right now the most sophisticated weaponry the Russians provided these ''separatists'' is being used to slaughter them?

To me it is the most unbelievable view, that somehow we don't want to provoke Vladimir Putin, who has taken Crimea—they have written that off—shot down an airplane, at least with Russian equipment; moved and dislocated eastern Ukraine; and has caused an economic crisis. And we don't want to provoke Vladimir Putin? It is staggering.

Mr. GRAHAM. In conclusion, in 1998 we were a signatory to Budapest memorandum that asked the Ukrainian people to give up over 2,000 nuclear weapons housed on their soil in return for a guarantee of their sovereignty.

Mr. MCCAIN. That included the State of Crimea as part of the territorial integrity of Ukraine.

Mr. GRAHAM. Exactly. The Russians were a signatory to that Budapest memorandum.

Clearly, the Russians have stepped all over it, and we are not doing anything. So in the future, would you give up your nuclear weapons relying on a promise by the United States?

This is important because we want to deter Iran from trying to get a nuclear weapon. I think this emboldens them to get a nuclear weapon.

As to radical Islam, it is hard to defeat an enemy if you don't understand what motivates them.

The Nazis did not want just the German-speaking regions surrounding Germany. It wasn't about the Sudetenland. It wasn't about the Rheinland. It wasn't about the issues Hitler claimed at the time. He wrote a book telling us what he wanted to do. People should have read the book. It was about creating a master race to govern other races. The Aryan race would be the dominant race on the planet—with some people not worthy of living, such as the Jews, and others would be slaves.

When we listen to what ISIL is saying and what motivates them, they want a master religion for the world, not a master race. If you are a Christian, you can pay a tax and convert or die. If you are a Muslim outside of their view of the faith, you just die. If you are an agnostic, you die. If you are a libertarian, you die. If you are an American—Republican or Democrat; they could care less—you die.

They are taught by their interpretation of the Koran literally to kill all that stands in their way of the caliphate. We can close Gitmo tomorrow. We could throw the Palestinians under the bus or give the Palestinians everything they want and throw Israel under the bus. It wouldn't matter.

We didn't bring this war on ourselves. These people are motivated by religious doctrine not widely accepted in the faith. But that doctrine requires them to kill everything in their path and to turn the world into a religion where they dominate, and there is no alternative to their religion.

That may sound crazy to you. It sounds a little crazy to me. Hitler is crazy to me. I can't explain why somebody wants to kill all the Jews. I can't explain why somebody believes that one race should rule the world and everybody else be under their boot. I can't explain what makes these people tick. I can only tell you what they do and why they do it. There is no appeasement with radical Islam, any more than there would be an appeasement with Hitler. We tried that in the 1930s, and 50 million people got killed.

So here is our choice: Face the enemy as it is, degrade and destroy in a way that will work; or accept the fact that they are coming here, not to conquer America—that is not going to happen—but to hit us hard and break our will so they can have that part of the world for which they have been longing for over 1,000 years.

Here is what I would say to America. Every time we have chosen to sit on the sidelines and watch other people suffer and did nothing about it, it wound up hurting us too. If you think we can live in a world where Christians over there are being raped, tortured, and crucified, and it won't affect Christians here, you are kidding yourself. If you think you can allow a force this evil to go unchecked because it is over there and it won't affect us here, you are making the mistake of a lifetime.

My biggest fear is that radical Islam—which is exactly what it is—will get a weapon of mass destruction one day and do a lot of harm to us here. Every day that goes by over there, that they get stronger, the more exposed we are here.

Finally, on 9/11, 3,000 Americans died only because they didn't have the ability to kill more. If they could have killed 3 million of us, they would have. Every day we let this problem grow unchecked they are closer to having the technology to kill millions of people here and elsewhere. So the sooner we deal with this, the safer we will be.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article titled ''Credibility Gap'' from the Washington Post and also the International New York Times article ''Scores of Syrian Christians Kidnapped by Islamic State'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the International New York Times, Feb. 24, 2015]

SCORES OF SYRIAN CHRISTIANS KIDNAPPED BY ISLAMIC STATE

(By Anne Barnard)

ISTANBUL.—Islamic State militants swept into several Assyrian Christian villages in northeastern Syria in recent days, taking scores of hostages, including both civilians and fighters, according to numerous interviews with residents and representatives of the many factions fighting in the area.

The attacks have displaced hundreds of families and sharpened Middle Eastern Christians' fears of the Islamic State, which considers non-Muslims, along with many Muslims who disagree with its tenets, infidels.

The extremist group displaced entire Christian communities from northern Iraq when it swept through Mosul and the surrounding area last year.

The new attacks came as some Christians in northeastern Syria, seeking to avoid the fate of northern Iraq's Christians and other minority sects like the Yazidis that were singled out by the Islamic State, had taken a more assertive role, fighting alongside Kurdish and other militias.

The latest fighting took place in a string of villages along the Khabur River, a tributary of the Euphrates. The central village, Tel Tamer, is a strategic crossroads, with a bridge over the river that connects northeastern Syria with the country's northern hub, Aleppo; residents reported that Islamic State militants bombed the bridge on Tuesday.

The area has long been controlled by Kurdish militias but has lately come under attack from the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL.

In recent weeks, villages have changed hands several times as the Kurdish groups, some Arab Muslim factions and a Christian group called the Syriac Military Council have joined forces against the Islamic State.

In the chaos Tuesday, the exact number of hostages seized remained unclear, with estimates ranging from several dozen to more than 100. Nuri Kino, an Assyrian-Swedish activist with family ties to northeastern Syria, said that Islamic State fighters were holding about 60 women and children in the village of Tel Shamiran, and that they had taken 90 men up into a mountainous area they control, perhaps seeking to exchange them for Islamic State prisoners.

Mr. Kino, who founded A Demand for Action, a group that advocates for religious minorities in Iraq and Syria, said he had gleaned the information by talking to residents over Skype from Los Angeles.

Dawoud Dawoud, the deputy president of the Assyrian Democratic Party in the area, reached in Hasaka, said that the villages had long been largely left alone, but that in early February, Islamic State fighters had demanded that crosses be removed from churches.

The jihadists raided the village of Tel Hermez, driving away a local group, the Guardians of Khabur, that had protected churches there, said Omar Abd al-Aziz, a local antigovernment activist who uses a nom de guerre for his safety. Called to help, Kurdish militias entered the town with fighters from the Syriac Military Council, who filmed themselves retaking the area and leading away bound men they said were Islamic State members.

Now, the Islamic State appears to be retaliating with even greater numbers and heavy weapons.

''It's the new Kobani,'' said Mr. Kino, referring to the Kurdish enclave bordering Turkey whose encirclement by the Islamic State prompted American-led airstrikes that helped drive the group back. He called for United States intervention to prevent massacres and displacements.

The threats to minority enclaves, as in Kobani and the attacks on Yazidis in Iraq's Sinjar mountains last summer, have galvanized international action when other fighting did not.

Another activist in the area, who gave only his first name, Siraj, because of concern for his safety, accused the Kurds of leaving the Assyrians vulnerable in order to provoke a Kobani-like international reaction.

But Nawaf al-Khalil, a spokesman for the Kurdish Democratic Union, a political party, tried to find a bright side, saying the events were ''a good sign of stronger ties between the Kurds, the Arabs and the Christians'' against the Islamic State.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 2015]

A CREDIBILITY GAP

(By Fred Hiatt)

If his negotiators strike an agreement next month, we already know that it will be far from ideal: Rather than eradicating Iran's nuclear-weapons potential, as once was hoped, a pact would seek to control Iran's activities for some limited number of years.

Such a deal might be defensible on the grounds that it is better than any alternative, given that most experts believe a military ''solution'' would be at best temporary and possibly counterproductive.

But making that kind of lesser-evil defense would be challenging in any circumstances. Three conditions will make it particularly hard for Obama to persuade Congress and the nation to accept his assurances in this case: the suspicious, poisonous partisanship of the moment here, with Israeli politics mixed in; worries that he wants a deal too much; and the record of his past assurances.

The partisanship needs no explanation, but the record of foreign-policy assurances is worth recalling:

In 2011, when he decided to pull all U.S. troops out of Iraq, Obama belittled worries that instability might result. Iraq and the United States would maintain ''a strong and enduring partnership,'' Obama said. Iraq would be ''stable, secure and self-reliant,'' and Iraqis would build a future ''worthy of their history as a cradle of civilization.''

Today Iraq is in deep trouble, with a murderous ''caliphate'' occupying much of its territory and predatory Shiite militia roaming through much of the rest.

That same year, Obama touted his bombing campaign in Libya as a model of U.S. intervention and promised, ''That's not to say that our work is complete. In addition to our NATO responsibilities, we will work with the international community to provide assistance to the people of Libya.''

The United States and its NATO allies promptly abandoned Libya, which today is in the grip of civil war, with rival governments in the east and west and Islamist terrorists in between.

Obama also said then, ''Some nations may be able to turn a blind eye to atrocities in other countries. The United States of America is different. And as president, I refused to wait for the images of slaughter and mass graves before taking action.''

That was before Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad's barrel bombs, systematic and well-documented prison torture and other depredations of civil war killed 200,000 of his compatriots, and drove millions more from their homes.

In August 2011, Obama declared that Assad must ''step aside.'' In a background briefing a senior White House official added, ''We are certain Assad is on the way out.'' In August 2013 came Obama's statement that ''the worst chemical attack of the 21st century . . . must be confronted. . . . I have decided that the United States should take military action against Syrian regime targets.''

No military action was taken, and Assad remains in power.

In September, the president said his strategy for defeating the Islamic State ''is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years.'' Shortly thereafter, an Iran-backed rebellion deposed Yemen's pro-U.S. government, forcing the United States to abandon its embassy and much of its anti-terror operation.

Just last month, in the State of the Union address, Obama presented his Ukraine policy

as a triumph of ''American strength and diplomacy.

''We're upholding the principle that bigger nations can't bully the small by opposing Russian aggression and supporting Ukraine's democracy,'' he said.

Since then Russian forces have extended their incursion into Ukraine, now controlling nearly one-fifth of its territory. Russia's economy is hurting, but Ukraine's is in far worse shape.

This litany of unfulfilled assurances is less a case of Nixonian deception than a product of wishful thinking and stubborn adherence to policies after they have failed. But inevitably it will affect how people hear Obama's promises on Iran, as will his overall foreign policy record.

That record includes successes, such as the killing of Osama bin Laden, warming ties with India and a potentially groundbreaking agreement with China on climate change. By most measures, though, the world has not become safer during Obama's tenure. Islamist extremists are stronger than ever; democracy is in retreat around the globe; relations with Russia and North Korea have worsened; allies are questioning U.S. steadfastness.

Openings as well as problems can appear unexpectedly in foreign affairs, but the coming two years offer only two obvious opportunities for Obama to burnish this legacy: trade deals with Europe and with Pacific nations, and a nuclear agreement with Iran. That limited field fuels worries that administration negotiators will accept the kind of deal that results from wanting it too badly.

Whatever its contours, Obama would be making a big mistake to try to implement such a momentous pact, as administration officials have suggested he might, without congressional buy-in. But it's not surprising that he would be tempted to try.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the patience of my friend and colleague from the State of Texas.

It is with a heavy heart that we see the events transpiring according to this chart.

It is with a heavy heart that we see our friends in Ukraine, who only want to be like us, being slaughtered, and we are refusing to assist them. I have assured them that I will never give up—ever—until we see a free, prosperous, democratic Ukraine which is part of the community of nations, which we would admire, and in which we include them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, when given the opportunity four times over the last few weeks to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, while at the same time rolling back the President's unconstitutional Executive action on immigration, four times our Senate Democratic friends have filibustered this funding. At the same time, they have been pointing to this side of the aisle and saying: If there is a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security, you are at fault. It is hypocrisy, to say the least.

But of all the Democrats who voted to filibuster the funding of the Department of Homeland Security—which, again, expires at midnight on this Friday night—there are 11 of our Senate Democratic colleagues who come from States which are parties to a lawsuit in Brownsville, TX, where the Federal judge issued a temporary injunction just last week saying that what the President did in his Executive action was illegal—illegal.

So how our colleagues on the other side of the aisle can filibuster the Department of Homeland Security funding because they say it includes a disapproval of the President's action at the same time the States they represent are parties to a lawsuit complaining about the illegality of the President's actions—how they can reconcile that is beyond me. Perhaps they can come to the floor and talk about that. But I think they should be asked that question, and I would be very interested in their answer.

Of course, as we all know, now the Obama administration—after the Federal judge agreed with what the President said 22 different times, that he didn't have the authority to do what he did—and, obviously, he changed his mind. But after the Federal judge agreed with what he said the first 22 times, that he didn't have the authority, now they have asked for a stay of that temporary injunction.

If the reports in the press are correct, Judge Hanen in Brownsville, in the Southern District of Texas, has given the States, the plaintiffs in the lawsuit, until March 2 to respond to this request for emergency stay.

One by one, the folks who criticized what the President was doing in one fashion or another came to the floor and have voted in effect to affirm what he did. As I said yesterday, in justifying these votes we heard a common refrain from several of our Democratic colleagues, including some of those 11 whose States have joined the lawsuit against the President's Executive action. They have said to us: We don't necessarily agree with the President's action, but you shouldn't attach that to an appropriations bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

Similarly, from Senate Democratic leadership came the demands for a ''clean bill''—a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security—without these provisions addressing the Executive action attached.

Just 2 days ago here on the floor, the Democratic leader himself called for the Senate to vote on such a bill. A press release issued from Senator REID's office was unequivocal: ''REID Remarks Calling On Senate GOP To Avoid A Shutdown By Passing A Clean DHS Funding Bill.''

Monday wasn't the first time we heard this from Democratic leadership. We heard it over and over and over, as the Democrats, in lockstep, filibustered the Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

So imagine my surprise when Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, offered to consider two bills, one that would address the President's Executive action from last November—the Collins bill—and a separate one that would fully fund the Department of Homeland Security.

You would, I guess, if logic prevailed in this place, expect that the Democratic leader would embrace that wholeheartedly, instantaneously, saying: That is exactly what we have been demanding, and now we have been offered it. We will take it.

Well, that didn't happen. This place can be very confusing sometimes, and you would be wrong if you thought the Democratic leader embraced what he had been demanding for the last few weeks. So after spending weeks demanding a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security, including as recently as Monday, 24 hours have passed and the Democratic leader has still refused to agree to hold a vote on a so-called clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

Let me just repeat that so I am absolutely clear. The Democratic leader has so far refused to agree to vote on a clean funding bill for the Department, even after he called on Senate Republicans to pass exactly that as recently as Monday.

So I don't know how to sugar coat it. Call it a flip-flop, call it disingenuous. I don't know what to call it. But when you are offered exactly what you have been demanding and you don't accept it, it tells me you are not particularly serious about wanting to solve the problem. It is this kind of doubletalk which I think causes the Senate to be held in low regard by the American people, where they think that what you say doesn't necessarily translate into action. It is becoming abundantly clear that our friends across the aisle do not seem to have gotten the message from the last election on November 4.

I mentioned this yesterday, and I will repeat it, with reference to some of the gamesmanship that appears to be going on here, at the time when the clock is ticking and the Department of Homeland Security funding runs out at midnight on Friday. Recently, the senior Senator from New York told the Huffington Post that ''it's really fun to be in the Senate Minority,'' as if creating obstacles, slowing things down, and impeding progress toward a goal that we all hold in common—funding the Department of Homeland Security—is somehow having fun. But filibustering critical funding for the men and women that protect us every day and protect the homeland is not what I call fun.

At the end of the day, the Senate will make sure that those who protect our borders, our ports, and our skies get paid. That is what the American people voted for last November. They were sick and tired. If I heard it once, I heard it 100 times: We are sick and tired of the dysfunction in Washington, DC, and that is why we are voting for a change.

That is why we have nine new colleagues in the Senate—to break that logjam of dysfunction.

So I would implore the Democratic leader to heed his own call for a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill and to quit playing games. Quit playing games with the lives of

the people who work at the Department of Homeland Security. Quit playing games with the American people, whose security is on the line if for some reason the ability of the Department to perform its important functions is disrupted because of the lack of funding. Quit playing games with the funding that pays the salaries of the men and women who protect our ports, who protect our airports, and who protect our border from transnational drug cartels.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. MARKEY. 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. MARKEY. Mr. President, everyone agrees that our immigration system is broken. The immigration system we have now hurts our economy, and it hurts our national security. The Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill; the House of Representatives chose not to act. Again, the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill. That is why I supported the Executive action by President Obama to address our immediate immigration crisis. We cannot wait for the House of Representatives' Republicans to act, and that is because immigration is one of our country's greatest strengths. Immigrants are a vital part of the fabric of Massachusetts and of our country. They start businesses, they create jobs, and they contribute to our communities.

The President's Executive order recognizes the value of immigrants to our country. President Obama's Executive order will bring millions of law-abiding immigrants out of the shadows and help to keep those families together. The order allows law enforcement to focus its resources where they belong: reinforcing security at our borders and prosecuting and deporting dangerous criminals who pose threats to public safety. This Executive action cannot and should not be viewed as the final word on the matter of immigration reform. It is the beginning of an effort to permanently fix our broken immigration system.

What unites us in Massachusetts and all across America is the unshakable belief that no matter where you come from, no matter what your circumstances, you can achieve the American dream. The immigration system we have now doesn't reflect those values.

Unfortunately, instead of working to fix the problems with our immigration system, the majority of the Senate has been manufacturing a government shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security, even as our Nation faces real threats to our safety and to our national security if we don't fully fund the Department of Homeland Security. The majority seems more interested in undermining President Obama's border policy than funding actual border protection in our country.

Let's look at what could happen if Homeland Security funding lapses.

No. 1, FEMA efforts. FEMA is a part of the Department of Homeland Security. FEMA efforts in Massachusetts to develop a preliminary damage assessment for disaster relief funding may be interrupted.

The people in my home State of Massachusetts are suffering from the second snowiest winter in our history. We have endured more than 8 feet of snow. Those snow piles are climbing even higher. Seawalls that protect our shores are crumbling. Roofs are collapsing. Homes are being destroyed. Small businesses are shuttered while owners struggle to make ends meet. Cities and towns across the Commonwealth have overspent their budgets by tens of millions of dollars responding to one snowstorm after another.

But instead of the relief that should come with the assurance that FEMA assistance is on the way, the people of Massachusetts have to worry that this Republican-manufactured government shutdown threat is jeopardizing this critical assistance. The last thing the people of Massachusetts should have to worry about is whether their disaster assistance will be delayed by the politics of immigration reform. This is absolutely outrageous. Massachusetts needs the disaster relief today.

No. 2, an estimated 30,000 Homeland Security employees would have to be furloughed, including those who process Federal grants for local police, fire, and other first responders. Firefighters might not get the best oxygen masks. Bomb squads might not get the right equipment they need. These are hardworking people who help protect our Nation and help our first responders do their jobs.

No. 3, a Department of Homeland Security shutdown would compromise our national security by stopping command and control activities at Department of Homeland Security headquarters, disrupting important programs such as detecting weapons of mass destruction. Homeland Security employees remaining on the job will not get paid, and those who are furloughed will be left to wonder whether they will ever be paid for the work they missed. This uncertainty hurts morale and puts families in financial jeopardy.

It is time for Republicans to end this brinkmanship and help pass a clean Homeland Security budget free of unrelated policy riders. Then we should get to work on comprehensive immigration reform. The immigration system we have now doesn't reflect our time-honored values as a melting pot of diversity and innovation. It hurts our economy and national security. In short, our immigration system is broken.

But for millions of immigrants who are living in the shadows, who are working every day to support their families, who have been brought up here from a young age, who are serving our country in the military or pursuing the dream of higher education—these people deserve a path that allows them to earn citizenship. That is why we need to work together on comprehensive immigration reform. It will give more families and individuals a real shot at the American dream. It will encourage immigrants who are educated here to innovate here.

This is an important debate, and we should have it, and we should not have it at the expense of the safety and the security of our Nation.

I call on my Republican colleagues to bring forward a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill, free of unrelated policy riders dealing with immigration. Let's give the people of our country the confidence that the Department of Homeland Security is going to protect against al-Shabaab launching a successful attack against the Mall of America, that a terrorist group cannot now be put together, thinking, perhaps erroneously, that the Department of Homeland Security has taken its eye off the ball while worrying about the funding levels that are necessary in order to secure our country.

I lived through this in Boston. Mohamed Atta and the other nine who hijacked the two planes on September 11, 2001, thought they could find an opening—and they did—in our airline security. In 2013 the Tsarnaev brothers thought they could find a hole in our security, and they attacked again in Boston.

We should not have any question raised about the Department of Homeland Security being on the job protecting our citizens and providing the security our country needs. That is where we are right now, and the Republicans are holding up the funding of this vital agency under the misguided notion that they are going to be able to write the entire comprehensive immigration bill inside a Department of Homeland Security budget. It is not going to happen. Everyone in this country knows it is not going to happen. The Republicans are playing a dangerous game with the security of our country.

I ask all who make the decisions in the Republican Party to please tell their most radical Members that the Department of Homeland Security must be funded. It must be funded this week. We must not only pay those who work for us, but we should thank them every day for the security they provide to our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts, Amen. Amen. We can't play around with our national security by holding somebody's legislative ideal as

a means of holding up the national security and holding the national security of this country hostage.

ELECTRONIC DEVICES AND PRIVACY RIGHTS

Mr. President, I came to talk about another issue. In the first part of the week, the Washington Post had an article that followed a series of articles in other newspapers, such as the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, about a device that was given certification by the Federal Communications Commission called a stingray.

This device, when used properly by law enforcement—specifically, the FBI—not only can locate and absorb the content of communications over cell phones but can also locate the specific location of that cell phone. It does so by making the cell phone think that it, the device, is the cell phone tower. So instead of the cell phone radio waves going to the normal cell phone tower, they would come to this device called a stingray. If used properly, it can be used to go after the bad guys—terrorists and criminals. Of course, that is one of the reasons this device was created and certified by the Federal Communications Commission.

Part of the protections, as used by the FBI and local law enforcement, to get content is to treat it as if they were going to break into somebody's home to get evidence. Our constitutional protections regarding the right of privacy require that the law enforcement agency go to a judge—an impartial part of the judicial branch—in order to get a court order to show probable cause that a crime has been committed and therefore the constitutional right of privacy is trumped, and with this court order, law enforcement can go in and get the evidence.

Well, as technology continues to evolve and explode, of course, questions about our constitutional right of privacy get a lot more difficult, and so now law enforcement wants to pinpoint the location of a cellphone so they can go in and grab that person. Again, it would seem that the constitutional right of privacy needs to have the protection of a judge's order, and it is this Senator's belief that the FBI, when employing this type of device, would, in fact, use those constitutional protections.

Different news articles have raised questions about how this device is handled once it is turned over to local law enforcement and whether they are being adequately trained on judicial protections, and indeed, are they employing those protections. The news articles, as evidenced by the Washington Post this past Monday, would indicate that those judicial protections are not being employed.

So this Senator, as one of the coleaders of the commerce committee, along with the chairman of the committee, JOHN THUNE, has written to the FCC and asked them what information they have about the rationale behind the restrictions placed on the certification of the stingray—the device that was certified by the FCC—and whether those similar restrictions have been put in place for other devices. As technology continues to improve, we are going to see a lot more of these types of devices.

We need to know whether the FCC has inquired about the oversight that may be in place in order to ensure that the use of the devices complies with the manufacturer's representations to the FCC at the time of the certification. We are asking for a status report of the task force that was previously formed so we can look at these questions surrounding the use of the stingray.

This is not the last time we are going to be asking these questions—not necessarily about this device, the stingray. There is a multiplicity of devices that are coming out on the market, and the question is: What about our privacy? Of course we are reminded about this issue every day because every day we read about another data breach in the newspaper.

I have filed legislation with regard to data breaches to ensure that at least the company has the obligation to notify the poor customers that their data is suddenly out there in the Internet ether because of that data breach. A lot of these questions are going to continue to be asked.

What about the device called the Pineapple? I had no idea this device existed. Here is what it does: If I go into a Starbucks and use their wireless Internet, someone could be sitting outside of that Starbucks in their car, or at one of the outside tables, with this device called a Pineapple, and instead of my wireless device using Starbucks' Internet system, it is on that Pineapple device and all of my communications are going directly to that person, and that person is able to steal all of my private information. That is a major theft. This is scary. Yet that device has been around for several years.

We have major privacy questions. The Presiding Officer, who is a member of the commerce committee, knows that we are going to be grappling with these issues, along with other committees, such as judiciary, on the right to privacy.

In the meantime, we have raised these issues with the FCC on this most recent detailed expose about this device called the stingray. If it is employed for our national security and our personal safety, which is the job of the government, then it is a good thing; however, if it is employed for other reasons, such as invading our constitutional right of privacy, that is another thing.

It is time for us to stand up for the individual citizens in this country and their right to privacy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Missouri.

PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, last week I was glad to see that a Federal judge in Texas issued a preliminary injunction against the President's Executive order on immigration. This ruling, if upheld—and I believe it will be—reaffirms that President Obama was right when he said at least 22 times that he didn't have the authority to take the action he now has taken on immigration.

In December of last year I joined in an amicus brief with Senator CRUZ and Senator CORNYN and, I believe, the attorneys general from 26 States—not the State of Missouri but 26 States. I was glad that my joining allowed Missouri to be represented in support of this lawsuit brought by the State of Texas against President Obama's illegal decision to allow amnesty to be established. The brief states the Obama administration exceeded its constitutional authority and disrupted the delicate balance of power between the Congress, whose job it is to pass the law, and the President, whose job it is to carry out the law.

Executive means just that. The job of the Executive is to execute the law. It is not to pass the law. There is no constitutional provision anyone has been able to show me or that I have ever been able to find that says if the Congress doesn't do something, the President can decide it needs to be done and the President just does it on his own. There is certainly no law that suggests the President can just willfully ignore the law.

The brief we joined asserts that the Obama administration exceeded the bounds of its so-called prosecutorial discretion. The idea that they can have some discretion about how vigorously they enforce certain laws is, both in this case and in the court ruling, held up to the standard it really should be allowed to meet. The idea that the President can say that there is too much law here to enforce and we can't afford to enforce the law—but then by not enforcing the law, it creates substantially more economic burden on the States and the Federal Government than enforcing the law would have created—by any standard makes no sense. This is not a determination that at some level there are just too many violations of some law that is not very significant that you could have some prosecutorial discretion. This is the law that impacts whether people can come into the country or not and whether they can stay in the country not being legally here.

The bill that Leader MCCONNELL introduced this week will put every Senator on record on this topic. I look forward to a chance to vote on that bill

and to see my colleagues vote on this bill. Who will stand with the President's clear power grab on immigration, and who will stand by the rule of law? At least half a dozen Democrats and perhaps more have said they disagree with what the President did with this November action. A vote on Senator MCCONNELL's bill will give them a chance to show whether they really disagree or not. It is specific to the November action. It is specific to the action the Federal judge in Texas said puts undue burdens on the State and exceeded the President's authority.

As I have said a number of times, I would like to see our friends on the other side of the aisle be willing to debate this issue. I have also admitted a number of times that if I were them and if the President of the United States had said 22 times he couldn't do something, I would have some reluctance—I suppose as they clearly do—to come to the floor and defend why now those 22 statements don't matter.

If the Democrats would simply allow the Senate to begin debating the bill, Members on both side of the aisle could offer amendments, and we could actually be doing the job we are expected to do as legislators. Unfortunately, they decided to repeatedly say: No, we don't want to debate this bill. No, we are not going to go forward. No, we are not going to let the normal process work. No, we are not going to deal with the bill sent over by the co-equal branch of the Congress, the House of Representatives. Hopefully, we will see what happens as this debate moves forward and the President's activities are held not only now to a standard of law but also to his own standard.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the 22 times the President has said he didn't have the authority to do what he has now done.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

22 TIMES PRESIDENT OBAMA SAID HE COULDN'T IGNORE OR CREATE HIS OWN IMMIGRATION LAW

1. The biggest problems that we're facing right now have to do with [the president] trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States of America.'' (3/31/08)

2. ''We've got a government designed by the Founders so that there'd be checks and balances. You don't want a president who's too powerful or a Congress that's too powerful or a court that's too powerful. Everybody's got their own role. Congress's job is to pass legislation. The president can veto it or he can sign it. . . . I believe in the Constitution and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We're not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end-run around Congress.'' (5/19/08)

3. ''Comprehensive reform, that's how we're going to solve this problem. . . . Anybody who tells you it's going to be easy or that I can wave a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works.'' (5/5/10)

4. ''[T]here are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are [here] illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the laws on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws. . . . I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration. And it would also ignore the millions of people around the world who are waiting in line to come here legally. Ultimately, our nation, like all nations, has the right and obligation to control its borders and set laws for residency and citizenship. And no matter how decent they are, no matter their reasons, the 11 million who broke these laws should be held accountable.'' (7/1/10)

5. ''I do have an obligation to make sure that I am following some of the rules. I can't simply ignore laws that are out there. I've got to work to make sure that they are changed.''

6. ''I am president, I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the Executive Branch to make it happen. I'm committed to making it happen, but I've got to have some partners to do it. . . . The main thing we have to do to stop deportations is to change the laws. . . . [T]he most important thing that we can do is to change the law because the way the system works—again, I just want to repeat, I'm president, I'm not king. If Congress has laws on the books that says that people who are here who are not documented have to be deported, then I can exercise some flexibility in terms of where we deploy our resources, to focus on people who are really causing problems as a opposed to families who are just trying to work and support themselves. But there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I am obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself. So the most important thing that we can do is focus on changing the underlying laws.'' (10/25/10)

7. ''America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job. But I can advocate for changes in the law so that we have a country that is both respectful of the law but also continues to be a great nation of immigrants. . . . With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. . . . [W]e've got three branches of government. Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. And then the judiciary has to interpret the laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.'' (3/28/11)

8. ''I can't solve this problem by myself. . . . [W]e're going to have to have bipartisan support in order to make it happen. . . . I can't do it by myself. We're going to have to change the laws in Congress, but I'm confident we can make it happen.'' (4/20/11)

9. ''I know some here wish that I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how democracy works. See, democracy is hard. But it's right. Changing our laws means doing the hard work of changing minds and changing votes, one by one.'' (4/29/11)

10. ''Sometimes when I talk to immigration advocates, they wish I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how a democracy works. What we really need to do is to keep up the fight to pass genuine, comprehensive reform. That is the ultimate solution to this problem. That's what I'm committed to doing.'' (5/10/11)

11. ''I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books. . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. I promise you. Not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.'' (7/25/11)

12. ''So what we've tried to do is within the constraints of the laws on the books, we've tried to be as fair, humane, just as we can, recognizing, though, that the laws themselves need to be changed. . . . The most important thing for your viewers and listeners and readers to understand is that in order to change our laws, we've got to get it through the House of Representatives, which is currently controlled by Republicans, and we've got to get 60 votes in the Senate. . . . Administratively, we can't ignore the law. . . . I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. We are doing everything we can administratively. But the fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there's been a great disservice done to the cause of getting the DREAM Act passed and getting comprehensive immigration passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It's just not true. . . . We live in a democracy. You have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it. And if all the attention is focused away from the legislative process, then that is going to lead to a constant deadend. We have to recognize how the system works, and then apply pressure to those places where votes can be gotten and, ultimately, we can get this thing solved.'' (9/28/11)

In June 2012, President Obama unilaterally granted deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA), allowing ''eligible individuals who do not present a risk to national security or public safety . . . to request temporary relief from deportation proceedings and apply for work authorization.'' He then argued that he had already done everything he could legally do on his own:

13. ''Now, what I've always said is, as the head of the executive branch, there's a limit to what I can do. Part of the reason that deportations went up was Congress put a whole lot of money into it, and when you have a lot of resources and a lot more agents involved, then there are going to be higher numbers. What we've said is, let's make sure that you're not misdirecting those resources. But we're still going to, ultimately, have to change the laws in order to avoid some of the heartbreaking stories that you see coming up occasionally. And that's why this continues to be a top priority of mine. . . . And we will continue to make sure that how we enforce is done as fairly and justly as possible. But until we have a law in place that provides a pathway for legalization and/or citizenship for the folks in question, we're going to continue to be bound by the law. . . . And so part of the challenge as President is constantly saying, 'what authorities do I have?' '' (9/20/12)

14. ''We are a nation of immigrants. . . . But we're also a nation of laws. So what I've said is, we need to fix a broken immigration system. And I've done everything that I can on my own[.]'' (10/16/12)

15. ''. . . I am the head of the executive branch of government. I'm required to follow the law. And that's what we've done. But

what I've also said is, let's make sure that we're applying the law in a way that takes into account people's humanity. That's the reason that we moved forward on deferred action. Within the confines of the law we said, we have some discretion in terms of how we apply this law.'' (1/30/13)

16. ''I'm not a king. You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law. And, you know, when it comes to enforcement of our immigration laws, we've got some discretion. We can prioritize what we do. But we can't simply ignore the law. When it comes to the dreamers, we were able to identify that group and say, 'These folks are generally not a risk. They're not involved in crime. . . . And so let's prioritize our enforcement resources.' But to sort through all the possible cases of everybody who might have a sympathetic story to tell is very difficult to do. This is why we need comprehensive immigration reform. To make sure that once and for all, in a way that is, you know, ratified by Congress, we can say that there is a pathway to citizenship for people who are staying out of trouble, who are trying to do the right thing, who've put down roots here. . . . My job is to carry out the law. And so Congress gives us a whole bunch of resources. They give us an order that we've got to go out there and enforce the laws that are on the books. . . . If this was an issue that I could do unilaterally I would have done it a long time ago. . . . The way our system works is Congress has to pass legislation. I then get an opportunity to sign it and implement it.'' (1/30/13)

17. ''This is something I've struggled with throughout my presidency. The problem is that I'm the president of the United States, I'm not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed. And Congress right now has not changed what I consider to be a broken immigration system. And what that means is that we have certain obligations to enforce the laws that are in place even if we think that in many cases the results may be tragic. . . . [W]e've kind of stretched our administrative flexibility as much as we can[.]'' (2/14/13)

18. ''I think that it is very important for us to recognize that the way to solve this problem has to be legislative. I can do some things and have done some things that make a difference in the lives of people by determining how our enforcement should focus. . . . And we've been able to provide help through deferred action for young people. . . . But this is a problem that needs to be fixed legislatively.'' (7/16/13)

19. ''My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are passed. Congress has said 'here is the law' when it comes to those who are undocumented, and they've allocated a whole bunch of money for enforcement. And, what I have been able to do is to make a legal argument that I think is absolutely right, which is that given the resources that we have, we can't do everything that Congress has asked us to do. What we can do is then carve out the DREAM Act folks, saying young people who have basically grown up here are Americans that we should welcome. . . . But if we start broadening that, then essentially I would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that's not an option. . . . What I've said is there is a there's a path to get this done, and that's through Congress.'' (9/17/13)

20. ''[I]f, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so. But we're also a nation of laws. That's part of our tradition. And so the easy way out is to try to yell and pretend like I can do something by violating our laws. And what I'm proposing is the harder path, which is to use our democratic processes to achieve the same goal that you want to achieve. . . . It is not simply a matter of us just saying we're going to violate the law. That's not our tradition. The great thing about this country is we have this wonderful process of democracy, and sometimes it is messy, and sometimes it is hard, but ultimately, justice and truth win out.'' (11/25/13)

21. ''I am the Champion-in-Chief of comprehensive immigration reform. But what I've said in the past remains true, which is until Congress passes a new law, then I am constrained in terms of what I am able to do. What I've done is to use my prosecutorial discretion, because you can't enforce the laws across the board for 11 or 12 million people, there aren't the resources there. What we've said is focus on folks who are engaged in criminal activity, focus on people who are engaged in gang activity. Do not focus on young people, who we're calling DREAMers. . . . That already stretched my administrative capacity very far. But I was confident that that was the right thing to do. But at a certain point the reason that these deportations are taking place is, Congress said, 'you have to enforce these laws.' They fund the hiring of officials at the department that's charged with enforcing. And I cannot ignore those laws any more than I could ignore, you know, any of the other laws that are on the books. That's why it's so important for us to get comprehensive immigration reform done this year.'' (3/6/14)

22. ''I think that I never have a green light [to push the limits of executive power]. I'm bound by the Constitution; I'm bound by separation of powers. There are some things we can't do. Congress has the power of the purse, for example. . . . Congress has to pass a budget and authorize spending. So I don't have a green light. . . . My preference in all these instances is to work with Congress, because not only can Congress do more, but it's going to be longer-lasting.'' (8/6/14)

Mr. BLUNT. Let me mention a few of those, but I will submit all 22 for the RECORD. As early as March of 2008, the President said: I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now are things that don't go through Congress at all.

In November of 2010 the President said: I am the President, not a king. I can't do these things just by myself. I have to have partners to do it.

In January of 2013, the President, again, still believes he is not a king, because he says: I am not a king. He says that at two different events on that day. He says: We can't simply ignore the law.

The truth is, in November of 2014 the President does decide we can simply ignore the law. The 22 times the President said we couldn't ignore the law I agree with him. For those who believe I don't find enough opportunities to agree with the President, here are 22 times I agree with the President's view that he cannot do these kinds of things on his own and by himself.

On February 14, 2013—2 years ago—the President said: The problem is that I am the President of the United States.

I could actually quit right there and maybe that would say all I need to say, but of course he said:

> The problem is that you know I'm the president of the United States. I'm not the emperor of the United States . . . we have certain obligations to enforce the laws that are in place.

It goes on. I get to that point, and I don't know quite how to explain—as I am sure the President doesn't know how to explain—what he has said and what he has now done.

On September 2013: ''My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are passed,'' still in full agreement with what the President said his job is.

As late as August of this last year, the President said: There are some things we can't do. Congress has the power of the purse, for example. Congress has to pass a budget and authorize spending. So I don't have a green light.

He goes on to suggest to do whatever the President might like to do. That is basically what this debate is about right now. It is not about whether the Department of Homeland Security would continue to function. In fact, what I wish to see is the President engaged as the principal officer responsible for the administration of the government.

I think something like that is what President Kennedy said after the Bay of Pigs, when he said: I am responsible here because I am the principal officer responsible for the administration of the government.

The President created this problem. He created this funding problem for States, he created this funding problem for the Federal Government, and he created this problem of exceeding his authority as President of the United States. But the President, once again, is missing from the discussion of how to solve the problem.

That could very well be, as is often the case, the person who would know how to solve the problem is the person who created it. But we are not hearing anything from that person because clearly people at the White House believe it is to their temporary political advantage to act as though the people in the Congress don't want the government to function, rather than to act as though people in the Congress believe the President was right the 22 times he said he couldn't do what he has now done.

I have heard several of my colleagues in the last few days—in fact, even one or two this morning on early news shows—say: We need a way for Congress to settle these kinds of disputes outside of the appropriations process.

One way to do that would be to pass a law I filed in the last Congress that the House of Representatives passed in a bipartisan way—the Senate was not allowed to vote on it and I would like to see us vote on it in this Congress—which is the ENFORCE the Law Act, which simply does allow the Congress, if a majority of the Members of the House or Senate believes the President is not enforcing the law as written, to go to a judge and seek an early determination, rather than wait for some aggrieved citizen who disagrees with a rule or regulation to have to hire their own lawyer after the rule is in effect,

and in the 2 years or so it might take to get that case to the Supreme Court, other individuals impacted by the rule or regulation are trying to comply with it, only to find out later, as the Court ruled a handful of times during the recent years of this Presidency that, no, the President doesn't have the authority to do that.

They said: No, you don't have the authority to appoint people to the National Labor Relations Board when the Senate is in session just because you have decided somehow the Senate is not in session. You don't get to decide whether the Senate is in session, Mr. President, if they have met all the requirements to be in session. You particularly don't get to decide whether the Senate is in session if that same session of the Senate approves some things that you thought needed to be done and that was good enough for you.

Then they said: Mr. President, by the way, when you appoint these people illegally, whatever rules and regulations they put forward aren't legal either.

So the couple of years of businesses trying to comply with the National Labor Relations Act rules and regulations, all of that is to the wayside. Those rules are all gone, but that doesn't restore the time, effort, money, and needless compliance that happens when the President exceeds his authority or when the President's agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, decide they could do something they would like to do without ever arguing before the Congress that we would like the authority to do this.

So passing the ENFORCE the Law Act would be a way to seek an earlier or quicker remedy. It does appear to me that the Federal judges are likely to decide pretty quickly—Federal judges, the court of appeals level and then the circuit level—that, no, Mr. President; you have gone beyond where you were in fact. You were right the first 22 times, not the November 2014 time that you decided if you don't like the law, you don't have to enforce the law.

I think we should move forward with that ability that the Congress currently doesn't have, but also I think we should continue to express our desire for this process to work the way it is supposed to work.

The House of Representatives, which is supposed to initiate spending bills, has done that. It is the job of the Senate to debate those spending bills. It is the job of Senators to offer amendments if they don't like them, and so far our friends on the other side have insisted they don't want to do that part of this job. Maybe we all should understand why they don't want to defend what the President has done because of all the times he said he couldn't do it.

RECESS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until 2 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEVEN).

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to commend both of our leaders, Leader MCCONNELL and Leader REID, for coming to the floor and agreeing to a path forward to fully fund Homeland Security, and I want to speak for a moment about how critical this is and how really—if we cannot get the House of Representatives to agree, if they are not willing to move forward and support this path—we have actually not one shutdown but the possibility of two different kinds of shutdowns that will happen within 3 days.

I am talking about the fact there are 3 days left before the funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires—on February 27, at the end of the day on Friday. We are in a situation where those who protect us from terror threats all around us will be in a situation where they either aren't at work or are working without pay. We will be working with pay but they won't be working with pay, which of course is an outrageous situation for us to put them in.

Every week we know there is a new terrorist threat. That is literally true now, and it is shocking, as we turn on the television and we read the papers and listen to the radio. The most recent threat we know is from al-Shabaab, a Somali terrorist group with ties to Al Qaeda. A video appeared this last week where we know they called for an attack at the Mall of America near Minneapolis, as well as at other shopping centers in the United States and Canada and Great Britain.

We also know that an attack on that mall would endanger as many as 100,000 people—men, women, and children. That is how many people come to that mall, that big mall, every single day. Al-Shabaab terrorists have attacked a mall before so we know this is not an idle threat. In 2013, they attacked the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, where 63 innocent people were killed.

On February 14, a shooter at a synagogue in Copenhagen killed three people. In late January, an American was 1 of 10 people killed in a terrorist attack in Libya. Earlier in January, in Paris, an attack by a terrorist claimed 16 lives. I could go on and on. In October alone, gunmen attacked the Canadian Parliament in Ottawa, killing a Canadian soldier.

Michigan has the busiest northern border crossing in the country between Detroit and Windsor. Every day over $1 billion in goods and people are crossing that border—every single day. We actually have three crossings—two of the busiest in the country—and we count on border and Customs security. We count on our Homeland Security people to be on the job doing their job every single day.

We also count on the people at the airports—all of us. Most of us are on planes one or two times a week. We all understand the critical importance of the airport. And for those of us who are surrounded by water, the Coast Guard is absolutely critical.

I could go on and on with all of the ways in which the men and women of Homeland Security, border security, Customs, the Coast Guard, as well as police and firefighters, our first responders, are keeping us safe every single day.

If the House does not agree to what we are doing here, in 3 days we will see the Department of Homeland Security shut down—an entire infrastructure put together after 9/11, which we all worked together on in a bipartisan way because we saw and we felt what had happened in terms of the threats to our country and the loss of lives.

It is critical this not be just a game. This can't be just a trick, where we are somehow voting straight up on Homeland Security funding without other riders on immigration or other things where there are differences with the President. If it is straight-up funding, then we vote, and then it goes to the House and it gets completely changed again, that is not going to work. We are going to stand with the men and women who stand with us, put their lives on the line, and work hard every single day to keep us safe. It is critical the House decide to join us if in fact the Senate acts today to fully fund Homeland Security, which I hope we will.

There is another thing I am deeply concerned about, and that is the fact we have heard a lot of people talk about we will just do a continuing resolution from last year. That is effectively a shutdown of the first responders, because when we look at the list—immigration, Customs enforcement, detention, antitrafficking, smuggling—of those things that are funded under a continuing resolution, which is a fancy word for last year's funding, those things don't continue.

The new grants that keep firefighters in Michigan and across the country going—in Detroit alone we have 150 firefighters—were supposed to start in October. Because we haven't fully funded Homeland Security, they have been waiting. We have people who will be laid off—police officers, firefighters in Michigan and across the country under a CR—under a continuing resolution. It is effectively a first responders shutdown.

So that is the second shutdown I am concerned about. We could see Customs and Border Protection unable to award new contracts for new video surveillance. How many times do we talk about the need to protect the borders? But if we don't fully fund Homeland

Security, if we do what it sounds like may happen from the House, some short-term funding from last year, we will stop first responders, we will stop surveillance equipment, we will stop the ability to upgrade our Coast Guard, and we prevent and delay contracts for police and fire.

Also without a fully funded Homeland Security, nuclear detection equipment can't be replaced. That deals with our enemies trying to smuggle nuclear devices or dirty bombs into this country.

And what about emergency communications? Think about the malls or think about things such as FEMA and the unprecedented storms and snow that we have seen in parts of our country, the cold.

The idea we would somehow not fund upgrades to emergency equipment and effectively have a first responder shutdown is outrageous. I can't imagine the public, and rightly so, will understand this. I certainly don't understand it. We have all heard concerns about the Secret Service and the ability to upgrade those operations. I could go on and on as it relates to first responder funding.

So I am, on the one hand, pleased that it appears we may in fact have a path forward to separate the debate on fully funding our Homeland Security, our protections at the borders and airports, and so on, as well as police and fire and first responders across the country from a debate on immigration. I appreciate the differences, and we can have that debate. I appreciate that has been proposed to be separated. But we have to make sure there are no tricks and no doublecrosses when it comes to the House of Representatives, because we are not going to support an effort to go back again and hold Homeland Security funding hostage to other policies and disagreements with the President.

Finally, let me stress if the House does less than what the Senate is going to do on fully funding Homeland Security, they are shutting down first responders in this country. That is what they are doing. If we see a funding bill that has last year's numbers, they are putting in place a shutdown of our first responders in this country with threats all around us and new threats every day.

People in this country deserve a lot better. We can do better than that. So I hope we will come together today to do the right thing: Fund Homeland Security fully so our police and firefighters are available and on the streets, and we are securing our borders and our homeland operations. I dearly hope the House of Representatives will step up and join us in getting this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan has made an eloquent speech about the importance of fully funding the Department of Homeland Security. What is astonishing to me is that she didn't listen to her own speech the first time the Republican majority leader brought up the House-passed bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it; and why she didn't listen to that speech the second time the Republican majority leader brought up the House-passed bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it; and why she didn't listen to that speech the third time the Republican majority leader brought up the House-passed proposal to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it; and why not the fourth time the Republican leader brought up a bill passed by the House of Representatives to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats blocked it.

This is the fifth vote to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, which we want to do, and which we voted to do four times. So let us not confuse the issue here. I am amazed that Senate Democrats come up with this stuff on the other side. One would think they were living in a different world than we are.

The House has passed legislation to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security. Senate Republicans have brought up a bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security four times. The Presiding Officer knows that. Four times we voted yes and four times they voted no. This is the fifth opportunity they will have to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, and I hope we can do that.

But let us not recreate events that never happened. Let us recognize the fact that for 2 weeks Senate Republicans have been prepared to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and the Democrats themselves have blocked it not once, not twice, not three times, but four times.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Now, Mr. President, if I may switch gears, I came to the floor to talk on another subject which fortunately has bipartisan support. I am glad to speak about something like that because I think the people of this country gave us and the Republican majority an opportunity this year to come to Washington and shake things up, but also get things done.

In the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, we are working hard to do just that with Senator MURRAY, the ranking Democrat on the committee, and just as I worked with Senator Harkin in the last Congress when our committee reported out 25 different pieces of legislation which became law. So we got things done in the last Congress, and I am fully confident that Senator MURRAY and I and the other members of our committee can do that in this Congress.

That doesn't mean we agree on everything. We don't agree on a lot of things. If you had to pick a group of liberals and a group of conservatives and line them up, our committee would probably have as much difference as any committee in the Congress. But we also have about 30 percent of the jurisdiction in the Congress. That is what Senator Ted Kennedy used to say when he was in the Senate. And we know it is our responsibility to get things done.

We are working hard on fixing No Child Left Behind. We are working with Secretary Burwell and the President on finding ways to move discoveries and devices through the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration into the medicine cabinets.

I see the Senator from Maryland on the floor. Yesterday we worked together to receive a report that Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland and I, Senator BENNET from Colorado, and Senator BURR from North Carolina, asked for 2 years ago to take a look at all the Federal regulations governing our 6,000 colleges and universities and give us an assessment of how much they cost, and how much confusion and duplication there is since the eight different times we have reauthorized the Higher Education Act of 1965. We asked how often we failed to weed the garden, how often we instead just dumped new laws and regulations on top of old ones, and to tell us exactly what to do.

Chancellor Zeppos of Vanderbilt University and Chancellor Kirwan of the University System of Maryland gave us this report. Senator MIKULSKI was there, I was there, and Senator MURRAY, Senator BURR, and Senator BENNET were there. It was a very impressive report. I won't speak for long about it because I see the Senator from Maryland would like to speak, but I wish to take 5 minutes and say these things. It is sometimes best to tell a story to underscore a point, and here is the first story. Vanderbilt University hired the Boston Consulting Group to tell the university how much it spent complying with Federal rules and regulations for higher education in a single year.

According to the Boston Consulting Group, Vanderbilt University spent $150 million complying with Federal rules and regulations last year. That is 11 percent of Vanderbilt's non-hospital expenditures. That adds up to about $11,000 of the tuition for each one of the 12,000 students at the university. It is absolutely absurd that somehow or another that could happen.

A second example is the student aid form 20 million families fill out every year. It is 108 questions long. Our committee has been told that two questions would provide all the necessary information for 95 percent of families: What is your income from two years ago and what is your family size? A bipartisan group of Senators have introduced a bill to do just that. This would save millions of hours and dollars across the country.

Here is a third example. Surveys conducted by the National Academy of

Sciences found that 42 percent of a principal investigator's time on a research project is spent on administrative tasks instead of research.

I asked the head of the National Academy of Sciences what would be a reasonable time?

He said about 10 percent.

We spend 30 billion in taxpayer dollars a year on research and development at colleges and universities. If we could save $1 billion of that $30 billion by reducing that 42 percent to closer to 10 percent, then we could fund a 1,000 more multiyear grants to investigate cancer research, Ebola research, and vaccines, and we should do that.

This is an enormously promising report.

Ten years ago the Senator from Maryland and I worked on a report called ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm.'' We asked a group of distinguished Americans to tell us the 20 things that we might do in Congress to help make our country more competitive in the world. They gave us the 20 things, which formed a blueprint, and we passed most of them and eventually funded most of them.

So I think this report we received yesterday has the opportunity to be as important as ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which later helped establish the America COMPETES Act. It is a blueprint for how we can reduce overregulation, simplify rules, save money, make consumer protection clear, keep tuition down, find more money for research, and let colleges and universities spend their time and money educating students instead of filling out forms.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland, Senator BENNET from Colorado, Senator BURR from North Carolina, and my partner Senator MURRAY on the HELP Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement from yesterday's hearing, followed by pages 1 through 6 of the report presented to us yesterday, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee hearing earlier this week be printed in the RECORD.

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This morning we are holding our first hearing this Congress on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act which will focus on the final report from the Task Force on Government Regulation of Higher Education.

Over a year ago, Vanderbilt University hired the Boston Consulting Group to determine how much it costs the university to comply with federal rules and regulations.

The answer: $150 million, or 11 percent of the university's total non-hospital expenditures last year.

Vanderbilt Chancellor Nick Zeppos says that this adds about $11,000 in additional tuition per year for each of the university's 12,757 students.

Each year, 20 million American families fill out a complicated, 108-question form called the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) to obtain a grant or loan to help pay for college. Several experts testified before our committee that just two questions would tell the Department of Education 95 percent of what it needs to know to determine a student's eligibility for a grant or loan: One, what is your family size? And, two, what is your family income?

So, in January a bipartisan group of six Senators introduced legislation to simplify the student aid application and repayment process, including reducing the 108-question FAFSA form to just two questions. If our legislation becomes law, then families, guidance counselors, and admissions officers would save millions of hours.

Most important, according to financial aid expert Mark Kantrowitz, the complicated, 108-question form discourages up to 2 million Americans each year from applying for aid. Last fall, the president of Southwest Tennessee Community College in Memphis told me that the complex form turns away from his campus 1,500 students each semester.

Tennessee has become the first state to make community college tuition-free for qualifying students. But first, each student must fill out the FAFSA. Now that tuition is free, the principal obstacle for a qualified Tennessee student to obtain two more years of education after high school is not money: it is this unnecessarily complicated federal form. Ten years ago, then again three years ago, surveys by the National Academy of Sciences found that principal investigators spend 42 percent of their time associated with federal research projects on administrative tasks instead of research.

I asked the head of the National Academies what a reasonable percent of time would be for a researcher to spend on administrative tasks. He replied: perhaps 10 percent or even less.

How many billions could we save if we reduced the administrative burden?

Taxpayers spend more than $30 billion a year on research and development at colleges and universities.

This year, the average annual cost of an NIH research project grant is $480,000. If we reduce spending on unnecessary red tape by $1 billion, the an NIH could potentially fund more than a thousand multi-year grants.

These should not be excused as normal, run-of-the-mill problems of government. These examples, and others like them, represent sloppy, inefficient governing that wastes money, hurts students, discourages productivity, and impedes research.

Such waste should be an embarrassment to all of us in the federal government.

And let me make clear: let's not just blame President Obama and Education Secretary Arne Duncan. They have contributed to the problem, but so has every President and every education secretary—and that includes me—since 1965 when the first Higher Education Act was enacted.

And the list of those embarrassed should also include the Congress of the United States for year after year adding to and tolerating a pile of conflicting, confusing regulations.

The Higher Education Act totals nearly 1,000 pages; there are over 1,000 pages in the official Code of Federal Regulations devoted to higher education; and on average every workday the Department of Education issues one new sub-regulatory guidance directive or clarification.

No one has taken the time to ''weed the garden.''

The result of this piling up of regulations is that one of the greatest obstacles to innovation and cost consciousness in higher education has become—us, the federal government.

So if all of us created this mess, then it is up to all of us to fix it.

That is why more than a year ago, four members of this committee—two Democrats and two Republicans—asked a group of distinguished educators to examine the current state of federal rules and regulations for colleges and universities. We asked them not just to tell us the problem, but to give us specific solutions.

They have done so in a remarkable document entitled ''Recalibrating Regulation of Colleges and Universities,'' in which they outline 59 specific regulations, requirements and areas for Congress and the Department of Education to consider—listing 10 especially problematic regulations.

I thank Vanderbilt University Chancellor Nick Zeppos and University System of Maryland Chancellor Brit Kirwan for leading the effort.

In their own words, America's 6,000 colleges and universities live in a ''jungle of red tape'' that is expensive and confusing and unnecessary.

The report makes clear that colleges and taxpayers expect appropriate regulation. But neither taxpayers nor colleges are well-served by the jungle that exists today. Consumer information that is too complicated to understand is worthless.

Colleges must report the amount of foreign gifts they receive; disclose the number of fires drills that occurred on campus. ''Gainful employment'' disclosures require 30 different pieces of information for each academic program subject to the regulation.

When a student withdraws from college before a certain time period, a student's federal money must be returned to the government. This is a simple concept.

Yet the regulations and guidance implementing this are ridiculously complex—200 paragraphs of regulatory text accompanied by 200 pages in the Federal Student Aid handbook.

The University of Colorado reports that they have two full-time staff devoted to this issue. One to do the calculation and the other one to recheck the other's work. Ohio State University estimates that it spends around $200,000 annually on compliance for this regulation.

Institutions offering distance education are subject to an additional set of bureaucracy that can result in additional costs of $500,000 to a million dollars for compliance.

All of these are examples of colleges and universities spending time and money on compliance with federal rules and not on students.

Senator Murray and I will discuss how to develop a bipartisan process to take full advantage of the recommendations in this report and to include many of them in reauthorization of the High Education Act, which we plan to do this year.

We will schedule additional hearings to gather comment on the report from institutions not directly involved with the report and consumers of higher education, including parents, students, and taxpayers.

Some of the recommendations require a change in the law. Many can be fixed by the Department itself.

I have talked with Secretary Duncan more than once about this effort and he is eager to do his part to solve the problem. I look forward to working with him and with President Obama on eliminating unnecessary red tape, saving students money, and removing unnecessary regulatory obstacles to innovation in the best system of higher education in the world.

This is not a new subject for me. One of the first things I did as a Senator was try to simplify student aid and the Free Application

for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). And I'm told the net result was the reduction of approximately 7 questions. Those have been replaced by many more now.

Although I voted against the final reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 2008, I authored a provision in the bill that required the Secretary of Education to publish a ''compliance calendar'' so schools can see all of their deadlines.

Unfortunately, 7 years later, the Department of Education has yet to implement this provision.

With bipartisan support and this groundbreaking report we have today, I'm counting on this effort to get farther than that one.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The federal government's substantial fiscal investment in higher education recognizes that postsecondary education is a linchpin in the nation's social and economic strength. Through that support, the government helps ensure that colleges and universities continue to contribute broadly to the fabric of American society. To ensure prudent stewardship of federal support for higher education, the Department of Education is charged with developing procedures to carry out laws passed by Congress in regard to higher education and with overseeing institutional compliance. Institutions of higher learning recognize the important role regulations play in the oversight of federal investments.

Over time, oversight of higher education by the Department of Education has expanded and evolved in ways that undermine the ability of colleges and universities to serve students and accomplish their missions. The compliance problem is exacerbated by the sheer volume of mandates—approximately 2,000 pages of text—and the reality that the Department of Education issues official guidance to amend or clarify its rules at a rate of more than one document per work day. As a result, colleges and universities find themselves enmeshed in a jungle of red tape, facing rules that are often confusing and difficult to comply with. They must allocate resources to compliance that would be better applied to student education, safety, and innovation in instructional delivery. Clearly, a better approach is needed.

In 2013, a bipartisan group of U.S. Senators recognized that the pending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) creates an opportunity to consider these issues in depth. They established a task force of college and university presidents and chancellors to study federal regulation of higher education broadly and identify potential improvements.

Looking at the landscape of regulation of colleges and universities writ large, the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education identified a number of challenges that are particularly problematic. As described in Section II of this report, we concluded that many rules are unnecessarily voluminous and too often ambiguous, and that the cost of compliance has become unreasonable. Moreover, many regulations are unrelated to education, student safety, or stewardship of federal funds—and others can be a barrier to college access and innovation in education.

Based on extensive discussions, consultations with experts, and site visits to campuses, the Task Force identified specific regulations that are of major concern to higher education institutions. Section III details those concerns, which include problematic financial responsibility standards, confusion and inconsistency in reporting requirements for campus crime, overreach in authorization of distance education programs, inefficient rules concerning verification of financial aid eligibility, counterproductive micromanagement of the accreditation process, and policies that result in consumers being inundated with information of questionable value.

The Task Force also reviewed the processes by which higher education regulations are developed and implemented, and offers several specific ideas for improvement. Section IV outlines recommendations that include asking the Government Accountability Office to review the Department of Education's methodology for estimating institutional costs of compliance with regulations; the creation of clear ''safe harbors'' for institutional compliance; the recognition of ''good faith'' efforts to comply; and several proposals for better practices by the Department.

To help policy makers think about the most effective and efficient way to regulate higher education, the Task Force developed the following Guiding Principles to govern the development, implementation, and enforcement of regulations by the Department:

Regulations should be related to education, student safety, and stewardship of federal funds.

Regulations should be clear and comprehensible.

Regulations should not stray from clearly stated legislative intent.

Costs and burdens of regulations should be accurately estimated.

Clear safe harbors should be created.

The Department should recognize good faith efforts by institutions.

The Department should complete program reviews and investigations in a timely manner.

Penalties should be imposed at a level appropriate to the violation.

Disclosure requirements should focus on issues of widespread interest.

All substantive policies should be subject to the ''notice-and-comment'' requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Regulations that consistently create compliance challenges should be revised.

The Department should take all necessary steps to facilitate compliance by institutions.

The Task Force believes that adherence to these principles would help improve regulation of higher education, and urges their adoption.

Again, to be clear: Regulations serve an important role in ensuring institutional accountability. But requirements that have an excessive reach, or that are unnecessarily costly and difficult to implement—or worse still, that hinder student access to college and drive costs up—are counterproductive. Smarter rules are needed. In the context of the forthcoming reauthorization of the HEA, this report from the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education proposes many specific avenues to improve the regulation of higher education.

THE TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL REGULATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The pending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) provides an opportunity for Congress to examine how institutions of higher education are regulated and to identify ways to streamline and simplify regulatory policies and practices. With that goal in mind, a bipartisan group of U.S. Senators—Lamar Alexander (R–TN), Barbara Mikulski (D–MD), Richard Burr (R–NC), and Michael Bennet (D–CO) created the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education in the fall of 2013 and directed it to consider these issues in depth.

The Senators articulated a three-part charge for the group:

1) Provide specific recommendations to consolidate, streamline, and eliminate burdensome, costly, and confusing regulations, laws, and reporting requirements;

2) Review and quantify the extent of all federal requirements with which institutions must comply, including estimates of the time and costs associated with specific regulations; and,

3) Provide recommendations for reform to ensure future regulations are promulgated in a manner that appropriately considers existing law and accurately examines the costs and benefits to taxpayers, institutions, and students.

The Senators appointed Task Force members representing institutions from across all sectors of higher education, and named Chancellors William E. Kirwan of the University System of Maryland and Nicholas S. Zeppos of Vanderbilt University (TN) as co-chairs. In addition to Chancellors Kirwan and Zeppos, the Task Force includes these members:

William L. Armstrong, President, Colorado Christian University

Bruce D. Benson, President, University of Colorado

Molly Corbett Broad, President, American Council on Education (DC)

Thomas V. Chema, President Emeritus, Hiram College (OH)

Margaret L. Drugovich, President, Hartwick College (NY)

Dana G. Hoyt, President, Sam Houston State University (TX)

Brice W. Harris, Chancellor, California Community College System

Jonathan A. Kaplan, Chief Executive Officer, Laureate Online Education (MD)

Cornelius M. Kerwin, President, American University (DC)

J. Michael Locke, Former CEO, Rasmussen College (IL)

Harold L. Martin Sr., Chancellor, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University

Claude O. Pressnell Jr., President, Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities Association

Thomas W. Ross, President, University of North Carolina

Robert G. Templin Jr., President, Northern Virginia Community College

In addition, the Senators asked the American Council on Education (ACE) to support the work of the Task Force.

SCOPE OF WORK AND TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES

The word ''regulation'' can be viewed broadly or narrowly. Narrowly defined, federal regulation means only a requirement imposed on institutions through the Code of Federal Regulations, the codification of all the regulations promulgated by federal agencies. Considered more broadly, it means any requirement placed on colleges and universities in order to participate in the federal student aid program. For the purposes of this Task Force and our report, we use ''regulation'' in this broader sense.

The Task Force engaged in extensive consultations for this project and solicited insights from higher education associations, campus officials, and other organizations and stakeholders. To gather input from individuals on campuses who are responsible for implementing regulations, ACE staff conducted extensive site visits and met with representatives from more than 60 institutions around the country.

Our aim was not simply to reduce the number of regulations imposed by the Department of Education, but rather to foster more effective and efficient rules that still meet federal objectives. To that end, we sought to accomplish these goals:

Summarize the increasing burden of federal regulation on higher education.

Identify regulations of particular concern to institutions of higher education, explain why they are problematic, and recommend changes to ameliorate them.

Offer longer-term process improvements that would minimize similar concerns about regulations in the future.

Section I of this report frames the current regulatory landscape for higher education. Section II describes specific current challenges. Section III details 10 regulations that colleges and universities find especially problematic, and recommends solutions. Finally, Section IV proposes ways to improve the regulatory process.

Effective oversight can help colleges and universities keep costs down, keep students safe, focus on educating students, and be good stewards of federal funds. In that spirit, the Task Force developed the following Guiding Principles to help govern the development, implementation, and enforcement of regulations by the Department:

Regulations should be related to education, student safety, and stewardship of federal funds.

Regulations should be clear and comprehensible.

Regulations should not stray from clearly stated legislative intent.

Costs and burdens of regulations should be accurately estimated.

Clear safe harbors should be created.

The Department should recognize good faith efforts by institutions.

The Department should complete program reviews and investigations in a timely manner.

Penalties should be imposed at a level appropriate to the violation.

Disclosure requirements should focus on issues of widespread interest.

All substantive policies should be subject to the ''notice-and-comment'' requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Regulations that consistently create compliance challenges should be revised.

The Department should take all necessary steps to facilitate compliance by institutions.

We believe that these principles would help improve the regulation of higher education, and we urge their adoption.

While the primary focus of this report is on requirements imposed by the Department of Education, institutions of higher education are also regulated by every Cabinet-level agency, as well as many sub-Cabinet-level agencies. In that regard, we acknowledge the important work by other groups and organizations, including the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Science Board, to examine regulations stemming from other agencies, particularly in connection with federally funded research.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the issue of funding for Homeland Security. However, I wish to note and acknowledge the comments just made by my colleague from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, the chair of the HELP Committee. I couldn't agree with him more.

Hello, America. Two Senators, different parts of the country, different political parties, different political views on some social issues or whatever, but I couldn't agree more with this outstanding report whose original idea came from the gentleman from Tennessee.

When we worked on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act about 5 years ago now, we agreed upon goals to make college more accessible, to make college more affordable, to always insist that that college offer a quality education and that students on the campus be safe and secure so they could be in a true learning environment.

I am a student loan/student grant person, so I was focusing on the students. I taught at Loyola University in Baltimore, in the community college, but my colleague, who was the president of a university, said: We ought to look at regs. Regulation could have a tremendous impact.

So we put our heads together. Our cochairs came from Tennessee. The Maryland cochair was Dr. Kirwan, a retiring but very able chancellor. And it is a terrific report. It is exactly what we wanted.

Where are the regs that, No. 1, are duplicative—the same darned report after report, and then you do a report on the reports so that then they can ask you questions and ask for a followup addendum. Then there are also instances where the requirements are contradictory. So there they are, the administrators of both the colleges and universities themselves or of an individual grant program. So we want to clarify that.

Not only under Senator ALEXANDER's leadership did we go for what were the top 10 concerns that were really burdensome, duplicative, or contradictory, they gave us a checklist on what would constitute criteria for a good reg. I think they gave us a great roadmap, and now it is our part to use the report. So we are not like everybody else where we got them to do a report and we don't do anything with it.

When we did ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which I was so excited to be part of, it was truly a bipartisan effort. It led to legislation, and it led to other executive branch input.

So I thank my colleague from Tennessee. I think this is the way we should be working together—put our heads together, get the best advice from what is out there in the real world, and then let's put our shoulders to the wheel and get it done.

Does the Senator have a sense of when he would like to move or the timetable to implement this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her comments and her leadership.

I would say to the Senator from Maryland that I will need to sit down and talk to the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, which we plan to do in March. My hope would be that in April we could begin five or six hearings aligned with the recommendations in the report, and on other matters such as accreditation, form working groups within our committee, and then by the fall move ahead with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and complete it by the end of the year.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and look forward to working with him.

Mr. President, this is the way it ought to be, where Senators come together and bring our best ideas. We also bring our concerns and we put them all on the table. But we began with civility, we began with respect, and we established what were agreed-upon goals and how each one of us thought we could get to the roadmap to do that. This is the way I would hope we would work.

Now, as we come to almost a crisis with the funding for Homeland Security running out on Friday, this is the time for us to put our party differences aside, put our pet projects aside, and focus not on what is good for our politics but what is good for America.

I understand that our leadership on both sides of the aisle—Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID—have arrived now at a framework where we will go through a set of parliamentary procedures, which is our way, to then arrive at a point where we could be voting on a full year's funding for Homeland Security without any additional riders that could derail the bill placed on it. I wish to compliment the leadership for beginning a communication and establishing a parliamentary choreography where we could actually get the job done. The leaders have been working on this. We know they will be coming here on the floor in a few minutes to share with us that idea and begin the procedures where every Senator can exercise their will and their judgment.

But I just want to say this as the ranking member or the vice chair of the Appropriations Committee: We have to fund the Department of Homeland Security. We just have to do it. We have to do it, and we have to do it now. I hope we can do it in the Senate this afternoon and that the House really follows what we are doing here.

This is so crucial because of the very nature of what the bill is—homeland security. This isn't about a new agency that might be duplicative of another. This isn't about new programs. It is not even about great big new sums of money. This Appropriations Committee arrived at its recommendations when we were working on the omnibus.

The Presiding Officer is the chair of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security. I know that in the way he does his due diligence, he has reviewed this bill. So the money part I don't think is controversial and it actually does the job. And the job is to do the full funding to protect the homeland.

I really worry about our country. Here we are, and we have ISIL making additional threats to the United States about the security of our malls. While

we were all pondering what our strategy would be and parsing what the politics would be, our great Federal agents were on the scene making sure that four Americans didn't go to join ISIL to fight against us and perhaps organize predatory attacks against us. Our people are on the job, and now it is time that we do our job and fully fund this agency.

America is at risk. We face terrorism. We face the consequences of natural disasters, which FEMA and the Coast Guard are really helping us with right now. We face cyber threats. We need the Department of Homeland Security funded in a way to prevent and respond to these situations.

When I look at this, it is really standing sentry in terms of all we need to do in terms of port security, airport security, guarding our borders through our Border Patrol agents, 23,000 Border Patrol agents. But I also look at the first responders. If anything happens in our country, it is local law enforcement and local firefighters who are the first to respond. We have helped them with this response by providing them with Federal funds. I am really proud of what we have done on this.

I want to speak particularly about the Fire Grant Program. Now think about what they do. Every day when they report to duty, our first responders don't know what they will face. In my own home State of Maryland, will they face a train derailment? We have had those. Will they face a Metro fire? We have had that. Will we have a multiple-vehicle accident on 95 that could involve a horrific accident that requires rescue from hazardous and toxic waste? Because of who we are, with our airports and our seaports, we also are a big threat for a terrorist attack. Our first responders are asking us to give them the money they need to pay the bills and also help them with these necessities.

Over 10 years ago I joined with one of my Republican counterparts, Senator Kit Bond of Missouri. We were both concerned with what was happening to our volunteer fire departments. As he crisscrossed Missouri and I crisscrossed Maryland, we were shocked to find out that a new firetruck could cost as much as $1 million, that wonderful SCBA protective gear that would be fire retardant or fire resistant could cost $2,000, that the special breathing apparatus that is being developed can cost over $5,000. When we put our heads together and listened to our firefighters, we realized you could not fund that on tip jars, pancake breakfasts, crabcake dinners, or oyster fries in my own State. We wanted to help them. We wanted to make sure we helped them so they could protect us.

So we looked at the Fire Grant Program. It has been a tremendous success in my own State in the decades since we passed it. Over 600 fire departments have been helped with the new equipment they need. When I travel my State, I have people who defend and protect me in my community shake my hand. The Presiding Officer knows what the volunteer firefighters do. I am sure it is the same situation in North Dakota as it is western Maryland. They say: You have helped me be able to do the job. Volunteer fire departments do all of this on their own time and on their own dime.

So what happens if we don't fund Homeland Security? It means that those $2 billion grants for emergency firefighters, port security, for local efforts and so on will not be funded. Make no mistake. For those people perhaps in the Senate or in the House that say that we just do a continuing resolution, a continuing resolution means that grants cannot be funded.

Under current law, for any program with an agency that is on a CR, it cannot issue grant money at all. So that means right now they are getting ready to take the Fire Grant Program proposals. Secretary Jeh Johnson can't put out communication to say it is now the annual time for fire chiefs to come in with their requests.

So we are placing America at risk—not only with the really big picture stuff. Often the big picture comes back home. On that terrible, terrible day of 9/11, who ran up into those burning buildings? Who ran up those steps of the World Trade Center? It was our firefighters.

I am flinching, flagging, abashed at their heroism and their desire to rescue. And every day—right this minute—one of them somewhere is doing something. Certainly we can fund the grant program so they can have the truck they need, so they have the breathing apparatus they need, so they have the protective gear they need, so we can protect them while they are protecting us—rather than protecting our political butts. We have got to get off our butts and fund this bill.

I look forward to the leadership on both sides of the aisle coming forward with a program to do it. I hope we have a sense of urgency. There is a saying from Tip O'Neill that ''all politics is local,'' but ultimately, all homeland security is local.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate our Democrat colleagues joining us and proceeding to the House-passed bill. I have spoken to the Democratic leader and my colleagues on the Republican side and commit to offering an amendment to the House bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, while addressing the President's Executive actions on a separate adjacent track through consideration of the Collins bill.

When the Senate proceeds to H.R. 240, I will offer a clean substitute and work to expedite consideration of the bill, as amended, to get it back over to the House this week. I would welcome bipartisan cooperation to pass the DHS funding bill as well as the commonsense Collins bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority leader and I have had very good discussions in the last 24 hours or so. We have agreed that, in order to pass a clean Homeland Security appropriations bill for the remainder of this fiscal year, the Democrats will support getting on the House Homeland Security funding bill. In exchange, the majority leader will provide that the only amendment will be a clean Homeland Security funding substitute, which he just outlined. The substance of this amendment is the same as the bill that was introduced by Senators MIKULSKI and SHAHEEN about a month ago.

The Senate will adopt that amendment and send the amended bill to the House in an expedited fashion. The Senate will then vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Collins bill.

Personally, I don't believe the Collins bill is a compromise. It would undermine law enforcement and tear families apart. So until full-year funding for the Homeland Security Department is enacted, I will vote against going to the Collins bill.

After a clean bill is signed into law, I will be happy to have a vigorous debate on immigration and the best way to fix our broken system.

I want to be very clear that Democrats would be willing to expedite the plan we have before us by consent.

In conclusion, I thank the majority leader for working with Democrats to come to a solution of this impasse that we have been faced with for the last 4 weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider vote No. 53, the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

Mitch McConnell, Thad Cochran, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, David Vitter, Jerry Moran, Daniel Coats, Michael B. Enzi, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, John Boozman, John Thune, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, James Lankford, Jeff Sessions.

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 H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Fischer	Murray
Ayotte	Flake	Nelson
Baldwin	Franken	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Hatch	Reid
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Boxer	Heitkamp	Roberts
Brown	Heller	Rounds
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McCaskill	Udall
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—2

Inhofe	Sessions

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). On this vote, the yeas are 98, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I just want to applaud the vote we just had. A 98-to-2 vote shows very clearly that our colleagues in the Senate want to see funding for Homeland Security. Everybody understands that the risks to this country are too great for us not to provide the resources the Department needs so they can continue to do their jobs.

We just heard that the Department of Homeland Security was involved with the FBI in the case of three people in Brooklyn who were threatening this country because they wanted to go to the Middle East and join ISIS. We need to make sure DHS has the funding they need. This is real progress. I applaud Senators MCCONNELL and REID for their efforts to get to this point.

I hope we can continue down this road to get funding for the Department, and that when we send the bill over to the House, the House will also work together in a bipartisan way to get a clean funding bill before the resources run out, before the money runs out for the Department of Homeland Security this Friday. We have a little bit of time. We need to get this done. The Senate took a giant step forward today to do that. I applaud my colleagues. I hope we can keep this going and that we can get this done very soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

INCOME INEQUALITY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I do not agree with Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER on very much, but I do agree that it is an excellent idea for there to be a joint session of Congress in the fall to hear from Pope Francis. To my mind, in the last few years the Pope has played an extraordinary role in speaking out on issues of enormous consequence that impact every man, woman, and child, not just in our country but on the planet. He has shown great courage in raising issues that we very rarely discuss here in the Congress or in parliaments around the country.

What I want to do briefly this afternoon is quote and discuss some of the statements that the Pope has made that I think we need to listen to. I think it is a wonderful idea that Speaker BOEHNER has invited the Pope, but I think it is important we also listen to what he has said. This is from Pope Francis.

> We have created new idols. The worship of the golden calf of old has found a new and heartless image in the cult of money and the dictatorship of an economy which is faceless and lacking any truly humane goal.

On another occasion what he says is: ''Man is not in charge today, money is in charge, money rules.''

Then he says in another quote:

> Today everything comes under the laws of competition and the survival of the fittest, where the powerful feed upon the powerless. As a consequence, masses of people find themselves excluded and marginalized: without work, without possibilities, without any means of escape.

Then he says this on an issue that is, I think, very relevant to this body:

> In this context, some people continue to defend trickle-down theories which assume that economic growth, encouraged by a free market, will inevitably succeed in bringing about greater justice and inclusiveness in the world. This opinion, which has never been confirmed by the facts, expresses a crude and naive trust in the goodness of those wielding economic power and in the sacralized workings of the prevailing economic system.

Then he says:

> . . . these things become the norm: that some homeless people die of cold on the streets is not news. In contrast, a ten point drop on the stock markets of some cities, is a tragedy.

In other words, when people die because they are poor and hungry and cold, that is not news. But a 10-point drop in the stock market becomes a tragedy.

Then he says:

> We must say ''we want a just system! A system that enables everyone to get on''. We must say: ''we don't want this globalized economic system which does us so much harm!''

Here we have the leader of the Catholic Church raising profound issues about the state of the economy—certainly not just to the United States but all over the world. I don't want to paraphrase him, but my interpretation of what he is saying is that money cannot be an end in itself. The function of an economic system is not just to let the marketplace reign and end up in a situation where a small number of people have incredible wealth while so many people have virtually nothing.

That is true not just of the United States, but it is even more true around the world. We have a situation right now—incredible as it may sound—where the wealthiest 85 people in the world own more wealth than the bottom half of the world's population. So 85 phenomenally wealthy billionaires are here, and half of the world's population are over here—over 3 billion people. Does anybody in the wildest stretch of their imagination think this is anything close to a just world economic system?

Oxfam recently told us that within the global economy within a year or two, the top 1 percent of the world's wealthiest people will own more wealth than the bottom 99 percent. What religion condones this type of economic disparity? What political party should condone this type of economic disparity?

What the Pope is essentially saying is we need to pay attention to those people who are hurting—not just the homeless, not just the hungry, but those people who are working longer hours for low wages and at exactly the same time when in this country we have seen a proliferation of millionaires and billionaires. Is that what our economy is supposed to be about?

Let me just amplify what the Pope was saying by giving you some cold statistics in terms of what is going on in the United States of America. I am not talking about the global economy. I am not talking about Greece, where unemployment is 25 percent and where their economy has contracted by a quarter in the last 6 years. I am talking about the American economy.

Since 1999 the median middle-class family—that family right in the middle of the American economy—has seen its income go down by almost $5,000 after adjusting for inflation. Incredibly, that family earned less income last year than it did 26 years ago, back in 1989.

Do you want to know why people in America are angry? Whether they are in the Occupy Wall Street movement and consider themselves progressive, whether they are in the tea party movement and consider themselves conservative, the median male worker—that man right in the middle of the American economy—earned $783 less last year than he did 42 years ago. In other words, you have seen an explosion of technological productivity, but the male worker in the middle of the economy—inflation adjusted for dollars—made $783 less last year than he did 42 years ago, while the median female worker—the woman in the middle of the American economy—earned $1,300 less last year than she did in 2007.

All over this country we are seeing men and women working longer hours for lower wages. We are seeing people working not one job but two jobs or three jobs in order to cobble together the income they need and maybe some health care as well. But while the middle class continues to disappear on a 40-year trajectory, the wealthiest people and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well. The gap between the very, very rich and everybody else is growing wider.

This is what the Pope means, I think, when he says this:

> While the income of a minority is increasing exponentially, that of the majority is crumbling. This imbalance results from ideologies which uphold the absolute autonomy of markets and financial speculation, and thus deny the right of control to States, which are themselves charged with providing for the common good.

This is from Pope Francis. So what does he mean when he talks about the income of a minority increasing exponentially while the majority is crumbling? Let me give you some examples. I talked about male wages, female wages, and median family income. Let me talk about what is going on in the top 1 percent.

Today the top 1 percent in America now own about 41 percent of the entire wealth of our country while the bottom 60 percent own less than 2 percent. Let me repeat that. The top 1 percent own over 40 percent of the wealth. The bottom 60 percent own less than 2 percent. Today, incredibly, the top one-tenth of 1 percent now own almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent—one-tenth of 1 percent. So 16,000 families own almost as much wealth as the bottom 300 million people in our country. Today the Walton family—the owners of Walmart and the wealthiest family in America—is now worth $153 billion. That is more wealth in one family than the bottom 40 percent of Americans. Over the past decade, the net worth of the top 400 billionaires in this country has doubled, up to an astronomical $1 trillion in just 10 years.

In terms of income as opposed to wealth, almost all of the new income generated in recent years, since the Wall Street crash, has gone to the top 1 percent. In fact, the last information that we have indicates that over 99 percent of all new income generated in this country goes to the top 1 percent.

The top 25 hedge fund managers on Wall Street made more than $24 billion in 2013, equivalent to the full salaries of more than 425,000 public school teachers. What we are seeing in this country is growing income and wealth inequality. What we are seeing around the world is the same.

What troubles me very much is that in the midst of a disappearing middle class, at a time when we have more people living in poverty today than at almost any time in recent history, I believe my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee will bring forth a budget in the next few years which will move us in exactly the wrong direction. When the rich get richer, their proposal will be let's give more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

When large corporations are enjoying huge profits, and major corporation after major corporation is paying nothing in Federal income tax, their proposal will be let's give more tax breaks to large multinational corporations.

Then after giving tax breaks to the rich and large corporations, they say: Well, we want a balanced budget, and the way we are going to balance the budget is on the backs of a disappearing middle class, on the backs of millions of working families, and on the backs of the poorest and most vulnerable people in this country.

This is the Robin Hood principle in reverse. This is taking from the poor and working people and giving it to the millionaires and billionaires.

I would hope the American people say: Enough is enough. We don't need more tax breaks for the rich and large corporations. We don't need to cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education, nutrition programs for hungry people, and Pell grants so the kids can go to college. That is not what we should be doing. In fact, we should be moving in exactly the other direction.

From 1983 to a few years ago, what we have seen in this country is an incredible transfer of wealth from the bottom 90 percent to the top 1 percent. We are talking about trillions of dollars in wealth going from the bottom 90 percent to the top 1 percent. Most Americans are saying: Enough is enough. We don't need more austerity for the middle class. We don't need to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Maybe it is time for some austerity for the top 1 percent.

I hope when we come together to discuss the budget, Members of the Senate will listen to what Pope Francis has been talking about and give us a budget which works for the most vulnerable people in this country, which works for tens of millions of working families, and does not simply work for large campaign donors.

With that, I yield the floor.

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. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, somebody asked me a little while ago, shouldn't we be voting on the mishmash on Homeland Security that the House of Representatives sent over because of the immigration matters in it.

I reminded them that the Senate in the last Congress voted by a 2-to-1 margin, on a bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill which we sent to the House of Representatives and the Speaker refused to bring the bill up. It probably would have passed.

Had it passed, it would have been signed into law and President Obama would not have issued any Executive orders. There would be no need to. We had everything from border security, which Republicans and Democrats voted for, to minors and the DREAMers, which Republicans and Democrats voted for.

In fact, we had hundreds of hours of hearings and markups. We had around 140 amendments that were brought up, and I would call for one Republican amendment and one Democratic amendment. We went back and forth day after day, night after night. We did 140 or 141 amendments.

All but one of them passed by a bipartisan vote. We then had dozens of amendments on the floor, all of which passed with bipartisan votes. The final bill got 68 votes.

We have done the work on immigration. Let's not play games and endanger the needed funding for the Department of Homeland Security at a time when we face all kinds of dangers in this country. Let's not close down Department of Homeland Security on a made-up mission of doing something for immigration.

We passed an immigration bill. They could take out the draft of that old bill, vote it up, and vote it down. Sixty-eight Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted for it. Let's bring up something similar. Let's have a real debate. Let's have amendments. Let's go to immigration. Then in the meantime, let's pass the Department of Homeland Security bill.

Millions upon millions of taxpayer dollars are being wasted even today as they prepare for a shutdown, not knowing whether these tactics are going to close down the Department, that major part of our government, or not. They have to spend the money. That is money wasted, to say nothing about the job that's not being done.

I refer to my speech about Groundhog Day because we have seen this one.

Our friends across the way in the Capitol closed down the government before.

In just 2 days, unless Congress acts, the doors at the Department of Homeland Security, one of the country's primary national security agencies, will shutter. Unless we act, 30,000 workers will be furloughed without pay. Another 130,000 will be asked to work in defense of our nation's security, without pay.

This is another needless, made-in-Washington crisis. We find ourselves here today because of the House's initial failure to act for more than a year and a half on bipartisan legislation that the Senate passed to help fix our broken immigration system. The House's inaction forced the President to do what he could through the executive authorities available to him. Those actions are welcomed. But they are not permanent, legislative fixes. Now, because Republicans in the House are angry that the President acted where they would not, they are threatening the functions of the very agency that helps protect our borders, our airspace, our waterways, and our communities.

Every State in this country will be affected by a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. In the midst of a fiercely cold winter, when the Northeast has been devastated by life-threatening storms, we put at risk important recovery resources available through FEMA. We put at risk counterterrorism efforts and analysis of critical intelligence, as we continue to mount and improve our national security in the face of unprecedented violent threats from enemies overseas. It is appalling that in the face of reports that terrorists want to target such domestic sites as the Mall of America, some in Congress are playing petty politics with the vital operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

A short-term continuing resolution will not solve this problem. A continuing resolution for the Department of Homeland Security recognizes neither the evolving threats to our Nation's security, nor the continuing stresses on our immigration system. A continuing resolution for the Department will tear immigrant families apart, rather than support keeping them together. A continuing resolution will not support an increase of $400 million for the Department. It will freeze FEMA resources at their current levels.

And let's remember one key fact that I do not hear these reckless voices in Congress acknowledging: The funding bill we should be considering—the Shaheen-Mikulski bill—already is a compromise bill. It is far from perfect. For example, I strongly oppose the new funding for family detention. Incarcerating women and children fleeing violence runs contrary to our long history as a nation that offers refuge to those most in need. Nonetheless I am prepared to support the bill, because it will help State and local communities with disaster recovery, with law enforcement activities, and will support our national security and counterterrorism efforts.

The Shaheen-Mikulski bill is the product of bipartisan negotiations between Republicans and Democrats in both the Senate and the House. But for the President's executive actions in November, it would have been included in the omnibus spending bill that was signed into law last year. Now we are on the brink of a potential shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. This is a fabricated crisis. The solution is simple. The Senate should approve the Shaheen-Mikulski bill, send it to the House, and end this stalemate. The House should promptly consider the bipartisan, comprehensive immigration legislation approved overwhelmingly by the Senate in 2013.

If there is another debate to be had about fixing our immigration system, let's have that debate. But let's stop holding the operations of one of the Nation's key national security agency captive, while asking tens of thousands of hardworking Americans—including more than 2,500 Vermonters—to either work without pay or take an unpaid leave of absence. This is not the way to run a country. Unlike in so many other questions facing our country, the solution to this contrived disaster is easy. Members of Congress just need to have the courage to act.

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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UKRAINE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise once again in support of the people of Ukraine in their struggle against Russian aggression. The most recent diplomatic efforts seem to have only emboldened President Putin.

Since Minsk II, which is the last time they came to an agreement with reference to a ceasefire, there have been hundreds of ceasefire violations and the city of Debaltseve has fallen under rebel control. Putin's forces now threaten Mariupol, which would provide a key land bridge to Crimea, and his intentions are clear.

In my view, we need to urgently increase the cost to Putin with tougher sanctions and by providing more security assistance to the Ukrainian military.

At a press conference on February 9 with Chancellor Merkel, the President said that his team was considering options including the provision of defensive military equipment if the diplomatic effort with respect to Russia has failed.

As recent events have shown, Minsk II is clearly dead, and we need to take a different approach.

At so many points in history, there have been opportunities for the international community to deter rogue actors from violating the sovereignty of other countries. Unless bullies such as Putin are confronted, they will always bully, they will always force a response, and they will always be an even greater problem for their neighbors and the broader international community.

Putin took Crimea, then he took Donetsk, then he took Luhansk, and last week he took Debaltseve. While he has paid a price because of the sanctions regime, that price has not changed his behavior. So now is the time to increase the cost to Putin. Now is the time to increase sanctions on Russia and work with Europe to consider additional sanctions in other sectors of the economy. Now is the time for the President to abide by his words on February 9—to provide badly needed defensive weapons to the Ukrainian Government and to rethink our strategic response to Russia's encroachment in Ukraine and across the former Soviet territories.

The international community simply cannot remain passive in the face of such unbridled aggression that will only invite further aggression. So I call upon the administration to fully implement measures this body authorized when it passed the Ukraine Freedom Support Act, which the President signed into law on December 18.

Last month I wrote to Secretary Kerry in the wake of the bloodiest period since the start of this crisis. I urged the administration to fully implement the authorities provided in the law and to comply with the clear reporting deadlines.

The legislation passed with unanimous consent in both Houses of Congress. It authorizes the President to provide much needed military and humanitarian aid to Ukraine, and it imposes additional sanctions against Russia in this time of crisis. The legislation was necessary in December, and it is even more necessary today.

We know the sanctions implemented by the United States and the European Union have had a tangible effect on the Russian economy. Combined with the decrease in global energy markets, they have put unprecedented pressure on President Putin. But he is undeterred. He continues to provide illegitimate and illegal support to separatists in eastern Ukraine, evidenced by OSCE and NATO reports cataloging the growing number of Russian troops and artillery that remain in the region and as evidenced by the spiking violence by so-called Russian-backed separatists against both military troops and civilians. Russian troops and these so-called Russian-backed rebels have carried out deadly attacks on civilians in eastern Ukraine. They have killed scores—they have killed women, they have killed children. They have ignored Minsk I. They have ignored

Minsk II. And now they have gained control of Debaltseve and have made moves towards Mariupol. This must end. The violence must end and the killing must stop.

We must renew our commitment to the people of Ukraine and stand against Putin's blatant aggression. I appreciate the administration's comprehensive efforts to counter Russian aggression, but I also believe it is not enough. We must act immediately to influence the course of events on the ground and urge the President to fully implement the Ukraine Freedom Support Act. The violence threatening Ukraine's territorial integrity is threatening the region. The international community has an obligation to respond to Putin's clear signals that his intention is to escalate tensions in Ukraine and across the region.

Since Senator CORKER and I, along with other committee members, introduced the Ukraine Freedom Support Act, Putin has escalated his belligerent and aggressive tactics. NATO has deployed more than 400 times last year to intercept Russian military flights near members' European airspace.

In July of 2014, Ukrainian pilot Nadiya Savchenko was captured by Russian forces and is being illegally detained in Russia despite Russia's commitment to Minsk to free her.

In September of last year, Russians abducted the Estonian security service officer Eston Kohver from Estonian territory. He was taken from Estonian territory to Moscow where he has been languishing in prison without due process.

In October, Sweden's military discovered what it believed was a Russian submarine outside of Stockholm. In December, about a dozen Russian aircraft, including bombers, flew into the Baltic Sea region. In January, attacks on civilian buses took the lives of 20 Ukrainians. It is time for the international community to say enough is enough.

Fully implementing the sanctions and assistance in the Ukraine Freedom Support Act will help restore its sovereignty, it will help restore its territorial integrity, and it will help deter Russia from further destabilizing the region.

I urge the President to implement these measures immediately, without delay. That said, I understand there are individuals on the European Union and Canadian targeted sanctions list who do not appear on the American list of sanctions. Now why is this the case?

Perhaps the most egregious example is Alexander Bortnikov, the head of the Russian FSB. Mr. Bortnikov is not on the U.S. lists in relation to either Ukraine or the Magnitsky act, but he is on the European Union and Canadian lists. To make matters worse, Mr. Bortnikov was here in the United States last week for President Obama's CVE conference. To say that I am puzzled would be an understatement.

The fact is there are almost 150 individuals and entities on the Canadian and EU sanctions lists that are not on the U.S. lists. If there is no justifiable reason for excluding these individuals, then they should be added.

Yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Kerry indicated that these lists will be synced, harmonized, in the coming days, and I will keep a close eye on this process. Clearly, for the international effort to be effective, we need to be in lockstep with our Canadian and European allies. When we passed this legislation last December, it coincided with a Wall Street Journal report about the fortune that Russians were spending to lobby Washington against passing that very bill. They claimed the sanctions would affect the West's willingness to invest in Russia, and I say that is exactly what these sanctions should do.

Putin is using his military power to impose his will in Ukraine, but he is also using every economic tool at his disposal, and we must do the same. We must make it clear to Mr. Putin that there will be consequences for his actions.

This is not only obviously important in the context of Ukraine, which it certainly is in the first instance, but it is also about sending a very clear global message that if you violate and upend the international order, there will be consequences for doing so. Because in the absence of real consequences to doing so, there are other actors in the world who are looking at what is happening in Ukraine who will say, well, what did the United States, what did the West do to stop the aggression of Russia? And if the answer is not very much, at the end of the day—certainly not enough to stop that aggression—then other actors in the world who may be more powerful than their neighbors, who may have nuclear weapons in their possession, such as North Korea, will think about what they want to do. And whether that is China in the South China Sea which has had territorial disputes with our allies South Korea and Japan, or whether it is the challenge we have in North Korea of a nuclear armed North Korea, whether it is Maduro in Venezuela oppressing his people—I can go through a list of global actors who will wonder that if, at the end of the day, there isn't much consequence for violating the international order, then I will do what I wish to do because I have the power to do it without consequences. That is an incredibly risky world to live in.

So I urge the President to implement our bill now. The military situation on the ground is clear. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, NATO, the Ukrainian National Security Defense Council, have all reported on the presence of Russian military convoys and troops in eastern Ukraine.

As a matter of fact, I was there last year in the midst of the invasion—and I call it an invasion, because last time I checked, where I come from, if you have Russian troops crossing from Russia into another sovereign country, if you have surface-to-surface missiles, if you have armored vehicles and tanks and all of them are crossing without provocation, then you clearly have an invasion—and that has only mounted. You can take a soldier and take his Russian insignia off and put something else on, but they are still Russian soldiers coming into Ukraine from Russia.

Fear is mounting in Mariupol that pro-Russian rebels with Russian support will conduct further attacks to ease land access to Crimea from Russia. If Russia gets its land access to Crimea, despite all of our talk that we will not forget that Crimea was taken by force illegally in violation of international law, Crimea is gone. If Russia continues down this path, its illegal occupation will be solidified and Putin clearly intends to continue to play his game.

Prior to Minsk II, Oleksandr Zakharchenko, the head of the separatists in Donetsk, said ''there will be no ceasefires'' and that the separatists will not stop their attacks until they have ''reached the borders of the former Donetsk region.''

He has stayed true to his word. There are no more ceasefires. He issued an order to ''take no prisoners,'' claiming that the separatists were no longer interested in prisoner swaps.

So I say to my colleagues, the situation is dire and it is becoming increasingly clear we are not doing enough to change it. We must raise the costs to Putin and his cronies by providing Ukraine with the assistance it needs to defend itself. The world is watching and waiting and the time is now. The Ukraine Freedom Support Act explicitly authorizes the provision of defensive military assistance. Let's provide it.

We have sent over night vision goggles, and I guess those are great to see the enemy, but if they can't stop the enemy, what good is that? What good is that?

Let's provide anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, crew weapons, and ammunition. Let's provide counterartillery radar to identify and target artillery batteries, fire control, range finder, and optical and guidance control equipment. Let's provide tactical troop-operated surveillance drones and secure command and communications equipment.

The administration was required to report to Congress on February 15 regarding its plan for increasing military assistance to the Government of Ukraine. Ten days later, we are still waiting on this report. I urge the President to impose the more stringent sanctions on Russia's defense and energy sectors that we outlined in the law. I urge him to enact further sanctions on Rosoboronexport and other Russian defense firms that we know contribute to the instability in Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, and Syria. These firms outfit pro-Russian rebels and Russian troops who have invaded

eastern Ukraine and established illegitimate republics recognized by no one but President Putin. It is time to enact those sanctions. It is time that we put an end to the chaos and violence these firms spread around the world. It is time to impose additional targeted sanctions on the Russian energy sector to add to existing sanctions that are already costing the Russian economy about $140 billion a year, or about 7 percent of its economy.

By imposing the energy sanctions called for in the act, the administration will tighten restrictions on shale deposits, arctic drilling, and offshore drilling.

The Ukraine Freedom Support Act calls for the administration to impose sanctions on other defense industry targets as well as on special Russian crude oil projects by January 31. We are still waiting to see the administration's response.

On September 18, Petro Poroshenko, the President of Ukraine, addressed a joint session of Congress. We applauded his message of solidarity. Now it is time to move past the applause. Now is the time to stand together in solidarity with the people of Ukraine. President Poroshenko asked for defensive arms, he asked us for aid, and he asked us for tougher sanctions on Russia. We all want a diplomatic solution to this problem, but I believe this can only come about when Putin believes the cost of continuing to ravage Ukraine is simply too high. We have a responsibility to increase that cost.

I ask the President to heed our call and to fully exercise the authority granted by the Ukraine Freedom Support Act and to do it now.

If we do that, not only do we save a key country that is presently bleeding—the eastern part of Ukraine is one of the most productive parts of the country. It is tough to keep providing financial support to it when it cannot openly stabilize itself because of the violence and the economic bleeding that goes on by virtue of the war in the East. This is about a country that is looking westward toward democracy, toward the European Union. We should be helping countries that want to make that decision and have made that decision by themselves be able to achieve their sovereign right to do so. We should be sending a clear international message about not violating the international order, and we should be sending a clear and powerful message that when you do, there are repercussions.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Vice Chairwoman MIKULSKI, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE RULES—114TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of sworn testimony by any subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

III. PROXIES

Except for the reporting of a bill, votes may be cast by proxy when any member so requests.

IV. ATTENDANCE OF STAFF MEMBERS AT CLOSED SESSIONS

Attendance of staff members at closed sessions of the Committee shall be limited to those members of the Committee staff who have a responsibility associated with the matter being considered at such meeting. This rule may be waived by unanimous consent.

V. BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee or any of its subcommittees may permit the photographing and broadcast of open hearings by television and/or radio. However, if any member of a subcommittee objects to the photographing or broadcasting of an open hearing, the question shall be referred to the full Committee for its decision.

VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee's consideration of said bill and report.

VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by Senators at full Committee markups shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markups.

VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriations bill is hereby authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriations bill.

IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, the Select Committee on Intelligence has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Committee rules.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

RULE 1. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

1.1. The regular meeting day of the Select Committee on Intelligence for the transaction of Committee business shall be every other Tuesday of each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

1.2. The Chairman shall have authority, upon notice, to call such additional meetings of the Committee as the Chairman may deem necessary and may delegate such authority to any other member of the Committee.

1.3. A special meeting of the Committee may be called at any time upon the written request of five or more members of the Committee filed with the Clerk of the Committee.

1.4. In the case of any meeting of the Committee, other than a regularly scheduled meeting, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify every member of the Committee of the time and place of the meeting and shall give reasonable notice which, except in extraordinary circumstances, shall be at least 24 hours in advance of any meeting held in Washington, D.C. and at least 48 hours in the case of any meeting held outside Washington, D.C.

1.5. If five members of the Committee have made a request in writing to the Chairman to call a meeting of the Committee, and the Chairman fails to call such a meeting within seven calendar days thereafter, including the day on which the written notice is submitted, these members may call a meeting by filing a written notice with the Clerk of the Committee who shall promptly notify each member of the Committee in writing of the date and time of the meeting.

RULE 2. MEETING PROCEDURES

2.1. Meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except as provided in paragraph 5(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2.2. It shall be the duty of the Staff Director to keep or cause to be kept a record of all Committee proceedings.

2.3. The Chairman of the Committee, or if the Chairman is not present the Vice Chairman, shall preside over all meetings of the Committee. In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman at any meeting, the ranking majority member, or if no majority member is present the ranking minority member present, shall preside.

2.4. Except as otherwise provided in these Rules, decisions of the Committee shall be by a majority vote of the members present and voting. A quorum for the transaction of Committee business, including the conduct of executive sessions, shall consist of no less than one third of the Committee members, except that for the purpose of hearing witnesses, taking sworn testimony, and receiving evidence under oath, a quorum may consist of one Senator.

2.5. A vote by any member of the Committee with respect to any measure or matter being considered by the Committee may be cast by proxy if the proxy authorization (1) is in writing; (2) designates the member of the Committee who is to exercise the proxy; and (3) is limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments pertaining thereto. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

2.6. Whenever the Committee by roll call vote reports any measure or matter, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to such measure or matter by each member of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEES

Creation of subcommittees shall be by majority vote of the Committee. Subcommittees shall deal with such legislation and oversight of programs and policies as the Committee may direct. The subcommittees shall be governed by the Rules of the Committee and by such other rules they may adopt which are consistent with the Rules of the Committee. Each subcommittee created shall have a chairman and a vice chairman who are selected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively.

RULE 4. REPORTING OF MEASURES OR RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. No measures or recommendations shall be reported, favorably or unfavorably, from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present and a majority concur.

4.2. In any case in which the Committee is unable to reach a unanimous decision, separate views or reports may be presented by any member or members of the Committee.

4.3. A member of the Committee who gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final Committee approval of a measure or matter, shall be entitled to not less than three working days in which to file such views, in writing with the Clerk of the Committee. Such views shall then be included in the Committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report.

4.4. Routine, non-legislative actions required of the Committee may be taken in accordance with procedures that have been approved by the Committee pursuant to these Committee Rules.

RULE 5. NOMINATIONS

5.1. Unless otherwise ordered by the Committee, nominations referred to the Committee shall be held for at least 14 days before being voted on by the Committee.

5.2. Each member of the Committee shall be promptly furnished a copy of all nominations referred to the Committee.

5.3. Nominees who are invited to appear before the Committee shall be heard in public session, except as provided in Rule 2.1.

5.4. No confirmation hearing shall be held sooner than seven days after receipt of the background and financial disclosure statement unless the time limit is waived by a majority vote of the Committee.

5.5. The Committee vote on the confirmation shall not be sooner than 48 hours after the Committee has received transcripts of the confirmation hearing unless the time limit is waived by unanimous consent of the Committee.

5.6. No nomination shall be reported to the Senate unless the nominee has filed a background and financial disclosure statement with the Committee.

RULE 6. INVESTIGATIONS

No investigation shall be initiated by the Committee unless at least five members of the Committee have specifically requested the Chairman or the Vice Chairman to authorize such an investigation. Authorized investigations may be conducted by members of the Committee and/or designated Committee staff members.

RULE 7. SUBPOENAS

Subpoenas authorized by the Committee for the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other material may be issued by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, Vice Chairman or member issuing the subpoenas. Each subpoena shall have attached thereto a copy of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, and a copy of these rules.

RULE 8. PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE TAKING OF TESTIMONY

8.1. NOTICE.—Witnesses required to appear before the Committee shall be given reasonable notice and all witnesses shall be furnished a copy of these Rules.

8.2. OATH OR AFFIRMATION.—At the direction of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, testimony of witnesses shall be given under oath or affirmation which may be administered by any member of the Committee.

8.3. INTERROGATION.—Committee interrogation shall be conducted by members of the Committee and such Committee staff as are authorized by the Chairman, Vice Chairman, or the presiding member.

8.4. COUNSEL FOR THE WITNESS.—(a) Any witness may be accompanied by counsel. A witness who is unable to obtain counsel may inform the Committee of such fact. If the witness informs the Committee of this fact at least 24 hours prior to his or her appearance before the Committee, the Committee shall then endeavor to obtain voluntary counsel for the witness. Failure to obtain such counsel will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

(b) Counsel shall conduct themselves in an ethical and professional manner. Failure to do so shall, upon a finding to that effect by a majority of the members present, subject such counsel to disciplinary action which may include warning, censure, removal, or a recommendation of contempt proceedings.

(c) There shall be no direct or cross-examination by counsel. However, counsel may submit any question in writing to the Committee and request the Committee to propound such question to the counsel's client or to any other witness. The counsel also may suggest the presentation of other evidence or the calling of other witnesses. The Committee may use or dispose of such questions or suggestions as it deems appropriate.

8.5. STATEMENTS BY WITNESSES.—Witnesses may make brief and relevant statements at the beginning and conclusion of their testimony. Such statements shall not exceed a reasonable period of time as determined by the Chairman, or other presiding members. Any witness required or desiring to make a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings shall file a paper and electronic copy with the Clerk of the Committee, and insofar as practicable and consistent with the notice given, shall do so at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance before the Committee.

8.6. OBJECTIONS AND RULINGS.—Any objection raised by a witness or counsel shall be ruled upon by the Chairman or other presiding member, and such ruling shall be the ruling of the Committee unless a majority of the Committee present overrules the ruling of the chair.

8.7. INSPECTION AND CORRECTION.—All witnesses testifying before the Committee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to inspect, in the office of the Committee, the transcript of their testimony to determine whether such testimony was correctly transcribed. The witness may be accompanied by counsel. Any corrections the witness desires to make in the transcript shall be submitted in writing to the Committee within five days from the date when the transcript was made available to the witness. Corrections shall be limited to grammar and minor editing, and may not be made to change the substance of the testimony. Any questions arising with respect to such corrections shall be decided by the Chairman. Upon request, the Committee may provide to a witness those parts of testimony given by that witness in executive session which are subsequently quoted or made part of a public record, at the expense of the witness.

8.8. REQUESTS TO TESTIFY.—The Committee will consider requests to testify on any matter or measure pending before the Committee. A person who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing, or any comment made by a Committee member or a member of the Committee staff, may tend to affect adversely that person's reputation, may request to appear personally before the Committee to testify or may file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony, evidence, or comment, or may submit to the Chairman proposed questions in writing for the cross-examination of other witnesses. The Committee shall take such action as it deems appropriate.

8.9. CONTEMPT PROCEDURES.—No recommendation that a person be cited for contempt of Congress or that a subpoena be otherwise enforced shall be forwarded to the Senate unless and until the Committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the recommendation, afforded the person an opportunity to oppose such contempt or subpoena enforcement proceeding either in writing or in person, and agreed by majority vote of the Committee to forward such recommendation to the Senate.

8.10. RELEASE OF NAME OF WITNESS.—Unless authorized by the Chairman, the name of any witness scheduled to be heard by the Committee shall not be released prior to, or after, appearing before the Committee. Upon authorization by the Chairman to release the name of a witness under this paragraph, the Vice Chairman shall be notified of such authorization as soon as practicable thereafter. No name of any witness shall be released if such release would disclose classified information, unless authorized under Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress or Rule 9.7.

RULE 9. PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING CLASSIFIED OR COMMITTEE SENSITIVE MATERIAL

9.1. Committee staff offices shall operate under strict precautions. At least one United States Capitol Police Officer shall be on duty at all times at the entrance of the Committee to control entry. Before entering the

Committee office space all persons shall identify themselves and provide identification as requested.

9.2. Classified documents and material shall be stored in authorized security containers located within the Committee's Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF). Copying, duplicating, or removing from the Committee offices of such documents and other materials is prohibited except as is necessary for the conduct of Committee business, and in conformity with Rule 10.3 hereof. All classified documents or materials removed from the Committee offices for such authorized purposes must be returned to the Committee's SCIF for overnight storage.

9.3. ''Committee sensitive'' means information or material that pertains to the confidential business or proceedings of the Select Committee on Intelligence, within the meaning of paragraph 5 of Rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and is: (1) in the possession or under the control of the Committee; (2) discussed or presented in an executive session of the Committee; (3) the work product of a Committee member or staff member; (4) properly identified or marked by a Committee member or staff member who authored the document; or (5) designated as such by the Chairman and Vice Chairman (or by the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf). Committee sensitive documents and materials that are classified shall be handled in the same manner as classified documents and material in Rule 9.2. Unclassified committee sensitive documents and materials shall be stored in a manner to protect against unauthorized disclosure.

9.4. Each member of the Committee shall at all times have access to all papers and other material received from any source. The Staff Director shall be responsible for the maintenance, under appropriate security procedures, of a document control and accountability registry which will number and identify all classified papers and other classified materials in the possession of the Committee, and such registry shall be available to any member of the Committee.

9.5. Whenever the Select Committee on Intelligence makes classified material available to any other committee of the Senate or to any member of the Senate not a member of the Committee, such material shall be accompanied by a verbal or written notice to the recipients advising of their responsibility to protect such materials pursuant to section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress. The Security Director of the Committee shall ensure that such notice is provided and shall maintain a written record identifying the particular information transmitted and the committee or members of the Senate receiving such information.

9.6. Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to those Committee staff members with appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know, as determined by the Committee, and, under the Committee's direction, the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director.

9.7. No member of the Committee or of the Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part or by way of summary, the contents of any classified or committee sensitive papers, materials, briefings, testimony, or other information in the possession of the Committee to any other person, except as specified in this rule. Committee members and staff do not need prior approval to disclose classified or committee sensitive information to persons in the Executive branch, the members and staff of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the members and staff of the Senate, provided that the following conditions are met: (1) for classified information, the recipients of the information must possess appropriate security clearances (or have access to the information by virtue of their office); (2) for all information, the recipients of the information must have a need-to-know such information for an official governmental purpose; and (3) for all information, the Committee members and staff who provide the information must be engaged in the routine performance of Committee legislative or oversight duties. Otherwise, classified and committee sensitive information may only be disclosed to persons outside the Committee (to include any congressional committee, Member of Congress, congressional staff, or specified non-governmental persons who support intelligence activities) with the prior approval of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, or the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf, consistent with the requirements that classified information may only be disclosed to persons with appropriate security clearances and a need-to-know such information for an official governmental purpose. Public disclosure of classified information in the possession of the Committee may only be authorized in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress.

9.8. Failure to abide by Rule 9.7 shall constitute grounds for referral to the Select Committee on Ethics pursuant to Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress. Prior to a referral to the Select Committee on Ethics pursuant to Section 8 of S. Res. 400, the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader.

9.9. Before the Committee makes any decision regarding the disposition of any testimony, papers, or other materials presented to it, the Committee members shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine all pertinent testimony, papers, and other materials that have been obtained by the members of the Committee or the Committee staff.

9.10. Attendance of persons outside the Committee at closed meetings of the Committee shall be kept at a minimum and shall be limited to persons with appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know the information under consideration for the execution of their official duties. The Security Director of the Committee may require that notes taken at such meetings by any person in attendance shall be returned to the secure storage area in the Committee's offices at the conclusion of such meetings, and may be made available to the department, agency, office, committee, or entity concerned only in accordance with the security procedures of the Committee.

RULE 10. STAFF

10.1. For purposes of these rules, Committee staff includes employees of the Committee, consultants to the Committee, or any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for or at the request of the Committee. To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall rely on its full-time employees to perform all staff functions. No individual may be retained as staff of the Committee or to perform services for the Committee unless that individual holds appropriate security clearances.

10.2. The appointment of Committee staff shall be approved by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, acting jointly, or, at the initiative of both or either be confirmed by a majority vote of the Committee. After approval or confirmation, the Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments to the Financial Clerk of the Senate in writing. No Committee staff shall be given access to any classified information or regular access to the Committee offices until such Committee staff has received an appropriate security clearance as described in Section 6 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress.

10.3. The Committee staff works for the Committee as a whole, under the supervision of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee. The duties of the Committee staff shall be performed, and Committee staff personnel affairs and day-to-day operations, including security and control of classified documents and material, shall be administered under the direct supervision and control of the Staff Director. All Committee staff shall work exclusively on intelligence oversight issues for the Committee. The Minority Staff Director and the Minority Counsel shall be kept fully informed regarding all matters and shall have access to all material in the files of the Committee.

10.4. The Committee staff shall assist the minority as fully as the majority in the expression of minority views, including assistance in the preparation and filing of additional, separate, and minority views, to the end that all points of view may be fully considered by the Committee and the Senate.

10.5. The members of the Committee staff shall not discuss either the substance or procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, either during their tenure as a member of the Committee staff or at any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of these rules, or in the event of the termination of the Committee, in such a manner as may be determined by the Senate. The Chairman may authorize the Staff Director and the Staff Director's designee, and the Vice Chairman may authorize the Minority Staff Director and the Minority Staff Director's designee, to communicate with the media in a manner that does not divulge classified or committee sensitive information.

10.6. No member of the Committee staff shall be employed by the Committee unless and until such a member of the Committee staff agrees in writing, as a condition of employment, to abide by the conditions of the nondisclosure agreement promulgated by the Select Committee on Intelligence, pursuant to Section 6 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, and to abide by the Committee's code of conduct.

10.7. As a precondition for employment on the Committee staff, each member of the Committee staff must agree in writing to notify the Committee of any request for testimony, either during service as a member of the Committee staff or at any time thereafter with respect to information obtained by virtue of employment as a member of the Committee staff. Such information shall not be disclosed in response to such requests except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of these rules or, in the event of the termination of the Committee, in such manner as may be determined by the Senate.

10.8. The Committee shall immediately consider action to be taken in the case of any member of the Committee staff who fails to conform to any of these Rules. Such disciplinary action may include, but shall not be limited to, immediate dismissal from the Committee staff.

10.9. Within the Committee staff shall be an element with the capability to perform audits of programs and activities undertaken by departments and agencies with intelligence functions. The audit element shall conduct audits and oversight projects that have been specifically authorized by the

Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, acting jointly through the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director. Staff shall be assigned to such element jointly by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, and staff with the principal responsibility for the conduct of an audit shall be qualified by training or experience in accordance with accepted auditing standards.

10.10. The workplace of the Committee shall be free from illegal use, possession, sale, or distribution of controlled substances by its employees. Any violation of such policy by any member of the Committee staff shall be grounds for termination of employment. Further, any illegal use of controlled substances by a member of the Committee staff, within the workplace or otherwise, shall result in reconsideration of the security clearance of any such staff member and may constitute grounds for termination of employment with the Committee.

10.11. All personnel actions affecting the staff of the Committee shall be made free from any discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, or disability.

RULE 11. PREPARATION FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

11.1. Under direction of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman designated Committee staff members shall brief members of the Committee at a time sufficiently prior to any Committee meeting to assist the Committee members in preparation for such meeting and to determine any matter which the Committee member might wish considered during the meeting. Such briefing shall, at the request of a member, include a list of all pertinent papers and other materials that have been obtained by the Committee that bear on matters to be considered at the meeting.

11.2. The Staff Director and/or Minority Staff Director shall recommend to the Chairman and the Vice Chairman the testimony, papers, and other materials to be presented to the Committee at any meeting. The determination whether such testimony, papers, and other materials shall be presented in open or executive session shall be made pursuant to the Rules of the Senate and Rules of the Committee.

11.3. The Staff Director shall ensure that covert action programs of the U.S. Government receive appropriate consideration by the Committee no less frequently than once a quarter.

RULE 12. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

12.1. The Clerk of the Committee shall maintain a printed calendar for the information of each Committee member showing the measures introduced and referred to the Committee and the status of such measures; nominations referred to the Committee and their status; and such other matters as the Committee determines shall be included. The Calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes. A copy of each such revision shall be furnished to each member of the Committee.

12.2. Measures referred to the Committee may be referred by the Chairman and/or Vice Chairman to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

RULE 13. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

13.1. No member of the Committee or Committee Staff shall travel abroad on Committee business unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and Vice Chairman. Requests for authorization of such travel shall state the purpose and extent of the trip. A full report shall be filed with the Committee when travel is completed.

13.2. No member of the Committee staff shall travel within this country on Committee business unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

RULE 14. CHANGES IN RULES

These Rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Committee, provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been given to each member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken.

APPENDIX A

S. Res. 400, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. (1976)[1]

Resolved, That it is the purpose of this resolution to establish a new select committee of the Senate, to be known as the Select Committee on Intelligence, to oversee and make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and programs of the United States Government, and to submit to the Senate appropriate proposals for legislation and report to the Senate concerning such intelligence activities and programs. In carrying out this purpose, the Select Committee on Intelligence shall make every effort to assure that the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States provide informed and timely intelligence necessary for the executive and legislative branches to make sound decisions affecting the security and vital interests of the Nation. It is further the purpose of this resolution to provide vigilant legislative oversight over the intelligence activities of the United States to assure that such activities are in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a)(1) There is hereby established a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Intelligence (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the ''select committee''). The select committee shall be composed of not to exceed fifteen Members appointed as follows:

(A) two members from the Committee on Appropriations;

(B) two members from the Committee on Armed Services;

(C) two members from the Committee on Foreign Relations;

(D) two members from the Committee on the Judiciary; and

(E) not to exceed seven members to be appointed from the Senate at large.

(2) Members appointed from each committee named in clauses (A) through (D) of paragraph (1) shall be evenly divided between the two major political parties and shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate upon the recommendations of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate. Of any members appointed under paragraph (1)(E), the majority leader shall appoint the majority members and the minority leader shall appoint the minority members, with the majority having a one vote margin.

(3)(A) The majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate shall be ex officio members of the select committee but shall have no vote in the Committee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(B) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services (if not already a member of the select Committee) shall be ex officio members of the select Committee but shall have no vote in the Committee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(b) At the beginning of each Congress, the Majority Leader of the Senate shall select a chairman of the select Committee and the Minority Leader shall select a vice chairman for the select Committee. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. Neither the chairman nor the vice chairman of the select committee shall at the same time serve as chairman or ranking minority member of any other committee referred to in paragraph 4(e)(1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(c) The select Committee may be organized into subcommittees. Each subcommittee shall have a chairman and a vice chairman who are selected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the select Committee, respectively.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be referred to the select committee all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) Intelligence activities of all other departments and agencies of the Government, including, but not limited to, the intelligence activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and other agencies of the Department of Defense; the Department of State; the Department of Justice; and the Department of the Treasury.

(4) The organization or reorganization of any department or agency of the Government to the extent that the organization or reorganization relates to a function or activity involving intelligence activities.

(5) Authorizations for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for the following:

(A) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(B) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(C) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(D) The National Security Agency.

(E) The intelligence activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

(F) The intelligence activities of the Department of State.

(G) The intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(H) Any department, agency, or subdivision which is the successor to any agency named in clause (A), (B), (C) or (D); and the activities of any department, agency, or subdivision which is the successor to any department, agency, bureau, or subdivision named in clause (E), (F), or (G) to the extent that the activities of such successor department, agency, or subdivision are activities described in clause (E), (F), or (G).

(b)(1) Any proposed legislation reported by the select Committee except any legislation involving matters specified in clause (1), (2), (5)(A), or (5)(B) of subsection (a), containing any matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall, at the request of the chairman of such standing committee, be referred to such standing committee for its consideration of such matter and be reported to the Senate by such standing committee within 10 days after the day on which such proposed legislation, in its entirety and including annexes, is referred to such standing committee; and any proposed legislation reported by any committee, other than the select Committee, which contains any matter within the jurisdiction of the select Committee shall, at the request of the chairman of the select Committee, be referred to the select Committee for its consideration of such matter and be reported to the Senate by the select Committee within 10 days after the day on which such proposed legislation, in its entirety and including annexes, is referred to such committee.

(2) In any case in which a committee fails to report any proposed legislation referred to it within the time limit prescribed in this

subsection, such Committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of such proposed legislation on the 10th day following the day on which such proposed legislation is referred to such committee unless the Senate provides otherwise, or the Majority Leader or Minority Leader request, prior to that date, an additional 5 days on behalf of the Committee to which the proposed legislation was sequentially referred. At the end of that additional 5 day period, if the Committee fails to report the proposed legislation within that 5 day period, the Committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of such proposed legislation unless the Senate provides otherwise.

(3) In computing any 10 or 5 day period under this subsection there shall be excluded from such computation any days on which the Senate is not in session.

(4) The reporting and referral processes outlined in this subsection shall be conducted in strict accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate. In accordance with such rules, committees to which legislation is referred are not permitted to make changes or alterations to the text of the referred bill and its annexes, but may propose changes or alterations to the same in the form of amendments.

(c) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as prohibiting or otherwise restricting the authority of any other committee to study and review any intelligence activity to the extent that such activity directly affects a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee.

(d) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as amending, limiting, or otherwise changing the authority of any standing committee of the Senate to obtain full and prompt access to the product of the intelligence activities of any department or agency of the Government relevant to a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 4. (a) The select committee, for the purposes of accountability to the Senate, shall make regular and periodic, but not less than quarterly, reports to the Senate on the nature and extent of the intelligence activities of the various departments and agencies of the United States. Such committee shall promptly call to the attention of the Senate or to any other appropriate committee or committees of the Senate any matters requiring the attention of the Senate or such other committee or committees. In making such report, the select committee shall proceed in a manner consistent with section 8(c)(2) to protect national security.

(b) The select committee shall obtain an annual report from the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such reports shall review the intelligence activities of the agency or department concerned and the intelligence activities of foreign countries directed at the United States or its interest. An unclassified version of each report may be made available to the public at the discretion of the select committee. Nothing herein shall be construed as requiring the public disclosure in such reports of the names of individuals engaged in intelligence activities for the United States or the divulging of intelligence methods employed or the sources of information on which such reports are based or the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for intelligence activities.

(c) On or before March 15 of each year, the select committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate the views and estimates described in section 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the select committee.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized in its discretion (1) to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, (2) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (3) to employ personnel, (4) to hold hearings, (5) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (6) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (7) to take depositions and other testimony, (8) to procure the service of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and (9) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) The chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(c) Subpoenas authorized by the select committee may be issued over the signature of the chairman, the vice chairman or any member of the select committee designated by the chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or any member signing the subpoenas.

SEC. 6. No employee of the select committee or any person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for or at the request of such committee shall be given access to any classified information by such committee unless such employee or person has (1) agreed in writing and under oath to be bound by the rules of the Senate (including the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Ethics) and of such committee as to the security of such information during and after the period of his employment or contractual agreement with such committee; and (2) received an appropriate security clearance as determined by such committee in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence. The type of security clearance to be required in the case of any such employee or person shall, within the determination of such committee in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, be commensurate with the sensitivity of the classified information to which such employee or person will be given access by such committee.

SEC. 7. The select committee shall formulate and carry out such rules and procedures as it deems necessary to prevent the disclosure, without the consent of the person or persons concerned, of information in the possession of such committee which unduly infringes upon the privacy or which violates the constitutional rights of such person or persons. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent such committee from publicly disclosing any such information in any case in which such committee determines the national interest in the disclosure of such information clearly outweighs any infringement on the privacy of any person or persons.

SEC. 8. (a) The select committee may, subject to the provisions of this section, disclose publicly any information in the possession of such committee after a determination by such committee that the public interest would be served by such disclosure. Whenever committee action is required to disclose any information under this section, the committee shall meet to vote on the matter within five days after any member of the committee requests such a vote. No member of the select committee shall disclose any information, the disclosure of which requires a committee vote, prior to a vote by the committee on the question of the disclosure of such information or after such vote except in accordance with this section.

(b)(1) In any case in which the select committee votes to disclose publicly any information which has been classified under established security procedures, which has been submitted to it by the Executive branch, and which the Executive branch requests be kept secret, such committee shall—

(A) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such vote; and

(B) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

(2) The select committee may disclose publicly such information after the expiration of a five-day period following the day on which notice of such vote is transmitted to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader and the President, unless, prior to the expiration of such five-day period, the President, personally in writing, notifies the committee that he objects to the disclosure of such information, provides his reasons therefore, and certifies that the threat to the national interest of the United States posed by such disclosure is of such gravity that it outweighs any public interest in the disclosure.

(3) If the President, personally, in writing, notifies the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate and the select Committee of his objections to the disclosure of such information as provided in paragraph (2), the Majority Leader and Minority Leader jointly or the select Committee, by majority vote, may refer the question of the disclosure of such information to the Senate for consideration.

(4) Whenever the select committee votes to refer the question of disclosure of any information to the Senate under paragraph (3), the Chairman shall not later than the first day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which the vote occurs, report the matter to the Senate for its consideration.

(5) One hour after the Senate convenes on the fourth day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which any such matter is reported to the Senate, or at such earlier time as the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate jointly agree upon in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senate shall go into closed session and the matter shall be the pending business. In considering the matter in closed session the Senate may—

(A) approve the public disclosure of all or any portion of the information in question, in which case the committee shall publicly disclose the information ordered to be disclosed,

(B) disapprove the public disclosure of all or any portion of the information in question, in which case the committee shall not publicly disclose the information ordered not to be disclosed, or

(C) refer all or any portion of the matter back to the committee, in which case the committee shall make the final determination with respect to the public disclosure of the information in question.

Upon conclusion of the consideration of such matter in closed session, which may not extend beyond the close of the ninth day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which such matter was reported to the Senate, or the close of the fifth day following the day agreed upon jointly by the majority and minority leaders in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (whichever the case

may be), the Senate shall immediately vote on the disposition of such matter in open session, without debate, and without divulging the information with respect to which the vote is being taken. The Senate shall vote to dispose of such matter by one or more of the means specified in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the second sentence of this paragraph. Any vote of the Senate to disclose any information pursuant to this paragraph shall be subject to the right of a Member of the Senate to move for reconsideration of the vote within the time and pursuant to the procedures specified in rule XIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the disclosure of such information shall be made consistent with that right.

(c)(1) No information in the possession of the select committee relating to the lawful intelligence activities of any department or agency of the United States which has been classified under established security procedures and which the select committee, pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of this section, has determined should not be disclosed shall be made available to any person by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate except in a closed session of the Senate or as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) The select committee may, under such regulations as the committee shall prescribe to protect the confidentiality of such information, make any information described in paragraph (1) available to any other committee or any other Member of the Senate. Whenever the select committee makes such information available, the committee shall keep a written record showing, in the case of any particular information, which committee or which Members of the Senate received such information. No Member of the Senate who, and no committee which, receives any information under this subsection, shall disclose such information except in a closed session of the Senate.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee on Ethics to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information by a Member, officer or employee of the Senate in violation of subsection (c) and to report to the Senate concerning any allegation which it finds to be substantiated.

(e) Upon the request of any person who is subject to any such investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics shall release to such individual at the conclusion of its investigation a summary of its investigation together with its findings. If, at the conclusion of its investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics determines that there has been a significant breach of confidentiality or unauthorized disclosure by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate, it shall report its findings to the Senate and recommend appropriate action such as censure, removal from committee membership, or expulsion from the Senate, in the case of a Member, or removal from office or employment or punishment for contempt, in the case of an officer or employee.

SEC. 9. The select committee is authorized to permit any personal representative of the President, designated by the President to serve as a liaison to such committee, to attend any closed meeting of such committee.

SEC. 10. Upon expiration of the Select Committee on Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, established by Senate Resolution 21, Ninety-fourth Congress, all records, files, documents, and other materials in the possession, custody, or control of such committee, under appropriate conditions established by it, shall be transferred to the select committee.

SEC. 11. (a) It is the sense of the Senate that the head of each department and agency of the United States should keep the select committee fully and currently informed with respect to intelligence activities, including any significant anticipated activities, which are the responsibility of or engaged in by such department or agency: *Provided*, That this does not constitute a condition precedent to the implementation of any such anticipated intelligence activity.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the head of any department or agency of the United States involved in any intelligence activities should furnish any information or document in the possession, custody, or control of the department or agency, or person paid by such department or agency, whenever requested by the select committee with respect to any matter within such committee's jurisdiction.

(c) It is the sense of the Senate that each department and agency of the United States should report immediately upon discovery to the select committee any and all intelligence activities which constitute violations of the constitutional rights of any person, violations of law, or violations of Executive orders, Presidential directives, or departmental or agency rules or regulations; each department and agency should further report to such committee what actions have been taken or are expected to be taken by the departments or agencies with respect to such violations.

SEC. 12. Subject to the Standing Rules of the Senate, no funds shall be appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1976, with the exception of a continuing bill or resolution, or amendment thereto, or conference report thereon, to, or for use of, any department or agency of the United States to carry out any of the following activities, unless such funds shall have been previously authorized by a bill or joint resolution passed by the Senate during the same or preceding fiscal year to carry out such activity for such fiscal year:

(1) The activities of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

(4) The activities of the National Security Agency.

(5) The intelligence activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

(6) The intelligence activities of the Department of State.

(7) The intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 13. (a) The select committee shall make a study with respect to the following matters, taking into consideration with respect to each such matter, all relevant aspects of the effectiveness of planning, gathering, use, security, and dissemination of intelligence:

(1) the quality of the analytical capabilities of United States foreign intelligence agencies and means for integrating more closely analytical intelligence and policy formulation;

(2) the extent and nature of the authority of the departments and agencies of the Executive branch to engage in intelligence activities and the desirability of developing charters for each intelligence agency or department;

(3) the organization of intelligence activities in the Executive branch to maximize the effectiveness of the conduct, oversight, and accountability of intelligence activities; to reduce duplication or overlap; and to improve the morale of the personnel of the foreign intelligence agencies;

(4) the conduct of covert and clandestine activities and the procedures by which Congress is informed of such activities;

(5) the desirability of changing any law, Senate rule or procedure, or any Executive order, rule, or regulation to improve the protection of intelligence secrets and provide for disclosure of information for which there is no compelling reason for secrecy;

(6) the desirability of establishing a standing committee of the Senate on intelligence activities;

(7) the desirability of establishing a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives on intelligence activities in lieu of having separate committees in each House of Congress, or of establishing procedures under which separate committees on intelligence activities of the two Houses of Congress would receive joint briefings from the intelligence agencies and coordinate their policies with respect to the safeguarding of sensitive intelligence information;

(8) the authorization of funds for the intelligence activities of the Government and whether disclosure of any of the amounts of such funds is in the public interest; and

(9) the development of a uniform set of definitions for terms to be used in policies or guidelines which may be adopted by the executive or legislative branches to govern, clarify, and strengthen the operation of intelligence activities.

(b) The select committee may, in its discretion, omit from the special study required by this section any matter it determines has been adequately studied by the Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, established by Senate Resolution 21, Ninety-fourth Congress.

(c) The select committee shall report the results of the study provided for by this section to the Senate, together with any recommendations for legislative or other actions it deems appropriate, no later than July 1, 1977, and from time to time thereafter as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 14. (a) As used in this resolution, the term ''intelligence activities'' includes (1) the collection, analysis, production, dissemination, or use of information which relates to any foreign country, or any government, political group, party, military force, movement, or other association in such foreign country, and which relates to the defense, foreign policy, national security, or related policies of the United States, and other activity which is in support of such activities; (2) activities taken to counter similar activities directed against the United States; (3) covert or clandestine activities affecting the relations of the United States with any foreign government, political group, party, military force, movement or other association; (4) the collection, analysis, production, dissemination, or use of information about activities of persons within the United States, its territories and possessions, or nationals of the United States abroad whose political and related activities pose, or may be considered by any department, agency, bureau, office, division, instrumentality, or employee of the United States to pose, a threat to the internal security of the United States, and covert or clandestine activities directed against such persons. Such term does not include tactical foreign military intelligence serving no national policymaking function.

(b) As used in this resolution, the term ''department or agency'' includes any organization, committee, council, establishment, or office within the Federal Government.

(c) For purposes of this resolution, reference to any department, agency, bureau, or subdivision shall include a reference to any successor department, agency, bureau, or subdivision to the extent that such successor engages in intelligence activities now

conducted by the department, agency, bureau, or subdivision referred to in this resolution.

SEC. 15. (a) In addition to other committee staff selected by the select Committee, the select Committee shall hire or appoint one employee for each member of the select Committee to serve as such Member's designated representative on the select Committee. The select Committee shall only hire or appoint an employee chosen by the respective Member of the select Committee for whom the employee will serve as the designated representative on the select Committee.

(b) The select Committee shall be afforded a supplement to its budget, to be determined by the Committee on Rules and Administration, to allow for the hire of each employee who fills the position of designated representative to the select Committee. The designated representative shall have office space and appropriate office equipment in the select Committee spaces. Designated personal representatives shall have the same access to Committee staff, information, records, and databases as select Committee staff, as determined by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

(c) The designated employee shall meet all the requirements of relevant statutes, Senate rules, and committee security clearance requirements for employment by the select Committee.

(d) Of the funds made available to the select Committee for personnel—

(1) not more than 60 percent shall be under the control of the Chairman; and

(2) not less than 40 percent shall be under the control of the Vice Chairman.

SEC. 16. Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as constituting acquiescence by the Senate in any practice, or in the conduct of any activity, not otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 17. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the Select Committee shall have jurisdiction to review, hold hearings, and report the nominations of civilian individuals for positions in the intelligence community for which appointments are made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(2) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), other committees with jurisdiction over the department or agency of the Executive Branch which contain a position referred to in paragraph (1) may hold hearings and interviews with individuals nominated for such position, but only the Select Committee shall report such nomination.

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'intelligence community' means an element of the intelligence community specified in or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

''(b)(1) With respect to the confirmation of the Assistant Attorney General for National Security, or any successor position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and, if and when reported, to the Select Committee for not to exceed 20 calendar days, except that in cases when the 20-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Select Committee shall have 5 additional calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(2) If, upon the expiration of the period described in paragraph (1), the Select Committee has not reported the nomination, such nomination shall be automatically discharged from the Select Committee and placed on the Executive Calendar.

''(c)(1) With respect to the confirmation of appointment to the position of Director of the National Security Agency, Inspector General of the National Security Agency, Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, or Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office, or any successor position to such a position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position, who at the time of the nomination is a member of the Armed Forces on active duty, shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and, if and when reported, to the Select Committee for not to exceed 30 calendar days, except that in cases when the 30-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Select Committee shall have 5 additional calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(2) With respect to the confirmation of appointment to the position of Director of the National Security Agency, Inspector General of the National Security Agency, Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, or Inspector General or the National Reconnaissance Office, or any successor position to such a position, the nomination of any individual by the President to serve in such position, who at the time of the nomination is not a member of the Armed Forces on active duty, shall be referred to the Select Committee and, if and when reported, to the Committee on Armed Services for not to exceed 30 calendar days, except that in cases when the 30-day period expires while the Senate is in recess, the Committee on Armed Services shall have an additional 5 calendar days after the Senate reconvenes to report the nomination.

''(3) If, upon the expiration of the period of sequential referral described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the committee to which the nomination was sequentially referred has not reported the nomination, the nomination shall be automatically discharged from that committee and placed on the Executive Calendar.''.

APPENDIX B

INTELLIGENCE PROVISIONS IN S. RES. 445, 108TH CONG., 2D SESS. (2004) WHICH WERE NOT INCORPORATED IN S. RES. 400, 94TH CONG., 2D SESS. (1976)

TITLE III—COMMITTEE STATUS

* * * *

SEC. 301(b) INTELLIGENCE.—The Select Committee on Intelligence shall be treated as a committee listed under paragraph 2 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate for purposes of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

TITLE IV—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUBCOMMITTEES

SEC. 401. SUBCOMMITTEE RELATED TO INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Select Committee on Intelligence a Subcommittee on Oversight which shall be in addition to any other subcommittee established by the select Committee.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Subcommittee on Oversight shall be responsible for ongoing oversight of intelligence activities.

SEC. 402. SUBCOMMITTEE RELATED TO INTELLIGENCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Committee on Appropriations a Subcommittee on Intelligence. The Committee on Appropriations shall reorganize into 13 subcommittees as soon as possible after the convening of the 109th Congress.

(b) JURISDICTION.—The Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Committee on Appropriations shall have jurisdiction over funding for intelligence matters, as determined by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

APPENDIX C

RULE 26.5(b) OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE (REFERRED TO IN COMMITTEE RULE 2.1)

Each meeting of a committee, or any subcommittee thereof, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by a committee or a subcommittee thereof on the same subject for a period of no more than fourteen calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

ENDNOTES

[1] As amended by S. Res. 4, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. (1977), S. Res. 445, 108th Cong., 2d Sess. (2004), Pub. L. No. 109–177, §506, 120 Stat. 247 (2005), and S. Res. 50, 110th Cong., 1st Sess. (2007), S. Res. 470, 113th Cong., 2d Sess. (2014).

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF VFW POST 1322

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor the oldest Veterans of Foreign War post in Arkansas. VFW Post No. 1322 in Van Buren, AR is celebrating its 90th anniversary.

Founded February 13, 1925, the post was named in honor of Robert W. Jack—the first casualty of World War I from Crawford County. Robert Jack was 23-years-old when he was killed by shrapnel on September 22, 1918, in the fourth day of the famous allied drive of St. Mihiel.

As a member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I understand the importance of acknowledging the bravery and valor of the young men and women who fought in defense of our country. Men like Robert Jack, and members of VFW Post 1322, set their personal lives aside to fight for our country. This post recognizes their service, sacrifice and courage.

Members are dedicated to improving the community and the lives of its members; offering scholarships to students, teaching flag etiquette to classes, providing local transportation for veterans and hosting community events.

As the Robert Jack VFW Post 1322 proudly celebrates its 90th anniversary, the building is also celebrating the 65th anniversary of its groundbreaking. In recent years, the building was in desperate need of maintenance. Members banded together and worked with local organizations and businesses to provide funds for extensive repairs. This is a true testament to the importance of Post 1322 in the community.

I congratulate VFW Post 1322 on its 90th anniversary. I wish members the best of luck and many more years of camaraderie, service and investment in the community.●

REMEMBERING JAMES KOLLER

● Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to remember Mr. James Koller, a devoted father, husband and Pennsylvania leader. Jim passed away on February 3, 2015, after a 6-year battle with ALS.

Jim's life was defined by his many passions. A successful lawyer and businessman, he was also deeply engaged with his community. A graduate of Marquette University and the Dickinson School of Law, he practiced real estate law in Philadelphia before cofounding Vesterra Corporation, a commercial real estate development company through which Jim built many strong community relationships. Alongside his professional success, Jim maintained an active role in his church and enjoyed an active lifestyle.

Jim's diagnosis with ALS 6 years ago did not slow him down; rather, it pushed him to do even more to combat the disease. Along with his family and friends, he started Team Koller, a fundraising group that participated in local ALS awareness events and raised tens of thousands of dollars for research and treatment. Even at the most difficult times, Jim stayed focused on solutions, seeking answers and help for those afflicted by ALS.

Although we mourn Jim's passing, his selfless and passionate efforts give me hope that we may soon find a cure for this menacing disease. May we continue to live and fight as James Koller did, with courage and fortitude. My thoughts and prayers are with Jim's wife Marianne, his sons, James and Kevin, and the rest of his family in this difficult time.●

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.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS, AS AMENDED—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency declared on March 1, 1996, with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, as amended and expanded on February 26, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2015.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 2015.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 212. An act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes.

H.R. 734. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 734. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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–675. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0171); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–676. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0173); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–677. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) program for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–678. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015–0011 - 2015–0017); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–679. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Domestic Source Restrictions on Certain Naval Vessel Components'' ((RIN0750–AI36) (DFARS Case 2014–D022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–680. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Deletion of Obsolete Text Relating to Acquisition of Commercial Items'' ((RIN0750–AI50) (DFARS Case 2014–D002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–681. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Raymond P. Palumbo, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–682. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Libya declared in Executive Order

13566; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–683. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (RIN0648–XD728) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–684. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Longview, Texas)'' ((MB Docket No. 14–245) (DA 15–150)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–685. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–686. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–687. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Insular Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled ''Report to the Congress: 2014 Compact Analysis'' and ''Impact of the Compacts of Free Association on Guam: Fiscal Year 2004 through Fiscal Year 2013'' ; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–688. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the North Slope Science Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–689. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of proposed legislation entitled ''Bureau of Land Management Foundation Act''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–690. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on the Use of Mandatory Recall Authority Submitted Pursuant to Section 206 of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, Public Law 111–353''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–691. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Implementation of Section 3507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010: Final Report''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–692. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Performance Report of the Food and Drug Administration's Office of Combination Products for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–693. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Children and Families (Family Support), Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–694. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2013 Report to Congress: Older Americans Act''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–695. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Generic Issues Program'' (Management Directive 6.4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–696. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Documentation Related to Goods Imported from U.S. Insular Possessions'' (RIN1515–AD97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–697. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Administration, Cost and Impact of the Quality Improvement Organization (QIO) Program for Medicare Beneficiaries for Fiscal Year 2011''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–698. A communication from the Director, Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Report for calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–699. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Impact of Recruitment Strategy on Fair and Open Competition for Federal Jobs''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–700. A communication from the Director of Public Affairs, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Service's fiscal year 2014 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–701. A communication from the Director, Office of Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's 2012 list of Government activities determined to be inherently governmental and those to be not inherently governmental in nature; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–702. A communication from the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of three recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 61st Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–703. A communication from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's commercial and inherently governmental activities for 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–704. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The District of Columbia Board of Elections Election Day Preparation and Administration Can Be Improved''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–705. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''ANC 8E Did Not Properly Support all Reported Expenditures''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–706. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Automobile or Other Conveyance and Adaptive Equipment Certificate of Eligibility for Veterans or Members of the Armed Forces with Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis'' (RIN2900–AP26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–707. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supportive Services for Veterans Families Program'' (RIN2900–AO50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–5. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Clarksville, Tennessee expressing support for the maintenance of current troop levels at Fort Campbell and urging Congress to oppose any reductions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM–6. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota, expressing strong support for the Executive Order issued on November 20, 2014, by the President of the United States, on the issue of immigration and immediate protections for long-term, law-abiding residents who are parents of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COATS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 555. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards for information on the kidnapping and murder of James Foley, Peter Kassig, Steven Sotloff, Kayla Mueller, or any other United States citizen by a foreign terrorist organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 556. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 557. A bill to promote Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 558. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 559. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 560. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for an exception from infringement for certain component parts of motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 561. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date on which the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 562. A bill to promote exploration for geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 563. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing shortages and long appointment waiting times; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 564. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include licensed hearing aid specialists as eligible for appointment in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 565. A bill to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 566. A bill to reauthorize the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 567. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 568. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 569. A bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 570. A bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. KING):

S. 571. A bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 572. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 573. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 575. A bill to continue operation of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps, a Cyber Crimes Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit, a Computer Forensics Unit, and a Cyber Crimes Unit to support the mission of the Homeland Security Investigations directorate of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement to combat the exploitation of children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 85. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Georgia Jones-Ayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 86. A resolution recognizing March 3, 2015, as the centennial of the Navy Reserve; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COATS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. Res. 87. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater co-operation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 117, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 144

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 144, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or making financial support conditioned upon a State, local educational agency, or school's adoption of specific instructional content,

academic standards, or curriculum, or on the administration of assessments or tests, and for other purposes.

S. 148

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to create a limited population pathway for approval of certain antibacterial drugs.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of major revenue legislation.

S. 223

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program on awarding grants for provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 239

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes.

S. 246

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 246, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 262, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 269, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, 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.

S. 284

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 284, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 289

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 289, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 318

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 318, a bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 371

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 371, a bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, supra.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property.

S. 399

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 399, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 421

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 421, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 437

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 437, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 517

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 517, a bill to extend the secure rural schools and community self-determination program, to restore mandatory funding status to the payment in lieu of taxes program, and for other purposes.

S. 527

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 527, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or in the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

S. 532

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 532, a bill to improve highway-rail grade crossing safety, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 546

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to marshal resources to undertake a concerted, transformative effort that seeks to bring an end to modern slavery, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 569. A bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 5 years ago, the President signed into law the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act. This law has made improvements to our school lunch program by making healthy food choices a reality for students nationwide. One of the best ways to help students make healthy choices is to teach them about their food and how it is grown. That is why I championed the inclusion of funding for a farm-to-school grant program, which was included in the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act. The program has had tremendous success and interest nationwide, and has awarded grants in 42 States—showing the reach and diversity of farm-to-school. In order to improve upon this successful program and expand its reach, I am glad to be joined today by Senator COCHRAN, and Representatives FUDGE and FORTENBERRY in the House, to introduce the Farm to School Act of 2015.

We all know that hungry children cannot learn. Studies have shown that healthy nutrition in a young person's diet is crucial to cognitive ability and better health in the long run. With food insecurity on the rise, more than 30 percent of all children in the United States struggle with obesity, resulting in poor health, and learning and behavioral difficulties at school. The school meal program has made tremendous strides in recent years to ensure not only that children have access to meals throughout the school day, but that those meals are nutritious. The Farm to School program has given children and schools across the country the tools to craft farm-fresh, healthy, and delicious meals that students enjoy.

The Farm to School grant program offers support to farmers and local economies, while teaching kids about nutritious foods and where they come

from. The program has helped schools across the country meet the new nutrition standards by offering children local, fresh produce that tastes great. Just as importantly, the program has a strong educational component, making our school cafeterias an extension of the classroom, giving students an opportunity to learn about nutrition, well-balanced meals, and even how to grow the food themselves.

In Vermont, I have seen first-hand how farm to school efforts have better connected children with the food in their cafeteria. Students participate in school gardens, sustainability projects, and taste tests for new school menu items. The Burlington School Food Project created a half-acre Healthy City Youth Farm, connecting schools to the farm by engaging individuals in local agricultural production. Organizations in Vermont such as Vermont Food Education Every Day, now the Northeast regional leader of the National Farm to School Network; Shelburne Farms; and the Northeast Organic Farming Association have been able to expand their programs to link more farms to the classroom throughout Vermont.

Farm to school is equally crucial to farmers and ranchers, who currently receive only 16 cents out of every dollar spent on food. The program opens another market to them to sell their locally grown and locally harvested goods. By incorporating farm fresh products in school meals, children learn the importance of where their food comes from. The program links the classroom with the farm to engage students in the importance of farming and contributing to the local economy.

The Farm to School Act of 2015 would build upon these successes and expand the program's scope by increasing the funding for the program to $15 million per year. The bill also recognizes the importance of growing the program to include preschools, summer food service program sites, and after school programs.

Improving childhood nutrition is a goal we all share. Small changes in eating habits by children will result in lifelong health benefits for generations to come. The Farm to School program empowers children and their families to make healthy choices now and in the future. As the Senate begins considering reauthorizing the child nutrition bill this year, I look forward to including these improvements in the Farm to School program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 569

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 ''Farm to School Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO LOCAL FOODS: FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAM.

Section 18(g) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''In this subsection, the'' and inserting the following:

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER.—The term 'agricultural producer' means a farmer, rancher, or fisher (including of farm-raised fish).

''(B) ELIGIBLE SCHOOL.—The''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated), by inserting '', including the summer food service program for children under section 13 and the early care and afterschool portions of the child and adult care food program under section 17,'' after ''under this Act'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and nonprofit entities through grants and technical assistance'' and inserting ''land-grant colleges and universities, and nonprofit entities through grants, technical assistance, and research'';

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting ''and technical assistance'' after ''training'';

(ii) by redesignating clauses (vi) and (vii) as clauses (vii) and (viii), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

''(vi) implementing agricultural literacy and nutrition education;''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) IMPROVED PROCUREMENT AND DISTRIBUTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall seek to improve local food procurement and distribution options for agricultural producers and eligible schools.

''(ii) AGGREGATION, PROCESSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND DISTRIBUTION.—In advancing local food procurement options and other farm to school objectives, the Secretary may provide funding for projects that include innovative approaches to aggregation, processing, transportation, and distribution.

''(D) AWARDS.—

''(i) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The total amount provided to a grant recipient under this subsection shall not exceed $200,000.

''(ii) TERM.—The term of an award shall not exceed 3 years.

''(iii) PURPOSE AND SCOPE.—In making awards under this subsection, the Secretary shall seek to make awards of diverse amounts and duration in order to best match the award to the purpose and scope of the project to be funded.

''(E) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not award a grant under this subsection if the grant funds would be used solely for the purpose of carrying out a conference.'';

(4) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (G) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively, and indenting the clauses appropriately;

(B) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking ''lunches'' and inserting ''meals'';

(C) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''To the maximum extent practicable'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable'';

(D) in clause (vi) (as so redesignated), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(E) by redesignating clause (vii) (as so redesignated) as clause (viii);

(F) by inserting after clause (vi) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(vii) expand the selection of local commodities for eligible schools; and''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) TRIBAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS.—In the case of projects serving tribal communities, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, give highest priority to projects that best use products from tribal agricultural producers, as determined by the Secretary.'';

(5) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking the paragraph designation and heading and all that follows through ''nonprofit entities—'' and inserting the following:

''(7) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RESEARCH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance, research, and information to assist eligible schools, State and local agencies, Indian tribal organizations, agricultural producers or agricultural producer groups, and nonprofit entities—'';

(C) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated)—

(i) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) to increase awareness of, and participation in, farm to school programs among agricultural and aquaculture producers or agricultural producer groups, including beginning, veteran, and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) REVIEW.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Farm to School Act of 2015 and every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary shall review and submit to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the progress that has been made in identifying and eliminating regulatory and other barriers related to developing farm to school programs.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—In preparing the report, the Secretary shall examine—

''(I) the direct and indirect regulatory compliance costs affecting the production and marketing of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products to school food programs; and

''(II) barriers to local and regional market access for small-scale production.'';

(6) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ADMINISTRATION.—Of the funds provided to the Secretary under subparagraph (A), not more than 5 percent may be used to pay administrative costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out this subsection.''; and

(7) in paragraph (9), by striking ''2011 through 2015'' and inserting ''2016 through 2021''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 85—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF GEORGIA JONES-AYERS

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 85

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers was a lifelong resident and prominent community leader in South Florida;

Whereas effective relationships between communities and the police departments that serve those communities promote more effective policing and further the interests of justice;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers worked tirelessly to promote dialogue and foster trust between the police and the community;

Whereas career criminals prey on their communities, destroy lives, and waste their God-given potential;

Whereas the prevention of recidivism, especially by first-time offenders, is an important goal of the criminal justice system, civil society, and faith communities;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers founded and served as Executive Director of Alternative Programs, Inc., a nonprofit agency committed to preventing first-time offenders from reoffending;

Whereas Alternative Programs, Inc. has helped hundreds of first-time offenders become productive members of society;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers retired in October 2013, after nearly 4 decades leading Alternative Programs;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers engaged in many other efforts for the betterment of the community, including cofounding the Daily Bread Food Bank;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers was honored by numerous organizations in Florida, including the Miami Police Department and the Florida Commission on Human Relations;

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers was the loving mother of 6 children, grandmother of 9 grandchildren, and great-grandmother of 20 great-grandchildren; and

Whereas Georgia Jones-Ayers passed away on February 17, 2015, at the age of 86: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the life of Georgia Jones-Ayers;

(2) recognizes—

(A) the lifelong commitment of Georgia Jones-Ayers to bettering the lives of the people of South Florida; and

(B) the landmark work of Georgia Jones-Ayers in steering troubled young people away from a life of crime;

(3) offers heartfelt condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones of Georgia Jones-Ayers; and

(4) in memory of Georgia Jones-Ayers, calls on the people of the United States to redouble their commitment to their neighbors and their communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 86—RECOGNIZING MARCH 3, 2015, AS THE CENTENNIAL OF THE NAVY RESERVE

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 86

Whereas the roots of patriotic Americans serving in maritime service trace back to even before the existence of the Continental Navy, when residents from seaside towns engaged in combat with British warships in defense of their homes;

Whereas the tradition of maritime service to the country continued through the robust United States merchant marine, and later the formation of State naval militias in the late 19th century to meet the need for additional naval support;

Whereas during the Spanish-American War, the Navy augmented its force with 4,000 sailors from the State naval militias;

Whereas the emergence of the United States as a world power in the early 20th century required a more robust and multilayered naval force;

Whereas the Act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 928, chapter 83), established the Naval Reserve, which became the ''Navy Reserve'' in 2006;

Whereas by the end of World War I, there were 290,0000 members of the Naval Reserve, more than half of the total manpower of the Navy, who fought valiantly during the war;

Whereas 84 percent of the sailors serving in World War II were members of the Naval Reserve, a group that included 100,000 women;

Whereas the more than 2,600,000 enlisted personnel and 269,000 officers in the Naval Reserve in 1945 served in every theater of World War II and on every type of vessel and aircraft;

Whereas 5 Presidents, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard M. Nixon, Gerald R. Ford, and George H. W. Bush, served honorably in the Naval Reserve;

Whereas in United States conflicts and national emergencies, including the Berlin Crisis, the Korean War, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Vietnam War, Operation Desert Storm, and hurricanes and other natural disasters, the Navy Reserve has responded to calls promptly and effectively;

Whereas following the attack on the Navy destroyer, USS Cole, on October 12, 2000, the Naval Reserve immediately responded with coastal warfare security;

Whereas since the attacks on our homeland of September 11, 2001, the Navy Reserve has mobilized more than 72,000 members of the Navy Reserve worldwide to counter threats to national security;

Whereas the Navy benefits from the military experience, civilian skills, and diverse backgrounds of the members of the Navy Reserve;

Whereas as the Senate recognizes the distinguished service of the members of the Navy Reserve, who are proud individuals of the United States, there are more than 2,000 members of the Navy Reserve deployed around the world; and

Whereas March 3, 2015, marks 100 years since the Act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 928, chapter 83), establishing the Naval Reserve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes March 3, 2015, as the centennial of the Navy Reserve;

(2) recognizes the indispensable and valuable contributions and sacrifices that individual members of the Navy Reserve have made throughout the history of the United States and continue to make in 2015;

(3) celebrates the commitment and service of members of the Navy Reserve, their families, and their employers; and

(4) encourages communities to seize the opportunity to honor and support these patriots in 2015, the centennial of the Navy Reserve.

SENATE RESOLUTION 87—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE RISE OF ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE AND TO ENCOURAGE GREATER CO-OPERATION WITH THE EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS, THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE IN PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO ANTI-SEMITISM;

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COATS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 87

Whereas an alarming increase in anti-Semitic attacks and incidents targeting Jewish institutions, places of worship, and individuals continue to take place in Europe and remain a challenge to stability and security;

Whereas on January 9, 2015, 4 members of France's Jewish community were murdered in an attack on a kosher supermarket following the deadly terrorist attack on the Paris offices of newspaper Charlie Hebdo;

Whereas, in a 2014 Anti-Defamation League survey of attitudes towards Jews in more than 100 countries around the world—

(1) 24 percent of those surveyed in Western Europe expressed anti-Semitic views;

(2) 34 percent of those surveyed in Eastern Europe expressed anti-Semitic views; and

(3) a majority of those surveyed worldwide either—

(A) had not heard of the Holocaust; or

(B) do not believe that the factual accounts and recorded history of the Holocaust are accurate;

Whereas the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights issued a report in 2013 on anti-Semitism in the 8 countries in which 90 percent of Europe's Jews reside, namely France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Belgium, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, in which 76 percent of respondents believed that anti-Semitism had worsened where they lived during the previous 5-year period;

Whereas France, which is home to Europe's largest Jewish population, reported that—

(1) twice as many French Jews immigrated to Israel during 2014 than had immigrated during 2013; and

(2) for the first time ever, more Jews moved to Israel from France than from any other country in the world;

Whereas anti-Semitic acts committed and recorded in European countries in 2014 included—

(1) murders and death threats against Jews; and

(2) arson, graffiti, and property desecration at Jewish sites, including Jewish cemeteries,

places of worship, schools, and community centers;

Whereas such acts led many Jewish individuals to conceal their religious affiliation;

Whereas on May 24, 2014, a gunman killed 4 people when he opened fire at the Jewish Museum of Belgium in Brussels, Belgium;

Whereas on July 29, 2014, Molotov cocktails were thrown at the synagogue in Wuppertal, Germany, which had been burned to the ground by the Nazis during the 1938 Kristallnacht, and was rebuilt as recently as 2002;

Whereas the foreign ministers of France, Germany, and Italy issued a joint statement in July 2014, proclaiming: ''Anti-Semitic rhetoric and hostility against Jews, attacks on people of Jewish belief and synagogues have no place in our societies'';

Whereas in September 2014, British Prime Minister David Cameron declared: ''There can never be any excuse for anti-Semitism, and no disagreements on politics or policy should ever be allowed to justify racism, prejudice or extremism in any form'';

Whereas on January 13, 2015, French Prime Minister Manuel Valls spoke before the French National Assembly and declared that anti-Semitism must be dealt with ''powerfully'' and that ''there has been an intolerable rise in acts of anti-Semitism in France [that] have not aroused the outrage expected by our Jewish compatriots'';

Whereas at the Tenth Anniversary of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE) Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism in November 2014, Samantha Power, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, noted, ''Rising anti-Semitism is rarely the lone or the last manifestation of intolerance in society. . . . When the human rights and fundamental freedoms of Jews are repressed, the rights and freedoms of other minorities and other sectors are often not far behind'';

Whereas the OSCE's December 2014 Basel Declaration on Enhancing Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism condemned ''manifestations of anti-Semitism, intolerance and discrimination against Jews'', and protected the commitment to ''declare unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those with regard to the situation in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism'';

Whereas the Government of the United States has consistently supported efforts to address the rise of anti-Semitism through diplomatic efforts including engagement in international organizations such as the OSCE;

Whereas the Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism in the Department of State, which is headed by the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, has consistently supported European efforts to combat Anti-Semitism; and

Whereas, at the urging of the United States and 36 other countries, including all European Union States, the United Nations General Assembly convened the first ever meeting on anti-Semitism on January 22, 2015, to consider ways to confront the long-standing and growing problem of anti-Semitism worldwide.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate urges the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and other relevant United States Government agencies and officials to work closely with the European Union and European governments to encourage further efforts to address anti-Semitism by—

(1) undertaking prompt, impartial, and effective investigations of any acts of violence motivated by anti-Semitism and fully prosecuting those responsible for such violence within the extent of the law;

(2) encouraging European countries and the European Union to designate senior-level special envoys to monitor, prevent, and combat anti-Semitism regionally and domestically;

(3) cooperating with European counterparts on developing programs to counter violent extremists engaged in anti-Semitic activity;

(4) encouraging the European Union and its Member States to integrate measures to combat anti-Semitism into relevant national strategies and action plans by including measures to protect human rights, religious tolerance, and equality, and to ensure hate crime and violence prevention;

(5) increasing cooperation on training initiatives related to hate crimes, particularly crimes motivated by anti-Semitism, for law enforcement personnel, and improving monitoring and reporting efforts;

(6) empowering civil society, including diverse religious and ethnic groups, civil and human rights organizations, and the business community, to fight anti-Semitism and discrimination;

(7) convening regular consultations with Jewish community organizations and non-Jewish civil and human rights organizations to demonstrate visible support, listen to concerns, and solicit recommendations on improving security and supporting victims; and

(8) reaffirming and implementing the recommendations in the OSCE's December 2014 Basel Declaration on Enhancing Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. 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 February 25, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Preserving the Multistakeholder Model of Internet Governance.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Evironment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Importance of MAP–21 Reauthorization: Perspectives from Owners, Operators, and Users of the System.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015, at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Fight Against ISIS: Building the Coalition and Ensuring Military Effectiveness.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Toward a 21st Century Regulatory System.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's FY2016 Budget Request for Indian programs.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 25, 2015 at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CENTENNIAL OF THE NAVY RESERVE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 86, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 86) recognizing March 3, 2015, as the centennial of the Navy Reserve.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106–286, appoints the following Member to serve on the Congressional Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable MARCO RUBIO of Florida.

The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: the Honorable ROY BLUNT of Missouri.

The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 96–114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: the Honorable JOE MANCHIN of West Virginia.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Thursday, February 26; 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 leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 240 postcloture, and all time during the adjournment or recess of the Senate count against postcloture time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WHITEHOUSE for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the 90th time to urge my colleagues in the Senate to take action on climate change. The science is clearly worthy of our trust, and it is indeed time to wake up.

The human contribution to climate change is no longer up for legitimate debate. We know that carbon pollution accumulates in the atmosphere. We know that carbon dioxide traps the sun's heat. We have actually known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. We know that the atmosphere and the oceans are heating up. We can measure that.

Ocean acidification and sea level rise are also measurable, and they are caused by carbon pollution. These risks to our environment, to our health, to our economy, and to our national security are every week more apparent.

News this week from New York City was that an advisory panel of scientists, engineers, and risk management experts just reported that the sea level rise along that city's shoreline—approximately 12 inches since 1900—may have expanded Superstorm Sandy's flood area by as much as 25 square miles, flooding the homes of some 80,000 people. That is pretty real.

The report's prognosis for the future puts the city in pretty deep water. New York City expects its local sea levels to rise by 11 to 21 inches more by 2050 and as much as 6 feet by 2100.

When he was mayor, Michael Bloomberg began in the wake of Hurricane Sandy an ambitious plan to shore up New York with levees, with storm barriers, and with other coastal defenses to make that great city more resilient in the face of rising seas. That plan is estimated to cost nearly $20 billion to fortify just one city, albeit a great one—New York City—against rising seas.

Let's look south to another major American metropolitan area, Miami-Fort Lauderdale, which also faces daunting projections of rising sea levels.

This map I have in the Chamber shows 3 feet of sea level rise in Miami-Dade County. This is before. This is after. As we can see, they have lost acres. All of this back to the coast is gone, acre upon acre of that city. This nuclear power station right here, Turkey Point, and this sewage treatment plant which serves that municipal area have both become islands.

I visited Florida last year to hear firsthand about the threats that climate change poses to the Sunshine State. I met Glenn Landers, a senior engineer at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Everglades Division. He has worked on water resources and restoration projects in Florida for nearly 20 years. This is the map he used to show me what just 2 feet of sea level rise would mean for South Florida. There is a lot less of it.

Like New York, they have measured almost 1 foot of sea level rise in South Florida in the last 100 years. And like New York, the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Compact—which is a bipartisan coalition of four South Florida counties—once we get away from this building, it turns out this can actually be a bipartisan issue; that cloud of special interest money that wraps the Congress isn't as apparent when you get to Florida counties. That bipartisan coalition predicts, like New York, again, continued sea level rise. Indeed, the waters around southeast Florida could surge up to another 2 feet in less than 50 years. As we can see, most of the iconic Everglades—which is the largest tract of wilderness east of the Rocky Mountains and home to some of the most rare and endangered species in America—will be under seawater.

Now, there is some resemblance between New York and Florida in the threat of sea level rise. But the resemblance to New York diverges when we look at some of the unique features of the Florida peninsula.

First is its low elevation. Miami is just 6 feet above sea level. Six feet of sea level rise goes a long way.

Second, southern Florida, as the Army Corps of Engineers constantly attests, rests on porous limestone. In New York, levees and dams can be built that will hold the ocean back. They can fortify New York City and wall it in like Holland. In Miami, they would be building those structures on a geological sponge. The rising water will just seep right under. And even in the higher areas that might still stay dry, saltwater will infiltrate the underground drinking water.

Of all the people and all the homes in the Nation at risk from rising seas, an estimated 40 percent are in the State of Florida. The Risky Business Project estimates that between $127 billion and $150 billion worth of property in Florida will be under the mean high tide by 2050. You might want to be careful where you buy in Florida these days if you plan to be around a while.

If we take into account damage from coastal storms, Florida could face an additional $4 billion in damage per year.

Luckily, Florida is home to a number of the country's leading research institutions. Scientific experts at Florida universities are actively researching and trying to plan for the State's changing climate.

Professor Harold Wanless of the University of Miami puts it pretty bluntly:

> Everyone wants a nice happy ending. But that's not reality. We're in for it. We have really done a job warming our ocean, and it's going to pay us back.

The Florida Climate Institute is a network of universities and public organizations that provides Florida policymakers and businesses with reliable, region-specific, factual information. The group includes the University of Florida, Florida State, the University of Miami, Florida A&M, the University of Central Florida, Florida Atlantic University, the University of South Florida, and Florida International University.

Let me focus on Florida International University in Miami. FIU leads the Florida Coastal Everglades Long Term Ecological Research Program to study the effect of climate change and human activity on freshwater availability in the Everglades. FIU hosts the International Hurricane Research Center on its campus and recently established the Extreme Events Institute, devoted to making communities more resilient to extreme weather.

Institute director Richard Olsen, who is an international expert on disaster response and resiliency, has called sea level rise ''a slow onset disaster'' for South Florida.

Four professors of FIU's School of Journalism and Mass Communication set up a media outreach initiative called Eyes on the Rise. Students in this program have produced documentaries to air on local television about the effect of sea level rise on local communities, on real estate prices, and on economic growth in southern Florida.

FIU is a member of the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment, a network of schools taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote climate research. FIU has adopted a plan to bring emissions 25 percent below 2007 levels before 2030.

On my Florida visit, Dr. Mike Heithaus, a marine scientist and dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at FIU, said:

> We're really standing here at ground zero. There's just about nowhere else on the planet where there is more at risk from sea level rise so fast.

He gets it. They get it. That is why Florida International University is at the fore of climate research and education, particularly as it affects the State of Florida.

But there is another member of that faculty who doesn't seem to get it, one of our Senate colleagues, the junior Senator from Florida. He teaches political science part time at FIU. Last month, however, that junior Senator from Florida voted against amendments to the Keystone XL bill stating that climate change is real and that humans contribute to it. Apparently the message from experts across Florida and frankly from experts across campus that manmade climate change, especially sea level rise, is a big problem for southern Florida—well, apparently that message hasn't gotten through.

What are Florida's other elected officials doing? Fort Lauderdale mayor Jack Seiler is working with NOAA, State and Broward County officials, and the South Florida Regional Planning Council to protect his city from flooding and climate change. Miami Beach mayor Philip Levine showed me the huge pumps his city has installed to pump out the flooding that comes in on high tides and from storms. Republican mayor Sylvia Murphy of Monroe County, which covers all of the Florida Keys and some of the Everglades, is a remarkable lady, and she has put climate and energy policy at the heart of her 20-year growth plan for the county. She is going to lose a lot of her county if we don't get ahead of this. And the senior Senator from Florida, my friend BILL NELSON, is an outspoken advocate for preserving the Florida coast and the Florida economy in the face of climate change.

The Miami Herald recently wrote:

> South Florida owes Senator NELSON its thanks for shining a bright light on this issue. Everyone from local residents to elected officials should follow his lead, turning awareness of this major environmental issue into action. It is critical to saving our region.

So said the Miami Herald.

Unfortunately, the junior Senator does not seem to have followed his senior colleague's lead either in shining a bright light on this issue or in turning awareness into action.

It is a little bit surprising that, according to a recent New York Times poll, an overwhelming majority of Americans support us taking action on climate change, including half of Republicans. Again, this is not that partisan of an issue once you get away from the polluter money that surrounds this building. Two-thirds of respondents said they would be more likely to vote for a candidate for President or for the Senate who explicitly campaigned on a platform of climate action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That includes 48 percent of Republicans as opposed to only 24 percent of Republicans who said they would be less likely to vote for such a candidate. So even among Republican voters, the balance tips in favor of climate action. If you look at young Republican voters—as I have said over and over on this floor—under the age of 35, they think climate denial is ignorant, out of touch, or crazy. Those are the words they selected in the poll, not my words.

Let's move west to Arizona. The folks at NASA—a pretty reputable organization—have a rover driving around on Mars right now that they control. These are people who know something about what they are doing, and the folks at NASA have made understanding our planet and its systems their life's work. This month their researchers released a study showing an 80-percent chance of a decades-long what they call ''megadrought'' in the American Southwest, a multi-decade drought between 2050 and 2099 unless we act aggressively to mitigate the effects of climate change. Arizona could see half as much precipitation in the second half of the century as it did in the second half of the last century. It is a call to arms to protect the State of Arizona.

Finally, here is this morning's newspaper headline: ''As ice melts, the future fades. Climate change may force Alaska natives to abandon their village.'' LISA MURKOWSKI, the Senator from Alaska, is quoted here. Senator MURKOWSKI acknowledges the impacts of climate change on Alaska's coastal community.

So maybe we are beginning to make some progress, but all around the country these effects are ones we have to begin to take more seriously. It is indeed time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:23 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 26, 2015, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MONICA C. REGALBUTO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT), VICE INES R. TRIAY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

AMIAS MOORE GERETY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE CYRUS AMIR-MOKRI, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WILLIE E. MAY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY, VICE PATRICK GALLAGHER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ANNE ELIZABETH WALL, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE ALASTAIR M. FITZPAYNE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KATHERINE SIMONDS DHANANI, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA.

SHEILA GWALTNEY, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

MICKEY D. BARNETT, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CONO R. NAMORATO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE KATHRYN KENEALLY, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. ROBIN RAND

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY B. CLARK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BARBARA R. HOLCOMB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. RONALD J. PLACE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S. C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. RAYMOND S. DINGLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JACINTO ZAMBRANO, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

CHERYL D. ANDERSON
CHARLES G. KEMPER IV
JAMES D. MOORE
CARLTON G. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

EUGENE S. ALKIRE
DAVID A. GAGNON
SHAUGHNESSY D. HODGE
ANTHONY T. LIEGGI
CHRISTOPHER R. REESE
DENNIS J. SORENSEN
PATRICK R. STARESINA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RONALD D. SCHOW

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

SEAN M. MILLER
JOSEPH B. POWELL

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ANDREW J. COPELAND
DANIEL R. GABLE
YONG J. LEE
BRIAN A. LIONBARGER

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO TARBUT V'TORAH COMMUNITY DAY SCHOOL

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize Tarbut V'Torah Community Day School (TVT) for recently having been ranked the number one private school for academics in Orange County, California from niche.com. TVT was also recognized as being the number one Jewish school for academics in the nation by Niche. As a result of their outstanding accomplishments, TVT was recently presented with a certificate of recognition from the County of Orange for achieving these excellent honors. Today, I applaud TVT for their tremendous academic accomplishments.

TVT, a Jewish day school with over 500 students, is a nurturing, caring community that embraces pluralism, cultivates Jewish identity and inspires students to lead meaningful Jewish lives. The school is known for its individualized college preparatory environment, which challenges students to think critically, work collaboratively, and explore creatively in order to realize their fullest potential. TVT also strives to encourage students to be inquisitive learners, compassionate citizens and courageous leaders in their community and in the world.

The success of TVT students is demonstrated through their exceptional standardized test scores and high acceptance rates into our nation's top universities. For example, the acceptance rate of TVT students to Stanford University is 12.1 percent, in comparison with the 5.1 percent national average. The acceptance ratios for other top universities are as follows: UC Berkeley, 41.7 percent vs. 17 percent; USC, 53 vs. 17.8 percent, and UCLA, 31 vs. 18.2 percent. Furthermore, TVT SAT scores surpassed the national average by more than 400 points, and TVT ACT scores outranked the national average 29 to 21.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the students, faculty, and those who govern the school, for their accomplishments and academic success within the community. It is an honor to represent such an accomplished school in the United States Congress, and I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING PHILIP B. PHILLIPS FOR BEING SELECTED FOR THE NAIOP OF NORTHEAST FLORIDA COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE TRADE ASSOCIATION'S LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great Floridian businessman, Mr. Philip B. Phillips, founder of the real estate development firm Phillips & Co, on receiving the NAIOP of Northeast Florida commercial real estate trade association's Lifetime Achievement Award.

Mr. Phillips founded Phillips & Co in 1986, and since then his firm has completed more than 1 million square feet of projects in Jacksonville, Orlando and Pensacola. He is a pillar in the Jacksonville business community, and a valuable partner in the economic growth and development of Northeast Florida.

Under Mr. Phillips' skillful leadership, his commercial real estate firm was responsible for constructing some of the largest projects in the Jacksonville area. He has developed the five-building Meridian complex in Deerwood Park, the four-building Greystone Project, and the 214,000 square foot multi-phase Central Park development. These projects have added countless jobs to the Jacksonville community as well as contributed to the economic success of our Northeast Florida economy.

NAIOP is one of the foremost commercial real estate industry organizations in the United States. It provides its members with numerous networking opportunities, educational programs, industry innovations, and strong legislative representation for the commercial real estate community. NAIOP's Lifetime Achievement Award is one of the greatest honors that the organization can bestow. The award recognizes those distinguished individuals for their lifetime work in the commercial real estate industry.

Mr. Phillips is truly deserving of this very distinguished honor; and the First Coast is proud to count him among our own. His lifework exemplifies everything for which NAIOP's Lifetime Achievement Award stands for. The Jacksonville business community is forever indebted to Mr. Phillips for his lifetime contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and Members of the House to join me in this very special congressional salute to this Jacksonville Business leader, Philip B. Phillips.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my immediate family I was unable to be present for votes on the House floor the week of February 9, 2015. Below is an explanation of how I would have voted and why.

I would have voted for H.R. 719, the TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2015 because the bill requires Transportation Security Administration Criminal Investigators to spend at least half of their time investigating individuals suspected of committing a crime.

I would have voted for H.R. 720, the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015 to ensure the Transportation Security Administration has adequate emergency plans in place to handle a shooting attack at an airport.

I would have voted for H.R. 431, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I am a cosponsor of the bill.

I would have voted against S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act because the bill allows a Canadian company to be exempt from paying its fair share into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which could leave taxpayers on the hook for an expensive clean-up in the event of an oil spill. Furthermore, the current planned route for the pipeline runs directly over the Ogallala aquifer, putting at risk a critical freshwater supply.

I would have voted for H.R. 644, the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2015 to encourage donations to charitable organizations. The bill would expand tax deductions for food donations, property conservation donations, and charitable foundations.

I would have voted for H.R. 636, the America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2015 because the bill is designed to help small businesses grow and create new jobs. This bill would facilitate investment in new equipment, new property, and technology upgrades for small businesses. Providing tax relief will help level the playing field for small businesses, which will stimulate economic growth and create jobs across the country.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 431—CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR SELMA FOOT SOLDIERS

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in strong support of H.R. 431, a bill that will bestow the Congressional Gold Medal upon the courageous Foot Soldiers who participated in "Bloody Sunday," "Turnaround Tuesday," and the final March from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama in 1965.

As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of their displays of courage and determination, I am inspired by the thousands of citizens, from all walks of life—including my good friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS—who came together to march for equal voting rights for future generations.

I commend these brave men and women for following their conviction and sacrificing their blood, sweat, and tears to bring about the change that this country so desperately needed.

However, Mr. Speaker, our work is not yet done!

It was only two years ago, when the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act by

ruling Section 5 unconstitutional. Since this ruling, we have seen an unprecedented number of bills introduced in state legislatures intended to restrict the precise right that the men and women we are honoring today fought to gain.

Not only are minority and low-income Americans' voting rights under assault, but the persistent opportunity gaps in employment, education, life skills, and career preparation continue to make the American Dream elusive for far too many Americans.

We must follow the example of these brave Foot Soldiers, and continue to fight injustice and inequality to create economic opportunities for everyone.

STEM EDUCATION ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. TONY CÁRDENAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 2015

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer today my full support for H.R. 1020, the STEM Education Act of 2015. In an increasingly technology-based world, businesses and other organizations continue to invest in, and rely heavily upon, information technology (IT) to increase efficiency, reduce costs, and safeguard information. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that the high tech industry will be among the fastest growing industries in the coming years. We must do more to ensure that our youth are properly prepared and educated to compete in the job market of the future, so that the United States can continue to be an international innovation leader. Unfortunately, our education system has been slow to adapt to the growing demand for computer scientists and software engineers. By 2020, there will be an estimated 1.4 million computer programming jobs, with only 400,000 American computer science students to fill those jobs.

With globalization increasing competition for high paying jobs, I cannot stress enough the importance and value of a strong and innovative computer science education in today's economy. Computer programming jobs are growing at twice the national average rate of job growth and computer science remains one of the highest paying college degrees, more than doubling the national median annual wage. These jobs also provide Americans with a living-wage and an opportunity to be financially secure. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the median annual wage in 2010 for computer programmers was $71,380 while the median annual wage was $33,840 for all workers.

I support H.R. 1020, because it continues the push for STEM programs to better prepare our youth for the computer programming jobs of the future so that the United States can continue being a world leader in innovation.

WELCOMING AUNJANUE ELLIS TO ''MOVING FORWARD AND SETTING THE WORLD''

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Ms. Aunjanue Ellis to the annual Black History Month event ''Moving Forward and Setting the World,'' organized by the Canisius College Academic Talent Search Program.

The Moving Forward and Setting the World event will feature the African-German Art Exhibition from Homestory, Germany to honor Black History Month.

The Canisius College Academic Talent Search Program, the host of this event, has shaped positive impact on many Western New York communities. The program is among eight federally funded TRiO programs established under Title IV of the Higher Education act of 1965. The Academic Talent Search Program provides educational, social and career support services for individuals with disadvantaged backgrounds in local schools and community service organizations.

Ms. Aunjanue Ellis, who I welcome to this event, is a famed actress who will star as the lead character in the 2015 miniseries ''The Book of Negroes.'' Ms. Ellis has also been a star in award winning films such as ''The Help,'' ''Men of Honor,'' and ''Ray.''

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to welcome the accomplished Ms. Aunjanue Ellis. I ask you to join me in thanking Ms. Ellis for speaking at this valued local event. I wish Ms. Ellis continued success in her acting career, and to continually see Ms. Ellis in influential roles.

HONORING GONZALO ARROYO

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Gonzalo Arroyo for his nearly two decades of commitment to helping low-income and immigrant families in Aurora, Illinois, through his leadership of Family Focus Aurora.

Gonzalo began working at Family Focus' Aurora Center in 1996, and has served as the director of the facility since 1998. During that time, he has helped countless families and individuals through the organization's many programs, from counseling new parents to computer classes aimed at improving work skills. Under Gonzalo's direction, Family Focus also has become a leader in providing guidance for recent immigrants looking to start a new chapter of their lives in Illinois.

I would like to congratulate Gonzalo for his hard work and his commitment to Family Focus Aurora and the people of our community. Although Gonzalo's leadership will be missed, I have no doubt that the work he has done and the lessons he has passed on will continue to serve and inspire the people of Aurora for many years to come.

HONORING MARTINSVILLE CANDY KITCHEN OF MARTINSVILLE, IN

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, mom-and-pop businesses are a vital part of local economies. Martinsville Candy Kitchen, located in Martinsville, Indiana, is a primary example of a small, family-owned business that has maintained a tradition of community involvement and devotion to making quality products. The Candy Kitchen not only influences the local economy but also serves as an important landmark in the Martinsville community.

The Martinsville Candy Kitchen has been in operation since 1919, producing 16 flavors of candy canes and other sweet treats. Over 30,000 candy canes are handmade in this shop every year. Considering that a batch takes more than 3 hours, we can understand the immensity of the task they take on each year. The owners of the business, Pam and John Badger, have been known to spend late nights in the kitchen working on large batches of candy canes. Therefore, I am proud to honor the Martinsville Candy Kitchen in this installment of the 9th District's ''Hoosier Small Business Spotlight.''

Following 95 years of business, the Martinsville Candy Kitchen continues to be a staple within the area in which it operates. People from all across Indiana visit the business to see candy canes being made during ''pour times,'' becoming a Christmas tradition for many families. In addition, the alleyway adjacent to the shop has been officially named ''Candy Cane Lane'' in recognition of the Candy Kitchen's presence in the community.

The history of Martinsville Candy Kitchen begins with its founder, Jim Zapapas, who learned the candy trade in St. Louis before moving to Indianapolis in 1916. His business originated as a short-order restaurant, soda fountain, and candy shop two years later. Over time, the company has had several owners. In early 2004, Pam and John Badger bought the Candy Kitchen from Bob and Karen Boyce, who were on the verge of having to close the doors of their business. The Badgers decided to buy the company in order to keep the historic business as a living part of Martinsville. Balancing their time between working full-time jobs and owning a business, they demonstrated their dedication to the community and the work ethic necessary to run a successful organization.

The Badgers' devotion to their customers and to the quality of their products has sustained their company's legacy. Their efforts serve as a testimony to the longstanding success of their business. The Candy Kitchen has been a Martinsville attraction since opening over 95 years ago, and it will continue to be a significant landmark for years to come.

HONORING GUSTAVO SAMBRANO

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize Mr. Gustavo

Sambrano, a native El Pasoan with a commendable record of service to his community and our nation.

Mr. Sambrano was born on March 26, 1932. He attended Bowie High School, a local institution with a rich and distinguished history of overcoming adversity and a consistent dedication to service. Mr. Sambrano was a proud member of the 1949 Texas state championship baseball team. This team primarily consisted of economically disadvantaged, Mexican-American students from El Paso's historic Segundo Barrio neighborhood. While traveling to Austin to play in the state championship, the team faced rampant racial discrimination. Upon arrival and against all odds, the Bears beat the most favored team in the state, the Austin Maroons. Mr. Sambrano would continue to remain engaged with his teammates and participate in community initiatives throughout his lifetime. In 2006, the El Paso Baseball Hall of Fame recognized the accomplishments of the team. Additionally, Sports Illustrated wrote a 2011 feature on the team further amplifying recognition of their profound accomplishment.

Following graduation from high school in 1950, Mr. Sambrano enlisted in the United States Air Force. Mr. Sambrano served honorably in numerous locations throughout the world to include England, Greenland, Italy, Korea, Spain and Thailand.

Following retirement after 20 years of faithful service from the U.S. Air Force, Mr. Sambrano attained a B.A from The University of Texas at El Paso. Mr. Sambrano continued to serve his local community as an educator with the El Paso Independent School District and his nation through federal civilian service in numerous capacities, with his career eventually culminating in retirement from the Defense Logistics Agency in Alexandria, Virginia. Following the completion of his civilian career, Mr. Sambrano once again returned home to El Paso, the community he held dearly.

I thank Mr. Sambrano for being an honorable ambassador of our community to the world through his notable service. While his road to success was often filled with adversity, Mr. Sambrano represents the ambition, dedication, perseverance and resilience that is so indicative of the many great El Pasoans I have the distinct privilege to represent.

IN HONOR OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the University of Kentucky, which celebrates its sesquicentennial anniversary this month. As an original land grant research university and Kentucky's flagship public institution of higher learning, UK is the cornerstone of education in the Commonwealth, having prepared graduates of exceptional quality and character for 150 years.

With humble beginnings in 1865, the school began as the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Kentucky University. In the time since its founding, the University of Kentucky has maintained its traditional values while also extending and enhancing its multifaceted mission of teaching, research, service, and health care. The University of Kentucky has progressed from its early innovative roots to become a vibrant and diverse place of development and potential.

Its faculty, staff, students, and alumni are deeply devoted to the University's central value of service to others. Students are civically engaged and most take advantage of the volunteer, leadership, service, and activism opportunities on the University's diverse and creative campus.

The University of Kentucky now looks to the next 150 years of higher learning, innovative discovery, transformative outreach and sophisticated care, as it honors the legacy of those who established its campus, nurtured its early work, upheld and enhanced its mission in the present, and who will deliver a new century of promise in the future. Athletics have also been an important part of the school's heritage, with the Kentucky Wildcats laying claim to more than 30 NCAA Championships and 270 conference titles across 22 intercollegiate sports. In particular, the University of Kentucky is home to the ''Greatest Tradition in College Basketball'' as the winningest program of all-time, in both the number of total wins and total win percentage. The Cats have also proven dominant in the postseason, with the most NCAA tournament appearances, the most tournament game wins, and eight national championships.

There is no doubt that the University will continue to accrue both academic and athletic achievements into the 21st Century. I encourage my colleagues to join in congratulating my alma mater, the University of Kentucky on this milestone. Kentuckians are proud of the progress this distinguished institution has made over the past 150 years in preparing our nation's next generation of leaders for success, and look forward to seeing all of the prosperity that the next 150 years will bring.

Go Cats.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 84 on H.R. 212, I am not recorded due to inclement weather resulting in a travel delay.

Had I been present, I would have voted Aye.

RECOGNIZING GABRIELLE DEBINSKI AND MILLICENT ALLAN OF THE UNI-CAPITOL WASHINGTON INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, for decades the United States and Australia have shared a special union, being one of our nations closest cultural, economic, and security partners. I rise today to recognize a unique international exchange program between our two nations: the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program

For the past 16 years, the Uni-Capitol Program has paired students from Australia with offices on Capitol Hill. Since the program's inception, more than 170 students, from 10 partner Australian universities located across 5 of the 6 Australian states and the Australian Capital Territory, have participated. The students in this program are the best and the brightest that Australia has to offer. They bring a unique perspective to the House and Senate offices that they serve—strengthening the special alliance between our two nations and fostering greater understanding and mutual respect between us.

This year, it has been my pleasure to host two outstanding Australian students in my Washington office: Ms. Gabrielle Debinski and Ms. Millicent Allan. Gabrielle and Millicent are great examples of the high-caliber students this program provides Congressional offices. They both proved themselves to be very intelligent and hard working. Furthermore, they excelled in drafting correspondence to my constituents, researching legislative issues, and attending briefings, all while demonstrating a desire to learn about, and engage in, the important policy issues facing our nation.

Mr Speaker, I have no doubt that Gabrielle and Millicent will go on to do great things in their future. I wish them both all the very best, and the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program many more years of continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on February 24, 2015 and missed roll call votes on H.R. 212 and H.R. 734. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call 84, and Yea on Roll Call number 85.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

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 $18,141,409,083,212.36. We've added $7,514,532,034,299.28 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING WILKINSON MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENT TANNER BARNDOLLAR

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize an eighth grade student from my district, Tanner Barndollar, for his work in designing a mission patch that was recently flown to the International Space Station. Tanner attends Wilkinson Middle School in Madison Heights, Michigan.

Mission patches have been used on NASA flights since the early days of the U.S. space program. The tradition was for the astronauts to design a patch to symbolize their flight. To this day, I remember the mission patch for the *Apollo 11* flight to the Moon. The patch for that mission was designed by the pilot of the command module, Michael Collins, and showed a bald eagle landing on the Moon carrying an olive branch in its talons. That patch became an iconic emblem of the first Moon landing.

To this day, mission patches remain important symbols of all NASA flights. The patch designed by Tanner Barndollar accompanied a microgravity experiment designed by four other Wilkinson students. Unfortunately, the first attempt to get this experiment and the mission patch up to the international space station failed when the unmanned rocket carrying them exploded shortly after liftoff last October. Fortunately, NASA was able to find space on another rocket to the space station that launched in January, and the Wilkinson microgravity experiment and Tanner's mission patch were carried into orbit on that flight.

Tanner's patch shows his obvious pride in his country, community and school, as well as his fellow students' participation in the Student Spaceflight Experiments Program. His design was selected from more than 51,000 student designs from around the country.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Tanner Barndollar and all the other young Americans who participated in the NASA Student Spaceflight Experiments Program.

HONORING WILLIAM WOLFE

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor William Wolfe for his exceptional service to our nation and Missouri. Mr. Wolfe began his twenty years of military service with the United States Army at the age of seventeen. During his years in the Army, he served as a pilot in the Vietnam War and flew AH–1 Cobra helicopters in combat. Two Purple Hearts were awarded to him for the wounds he endured during combat. He retired in 1980 at the rank of Captain.

After having served in the military, he returned home and began to explore different venues of business. He operated and owned a general store in Grandin, Missouri, for a number of years and in 1995 he formed a privately held company in Gravois Mills, Missouri, called Chevron Sierra Land Co. This company sells parcels of land in Carter, Ripley, Iron, Washington, Camden, and Morgan counties.

William Wolfe's service in the military has been truly admirable and his businesses have greatly benefited our Missouri community. It is my pleasure to recognize his achievements and service before the House of Representatives.

A TRIBUTE TO SALLY KNOWLES-JACKSON AND THE UNI-CAPITOL WASHINGTON INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as one of our closest allies, the nation of Australia has stood steadfast with the United States as we tackle issues of great importance to both nations. Like any strong friendship, our bilateral relationship requires that we collaborate and exchange ideas. I have been fortunate to work with Ambassador Kim Beazley to foster commerce between Connecticut and Australia, and have had the pleasure of hosting the Ambassador in my home state. And for many years, I have continued learning about Australia's goals and priorities by hosting a series of intelligent, dedicated, and curious young professionals in my office through the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program.

The program places 15 students of Australia's best and brightest students in internships in Congressional offices, federal agencies, and committees to lend an able hand to office operations, learn about American government, and serve as what they often call themselves: Unofficial Ambassadors.

I would be remiss not to note that this important relationship would not be possible without the dedication of Mr. Eric Federing, who year after year shepherds a new generation of Australian students into our nation's capital. Over the course of its 16 years, the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program has brought an impressive 170 students from 10 Australian universities to the United States Congress.

This year I was privileged to have Sally Knowles-Jackson join our office from the University of Melbourne where she is studying to be a lawyer. I would like to offer my sincere thanks to Sally for her hard work and dedication. Curious and positive, she quickly adjusted to the fast-paced life of a Congressional office and eagerly took on the tasks and responsibilities of her position. While in the UniCapitol program, she has had the opportunity to meet with officials from the Australian Embassy and the UN, attend briefings and hearings, meet with White House officials, members of the DC media, and learn the ins and outs of the Capitol building's historic halls. Sally has been able to learn not only about life in D.C., but also about our constituents back home in Connecticut.

When she returns to Melbourne next week it is my hope that Sally will bring with her an understanding of the American legislative process, knowledge of Washington, DC, and an appreciation for the enduring friendships our two nations have maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once more thank Eric, Sally, my colleagues who have also hosted their own Unofficial Australian Ambassadors, as well as the nation of Australia for sharing in this truly one-of-a kind experience. I look forward to welcoming future Uni-Capitol Washington Internship students into my office.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLOOMINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the centennial celebration of the Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce. Since 1915, the Chamber of Commerce has been a vital resource for the betterment of business in the Bloomington, Indiana community.

Over the past 100 years, the Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce has offered exceptional leadership opportunities, meaningful volunteer activities and exclusive business-building programs. The Chamber is the region's principal advocate for business. By providing chief support for local and statewide transportation projects, the development of public water resources and downtown revitalization projects, the Chamber demonstrates itself as a forward-thinking organization that is deeply concerned about the well-being of the community. In addition, its workforce preparedness programming, aimed at the area's large population of students and young professionals, exhibits a commitment to building better business for future generations in Bloomington.

Bloomington's local economy has greatly benefited from the Chamber's work over the past century. As a result of its efforts, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce named Bloomington its 2011 Chamber of Year and its 2014 Community of the Year. In 2012, the Chamber received the national Chamber of Year Award from the Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives, an accomplishment that is a testament to its outstanding service to the business community.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the Greater Bloomington Chamber of Commerce for its tireless years of dedication. I wish the Chamber continued success in its service to local business for the next 100 years.

COMMEMORATING THE LIVES LOST DURING THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the devastating atrocities that took place in Azerbaijani town of Khojaly on February 26, 1992. Thanks to Armenian and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) forces

over the course of 22 hours, 613 civilian lives were lost. Innocent children, women and elderly men were brutally murdered.

Since this tragedy took place in the early 1990's, Azerbaijan has worked to heal and become a successful country, with a booming economy. As a result, the economy of Azerbaijan is the fastest growing among the CIS states. In the turbulent geopolitical region, Azerbaijan is a reliable partner of the United States. Moreover, Azerbaijan is a close ally and trade partner with another strong American ally—Israel—in the region.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand close by our allies. That is why I urge my colleagues to recognize the human tragedy that occurred in Azerbaijan 23 years ago. Please, join me and all of our Azerbaijani friends in commemorating the lives lost during the Khojaly massacre.

CONGRATULATIONS LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE SAN BERNARDINO AREA FOR ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the League of Women Voters of the San Bernardino Area celebrating its 60th year anniversary.

Irmagard Blum, Margaret Chandler, Sibyl Disch, Joan Fallert, Jane Hall, Sally Hartley, Jerry Keller, Jane Kotnerm, Ruther Kekkonen, Gerry Pico, Jackie Russler, and Nancy Smith founded the League of Women Voters of San Bernardino on March 17, 1955. The League of Women Voters of San Bernardino objective is to promote political participation amongst citizens, especially women, without partisan bias. The League of Women voters of San Bernardino continue their commitment to support political action and advocacy. For its past 60 years, this organization has committed over six decades to support local services for voters, from registration, serving as a witness, and partake in other acts to ensure citizen participation in and oversight of the election process.

The League of Women Voters in San Bernardino Area educates citizens on issues and candidates, supports voter registration, and encourages citizens to create and implement positive policy in Congress.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ANDREW MARSHALL

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Andrew Marshall, the recently retired Director of the Pentagon's Office of Net Assessment, and the more than 41 years of distinguished and dedicated service that he has rendered to his office and his country. Always one to avoid the limelight and shun the recognition he deserves, Mr. Marshall has quietly but ably served twelve different Secretaries of Defense and been appointed and reappointed to his long-held position by no fewer than eight U.S. Presidents—Republican and Democrat alike. His accomplishments as a practitioner and proponent of net assessment and truly strategic thinking have shaped U.S. policy for decades and changed the way that generations of strategists and policymakers thought—and will continue to think—about defense. He has my thanks and those of a grateful nation.

PATRICK SULLIVAN TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patrick Sullivan, Rio Grande County's Road and Bridge Supervisor and the 2014 recipient of the Colorado Association of Road Supervisors and Engineers Supervisor of the Year Award.

In addition to his 35 years with Rio Grande County, the glowing letters of recommendation he received from his community speak to Mr. Sullivan's dedication. In addition to his duties as Road and Bridge Supervisor, he also serves as assistant fire chief for the Monte Vista Fire Department. He received recommendations from the Colorado State Patrol and the SLV Hazardous Substance Board, who both emphasized his unflagging devotion to Rio Grande County.

According to his coworkers, Mr. Sullivan goes above and beyond, and performs his duties with a commitment to excellence and dedication to his team. Their recommendations and the nomination speak to the mutual commitment he and his team has to public safety and their community. For Mr. Sullivan, his duties are more than a job; they are a way to serve and strengthen his community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Patrick Sullivan. He is not only a hard working civil servant but a dedicated husband and father. His contributions have and will continue to make Rio Grande County a great place to live for those who call it home.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes 84–85 due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on #84 and yes on #85.

IN RECOGNITION OF KYLEE McCUMBER

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of the founder of Kylee's Kare Kits for Kidz, Inc., Kylee McCumber. Currently a 7th grader at Sky View Middle School in Leominster, Massachusetts, Kylee is an exceptional young activist who began this nonprofit organization at the age of 10 to help food insecure children in her school.

In 2012, Kylee recognized that there were children going hungry on the weekends because they didn't have enough food to eat. Kylee started out with a goal to help 10 children per week by providing them with a "kare kit" of non-perishable food items to take home over the weekend. Today, Kylee, along with the help of her family and fellow classmates have been providing "kare kits" of non-perishable food items to over 200 students every Friday.

Last fall, as part of the Unilever Project Sunlight program, Kylee traveled to Mumbai, India to film a commercial to raise awareness about child hunger. In the commercial Kylee states, "The enemy is hunger—not the hungry." When asked why she does what she does, she simply states "It is better to give than receive and I receive so much more than what I give. It is so important to be grateful for all we have and pay it forward when we can." The work that Kylee is doing to end hunger is truly inspirational. She is a leader and role model. I am proud to represent Kylee, and I thank Kylee for her extraordinary service to the City of Leominster. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in paying tribute to this remarkable young woman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 2015 I was unable to be present and missed the following votes:

On Roll Call vote 84, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, As Amended, H.R. 212, the Drinking Water Protection Act, I would have voted Yes.

On Roll Call Vote 85, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and pass H.R. 734, the FCC Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015, I would have voted Yes.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. TERRY WAGONER ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Terry Wagoner of Royal Oak, Michigan, on her retirement from William Beaumont Hospital after 44 years of dedicated service as a Registered Nurse.

Mrs. Wagoner began her nursing career at Beaumont after graduating from Grace Nursing School in Detroit, Michigan, in 1970. Her time at Beaumont spanned the hospital's growth from a community hospital to one of the nation's leading hospitals.

Predominantly working with medical and geriatric patients throughout her career, Mrs. Wagoner's kindness and compassion have

made her one of Beaumont's top nurses and a mentor to the generations that have followed in her footsteps. Mrs. Wagoner's dedication to the care and well-being of her patients often included taking care of the emotional needs of their family members. Holidays with her own family often included a family member of a patient who had nowhere to go.

Mrs. Wagoner has given tirelessly to William Beaumont Hospital, to her patients, to her colleagues and to her family. I am proud to congratulate her on this accomplishment, and wish her well in a retirement that is so richly deserved.

THE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF BROADCASTERS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to formally recognize the contribution of broadcasters across the country and from my home state of Georgia. Every community is impacted by broadcasters, the individuals who have dedicated their lives to disseminating important information by radio and television. As north Georgia prepares for snow, ice and sleet today and tonight—broadcasters are my constituents' go-to source for the latest on road conditions, power outages and school closings. We turn to broadcasters first—whether we are in our cars listening to the radio, or watching the news on television at home.

There are over 500 local radio and television stations in Georgia. In 2014 alone, local radio and television stations in Georgia produced over 50,000 hours of original over-the-air news programming, representing an increase from 2013. Broadcasters have created over 85,000 jobs in Georgia and the radio and television industry had an economic impact on Georgia of over $39 billion in 2012.

COMMENDING THE CITY OF HATTIESBURG FOR DECLARING THE MONTH OF MARCH AS MARCH FOR MEALS MONTH

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincerest appreciation and admiration to the City of Hattiesburg, the Honorable Mayor Johnny Dupree, and all who were involved in declaring the month of March as March for Meals Month in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. March for Meals commemorates the hard-work and selfless dedication of the MEALS ON WHEELS program, which brings hot meals to the homes of those in need.

I especially want to acknowledge the men and women who volunteer and work tirelessly to ensure that the MEALS ON WHEELS program at Christian Services, Inc. is a success. The program has proven to be a valuable resource to older adults and homebound individuals in the City of Hattiesburg and its surrounding areas. In 2014, over 78,000 meals were delivered through MEALS ON WHEELS. Providing hot meals everyday not only meets the physical needs of the elderly and homebound but the smiles and kind words that MEALS ON WHEELS volunteers bring with each meal offer joy and hope with each delivery.

With the increasing need for programs to feed the homebound and seniors in our area, Christian Services has partnered with the City of Hattiesburg and the national MEALS ON WHEELS "No Senior Goes Hungry" campaign to raise awareness to the program and its contribution to the community. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Mississippi and the United States House of Representatives, I wish MEALS ON WHEELS continued success in their valiant effort to help their fellow man and commend the City of Hattiesburg for declaring March to be March for Meals Month.

AUTISM SOCIETY OF AMERICA'S 50TH YEAR CELEBRATION

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the Autism Society of America's 50th Year Celebration and commemorate the organization on five decades of extraordinary service and effective advocacy on behalf of the autism community.

In 1964, concerned parents of children with autism—including Ruth Sullivan, Dr. Bernie Rimand and Dan Torisky—joined together to form what is now called the Autism Society of America. Continuing to implement the vision of its founders, the Society today is a grassroots organization that ensures parents have quality options and the supports necessary for their child to live and prosper in our communities.

The Autism Society of America and its 104 local and state affiliates work towards one goal: to help each individual with autism maximize his or her quality of life.

Having worked with the Society's remarkable president Scott Badesch—a tenacious and wise leader—I can attest to the dedication and commitment of the organization's leadership, and its staff and volunteers. Each person who comes to the Autism Society gains the knowledge that accompanies 50 years of experience to help ensure a life of dignity, respect and opportunity.

The organization has played a critical role in the enactment of many landmark pieces of legislation for individuals with disabilities—including the three laws I have written that provide federal resources for research, services and supports for children and adults with autism.

Today, the Society's mission and work has never been more important or more timely. We as a nation are in the midst of a huge yet largely invisible crisis that begs serious focus and durable remedies.

I am referring to the aging out crisis.

Every year, 50,000 young people on the autism spectrum matriculate into adulthood and are in the process of losing essential services. Individuals with autism in the aging out generation and their parents find themselves entering into a system unprepared to meet their needs, and one that disincentivizes the opportunity and independence the Society has worked to achieve.

With the strong support and hard work of the Society, last Congress, we enacted my Autism CARES Act which calls for an agency report that lays the foundation for better addressing the aging out crisis.

The Society provided extremely valuable input into my legislation, now P.L. 113–157, which authorizes $1.3 billion over five years to continue the critical pipeline of federal research dollars, and was the first piece of enacted legislation to address aging out. The Autism CARES Act tasked multiple Federal agencies to provide a comprehensive study on the needs of autistic young adults and transitioning youth and how they can better shape policies and programs to meet these needs.

This important law—like so many critical policy changes over the past 50 years—would not have been possible without the Autism Society of America.

I am so proud of and deeply grateful for the work of all of the volunteers and staff of the Autism Society of America and their affiliates. Thank you for your hard work and daily commitment to improving the lives of individuals with autism.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 85 on H.R. 734, I am not recorded due to inclement weather resulting in a travel delay. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye.

WELCOMING ONA BROWN TO "MOVING FORWARD AND SETTING THE WORLD"

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Ms. Ona Brown to the annual Black History Month event "Moving Forward and Setting the World," organized by the Canisius College Academic Talent Search Program. The Moving Forward and Setting the World event will feature the African-German Art Exhibition from Homestory, Germany to honor Black History Month.

The Canisius College Academic Talent Search Program, the host of this event, has shaped a positive impact on many Western New York communities. The program is among eight federally funded TRiO programs established under Title IV of the Higher Education act of 1965. The Academic Talent Search Program provides educational, social and career support services for individuals with disadvantaged backgrounds in local schools and community service organizations.

Ms. Ona Brown, whom I welcome to this event, has recently been named one of the top five speakers in the world by Toastmasters

International. With more than fifteen years of public speaking experience Ms. Brown works with her consulting firm World Network Now to inspire and empower individuals around the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to welcome the accomplished Ms. Ona Brown. I ask you to join me in thanking Ms. Brown for speaking at this valued local event. I wish Ms. Brown the best on her mission to change the lives of individuals across the globe.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATHLEEN HODEL

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exemplary Arizonan, volunteer and fundraiser. Kathleen Hodel has become one of Lake Havasu City's greatest assets over her 20-year career. During this time she has been involved with and served on the boards of some 18 community organizations.

Two years ago, Kathy Hodel was diagnosed with an aggressive form of bone cancer. The irony of the situation that Kathy has spent years of her life fundraising for cancer research and cancer patients is not lost. She still continues fundraising and is an active member of her community.

Some of Ms. Hodel's most lasting efforts can be attributed to the fundraising she has done on behalf of Mohave Community College Foundation, resulting in a new library, classroom buildings, and scholarships for students.

Her list of achievements and awards is long and well-deserved. Most recently, in November of 2014, Kathy Hodel was recognized by the Greater Arizona Chapter of the Association of Fundraising Professionals with the Spirit of Philanthropy Award at the 30th Annual Leadership in Philanthropy Awards Dinner.

It is my honor to commend Kathy Hodel for being such a shining beacon of positive influence and selflessness in the Mohave County community. She is an example to us all of what can be achieved with hard work, determination, enthusiasm and compassion. Kathy, we thank you for your lifetime of service.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL WILLIAM B. WALKUP—TENNESSEE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel William B. Walkup, Commander of the Tennessee National Guard's 118th Wing, Mission Support Group.

After 32 years of dedicated service to our state and country, Colonel Walkup has announced his retirement, effective April 18, 2015.

Through the numerous roles and positions of leadership, Colonel Walkup has made a lasting impact on the guardsmen of the 118th Wing and our state's Air National Guard.

Over the past three decades, Colonel Walkup was a Squadron Navigator, Chief of Current Operations, Chief Navigator, Operations Support Squadron Commander, Aircraft Maintenance Squadron Commander and Maintenance Group Commander. Colonel Walkup has participated in deployments to the Middle East, Europe, Central and South America, and Southwest Asia. He has flown combat and support missions in Somalia, Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

While deployed abroad during Operation Iraqi Freedom, Colonel Walkup served as the 485th Deputy Maintenance Group Commander, in charge of the largest C–130 contingent in the war with 46 assigned aircrafts. In addition, Colonel Walkup served as the 486th and 332nd Maintenance Group Commander, during which he successfully lead over two hundred members in humanitarian, logistics and aircraft maintenance support with deployments to Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Kuwait for Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Joint Forge, the Global War on Terrorism, and Operation Unified Response.

Colonel Walkup's success as a guardsman is the product of hard work, an exceptional level of dedication, and a love for country that is unparalleled.

Mr. Speaker, this recognition is certainly well-deserved and is a testament to the heroism and dedication to duty that has marked Colonel Walkup's exemplary service in the Tennessee Air National Guard. I, along with the citizens of a grateful state and nation, extend a heartfelt thanks for his outstanding service to this great country and wish him the very best upon his retirement.

THE MEDICAID PHYSICIAN SELF–REFERRAL ACT OF 2015

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Medicaid Physician Self-Referral Act of 2015. This bill makes a necessary clarification to Section 1902 of the Social Security Act. It provides that Medicaid designated health services claims are subject to the same requirements as Medicare designated health services claims under the Physician Self-Referral Law.

Currently, there is uncertainty among stakeholders regarding the extent to which the requirements of the Physician Self-Referral Law apply to Title XIX of the Social Security Act. As a result, an important tool for fighting fraud in the healthcare system—which has successfully been employed for many years in the Medicare program—is underutilized in the Medicaid context. Congressional action is needed to provide legislative clarity that will strengthen the integrity of the Medicaid program in this area.

Health care providers subject to the Physician Self-Referral Law should not be able to avoid penalties simply because a claim is a Medicaid claim rather than a Medicare claim. Both programs involve taxpayer money and we need to ensure that law enforcement officials have the tools they need to combat fraud, waste, and abuse.

Although the law has long provided that the Medicaid and Medicare programs are on equal footing with respect to the Physician Self-Referral Law, this bill leaves no doubt that Congress intends this to be the case.

HONORING LARRY SHARP

HON. PETE AGUILAR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of Larry Sharp, a community leader from California's Inland Empire. Over the course of his career, Larry Sharp was a consistent advocate for working families. From his leadership on crucial economic projects, to his devotion to public education, to his dedication to support local businesses, Larry was an integral part of our community.

While Larry was the successful CEO and President of Arrowhead Credit Union, he was better known in the community as a leader, activist, father, and grandfather. He was a true community leader, never failing to stand up and defend his friends or neighbors when they were in need. During one of the most difficult times in recent memory, the 2008 economic crisis, Larry was at the forefront of helping Inland Empire residents facing housing and financial challenges. He worked with Republicans and Democrats at all levels of government, as long as it meant he was working on behalf of his community.

Larry was a leader, an advocate, but most importantly—he was a dear friend and mentor. He served his community for decades, and we are so much better for it. He will be dearly missed by his wife Cassie, five children, four grandchildren, and the entire Inland Empire Community. We will always be indebted to him for his devotion and work that bettered the lives of San Bernardino County's working families.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEDICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. JOHN SHEA, JR.

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and medical contributions of renowned surgeon, innovator and "father of middle-ear surgery," Memphian Dr. John Shea, Jr. A graduate of the University of Notre Dame and Harvard Medical School, Dr. Shea served in the Korean War before returning to Memphis and taking over his father's medical practice in 1952. Two years later, he traveled to Vienna, Austria where he began extensive research into otosclerosis that would lead to his inventing the world's first prosthetic stapes—the tiny stirrup-shaped bone in the middle ear—and performing the groundbreaking stapedectomy procedure, which has since been used by doctors worldwide.

While in Vienna, he read German manuscripts on otosclerosis, which is a condition of the inner ear that causes calcification of the

stapes and is considered a leading cause of deafness. Although the medical community ended surgical attempts to address this condition 50 years earlier, Dr. Shea had a vision to combat this cause of deafness in middle-aged adults by replacing the calcified bone with a prosthetic. While many of his colleagues questioned the procedure as dangerous, Dr. Shea was convinced through his research that the revolutionary surgery would work. On May 1, 1956, he successfully performed the first stapedectomy and went on to repeat the procedure nearly 50,000 times during his career before retiring in 2011.

In addition to inventing the prosthetic stapes and developing the stapedectomy, Dr. Shea contributed to otology surgical instruments, including drills and microscopes, and intratympanic perfusion treatment for Meniere's disease or spontaneous vertigo. His ingenuity earned him a spot on the London Times list of "1,000 Makers of the Twentieth Century" and a 1962 featured cover article in Life magazine as one of five people who were recognized as part of "The Takeover Generation." In 2013, he donated 406 papers, including over 300 published articles, documenting his life's work to the local Memphis Public Library's Memphis Room. Dr. Shea belonged to more than 50 scientific societies, and was a clinical professor in the otolaryngology departments of the University of Tennessee, the University of Mississippi, the University of North Carolina and Tulane University. Additionally, he received honorary doctorates from Memphis schools Christian Brothers University and Rhodes College, and an honorary fellowship from the Australian and English Royal College of Surgeons.

In 1985, Dr. Shea opened the Shea Ear Clinic at Poplar and Ridgeway in Memphis where his son, Dr. Paul Shea, continues the family practice today. Dr. Shea, Jr. was a pioneer in the field of otology and a legendary doctor who helped usher in a new era of treatment. He came from one family of physicians and leaves behind another. My father, Dr. Morris D. Cohen, taught me about Dr. Shea, Sr. and Jr. and always spoke admiringly of them and their level of professionalism. While many Memphis physicians have received national acclaim, none have been more renowned than Dr. John Shea, Jr. Memphis will miss Dr. John Shea, Jr., and I send my condolences to his wife Lynda Lee Mead; sons Paul and Dr. John Shea III (private practice otologist); daughters Susanna Shea and Wendy Canarios; seven grandchildren and three great grandchildren; and his friends and loved ones. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and medical contributions of Dr. John Shea, Jr. His was a life well-lived.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN FLEMING

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington for votes on Tuesday, February 24, 2015. Winter weather conditions in Northern Louisiana caused my flight to be cancelled. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted NAY on H.R. 212 and AYE on H.R. 734.

HONORING DR. ERNO DANIEL

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of Dr. Erno Scipiades Daniel who passed away on February 21, 2015. Dr. Daniel was a devoted and renowned physician in our local community of Santa Barbara, California and although he has passed, his legacy will remain with us for years to come.

Dr. Daniel was born on December 15, 1946 in Budapest, Hungary and as a child lived through the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. As a teenager he immigrated to the United States with his mother and sister to reunite with his father who left for the U.S. a decade earlier. In 1964, Dr. Daniel not only earned his American citizenship, but also a high school diploma from Santa Barbara High School. He continued his studies at the California Institute of Technology earning an undergraduate degree in chemistry, later receiving a master's degree and PhD from the University of California, San Diego. An outstanding and hard-working student, Dr. Daniel then graduated from medical school at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he also completed his residency in internal medicine.

Dr. Daniel is known as a dedicated and distinguished physician throughout our community where he practiced at the local Sansum Clinic since 1978. Later in his life he also served as the medical director of the Vista del Monte Rehabilitation and Care Center, was on the medical and scientific advisory board of the Center for Cognitive Fitness and Innovative Therapies of Santa Barbara, and devoted his time at Santa Barbara's Cottage Hospital teaching in the internal medicine residency program. Known for his expertise in geriatric medicine, Dr. Daniel established himself as a leading educator in dementia and Alzheimer's disease. He traveled across the United States lecturing on these diseases and was the author of a variety of educational sources discussing the topic.

Not only was Dr. Daniel a brilliant physician, but also a loving husband, father, and grandfather. Married to the love of his life for over 38 years, there was nothing that brought him greater happiness than his family. His medical legacy and kindness towards others will live on through both his family and the numerous patients whose lives he touched throughout his professional career. He will be greatly missed by his colleagues, patients, family, and the greater Santa Barbara community.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to Dr. Daniel's family and friends, and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this exemplary citizen and member of the Santa Barbara community.

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, February 26, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 3

9 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Commerce and the Department of Transportation.

SR–253

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine a review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SH–216

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Federal Reserve accountability and reform.

SD–538

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest

To hold an oversight hearing to examine United States citizenship and immigration services, focusing on ensuring angency priorities comply with the law.

SD–226

MARCH 4

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of the Interior.

SD–124

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine wasteful duplication in the Federal government.

SD–608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security

To hold hearings to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on oversight and reform of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

SR–253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2015'', S. 280, to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, H.R. 460, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, H.R. 615, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, an original bill entitled, ''Federal Improper Payments Coordination Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Presidential Library Donations Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Federal Vehicle Repair Costs Savings Act'', S. 546, to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, S. 242, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, S. 86, to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns, and S. 136, 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.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine whistleblower retaliation at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, focusing on improving protections and oversight.

SD–226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SD–G50

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Navy and Marine Corps.

SD–192

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD–192

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Personnel

To hold hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR–232A

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 438, to provide for the repair, replacement, and maintenance of certain Indian irrigation projects.

SD–628

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President 2015.

SD–106

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine United States nuclear weapons policy, programs, and strategy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR–222

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the postures on the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD–G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine opportunities for the United States to build on its status as an Arctic nation for the betterment of the nation and those who live in the Arctic.

SD–366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine America's health information technology (IT) transformation, focusing on translating the promise of electronic health records into better care.

SD–430

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from the American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Military Officers Association of America, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, and the National Council on Aging.

CHOB–345

MARCH 12

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To receive a closed briefing on missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SVC–217

MARCH 17

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the state of technological innovation related to the electric grid.

SD–366

MARCH 18

10 a.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from multiple veterans service organizations.

SD–G50

MARCH 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine management reforms to improve forest health and socioeconomic opportunities on the nation's forest system.

SD–366

MARCH 25

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR–222

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1085–S1126.

Measures Introduced: Twenty-one bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 555–575, and S. Res. 85–87. **Pages S1117–18**

Measures Passed:

Centennial of the Navy Reserve: Senate agreed to S. Res. 86, recognizing March 3, 2015, as the centennial of the Navy Reserve. **Pages S1123–24**

Measures Considered:

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

Pages S1085, S1090–99, S1099–S1109

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 February 5, 2015, was agreed to. **Page S1104**

The motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on February 5, 2015, was agreed to. **Page S1104**

By 98 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 58), 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.

Pages S1104–05

Subsequently, the third motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill was rendered moot.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture, at approximately 11 a.m., on Thursday, February 26, 2015, and that all time during the adjournment or recess of the Senate count against post-cloture time. **Page S1124**

Appointments:

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106–286, appointed the following Member to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Senator Rubio.

Page S1124

Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, as amended, appointed the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Senator Blunt. **Page S1124**

Congressional Award Board: The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 96–114, as amended, appointed the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: Senator Manchin vice The Honorable Max Baucus of Montana. **Page S1124**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Cuba and of the emergency authority relating to the regulation of the anchorage and movement of vessels, as amended; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–7) **Page S1116**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

Amias Moore Gerety, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Willie E. May, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Katherine Simonds Dhanani, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Somalia.

Sheila Gwaltney, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kyrgyz Republic.

Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2020.

Cono R. Namorato, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

4 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S1125–26**

Messages from the House: **Page S1116**

Measures Referred: **Page S1116**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1116–17**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1117**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1118–20**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1120–23**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1115–16**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1123**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—58) **Page S1105**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:23 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Thursday, February 26, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1124.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: AIR FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force, after receiving testimony from Deborah Lee James, Secretary, and General Mark A. Welsh, Chief of Staff, both of the Air Force, Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine healthcare recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, after receiving testimony from Alphonso Maldon, Jr., Chairman, and Stephen E. Buyer, Michael R. Higgins, General Peter W. Chiarelli, USA (Ret.), Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., USN (Ret.), each a Commissioner, all of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, Department of Defense; Vice Admiral Norbert R. Ryan, Jr., USN (Ret.), Military Officers Association of America, Joyce W. Raezer, National Military Family Association, and Thomas J. Snee, Fleet Reserve Association, all of Alexandria, Virginia; and Major General Gus L. Hargett, Jr., ARNG (Ret.), National Guard Association of the United States, Washington, D.C.

REGIONAL NUCLEAR DYNAMICS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine regional nuclear dynamics, after receiving testimony from Andrew F. Krepinevich, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, Matthew Kroenig, Georgetown University, and George Perkovich, and Ashley J. Tellis, both of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, all of Washington, D.C.

AMERICA'S DEBT

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine America's debt, after receiving testimony from Laurence J. Kotlikoff, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts; Heather Pfitzenmaier, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.; and Bruce Bartlett, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy, Great Falls, Virginia.

INTERNET GOVERNANCE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine preserving the multistakeholder model of Internet governance, after receiving testimony from Lawrence E. Strickling, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, National Telecommunications and Information Administration; Fadi Chehade, Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, Los Angeles, California; and David A. Gross, Wiley Rein LLP, Washington, D.C.

MAP–21 REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21) reauthorization, focusing on perspectives from owners, operators, and users of the system, after receiving testimony from Carlos M. Braceras, Utah Department of Transportation Executive Director, Salt Lake City, on behalf of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; Steve Heminger, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, San Francisco, California; Thomas J. Riordan, Neenah Enterprises, Inc., Neenah, Wisconsin,

on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers; Dave Gardner, Ingredion Incorporated, Chicago, Illinois, on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and Walt Rowen, Susquehanna Glass Co., Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

FIGHT AGAINST ISIS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), focusing on building the coalition and ensuring military effectiveness, after receiving testimony from General John R. Allen, (USMC, Ret.), Special Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL, Department of State.

21ST CENTURY REGULATORY SYSTEM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine a 21st century regulatory system, after receiving testimony from Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, and Michael Mandel, Progressive Policy Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; Jerry Ellig, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia; and Sally Katzen, New York University School of Law, New York, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 230, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska;

S. 321, to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe; and

S. 501, to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico.

INDIAN PROGRAMS BUDGET

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for Indian programs, after receiving testimony from Kevin Washburn, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Yvette Roubideaux, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for American Indians and Alaska Natives; and Rodger J. Boyd, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Office of Native American Programs.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 38 public bills, H.R. 1055–1092; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 124–127, were introduced. **Pages H1162–64**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1165–66**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 125, providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–29). **Page H1162**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Hardy to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1119**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:17 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1121**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Tierian Cash, National Chaplain for the American Legion, Longs, South Carolina. **Page H1121**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a voice vote. **Pages H1121, H1142**

Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans: The House passed H.R. 529, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans, by a recorded vote of 401 ayes to 20 noes, Roll No. 90. **Pages H1135–42**

Rejected the Ted Lieu (CA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 176 yeas to 243 nays, Roll No. 89. **Pages H1139–41**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Page H1135**

H. Res. 121, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 529) and (H.R. 5), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 87, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 86. **Pages H1126–34**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Tuesday, February 24th:

STEM Education Act of 2015: H.R. 1020, to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas to 8 nays, Roll No. 88.

Page H1135

Announcement by the Chair: The Speaker addressed the Members on matters of decorum in the House. **Page H1141**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 124, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H1142**

Student Success Act: The House began consideration of H.R. 5, to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, and inform parents of the performance of their children's schools. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H1142–50**

H. Res. 121, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 529) and (H.R. 5), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 87, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 86.

Pages H1126–34

Recess: The House recessed at 6:42 p.m. and reconvened at 9:56 p.m. **Page H1161**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared on March 1, 1996, with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft in international airspace north of Cuba on February 24, 1996, as amended and expanded on February 26, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2015—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–12).

Page H1161

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1133–34, H1134, H1135, H1140–41, and H1141–42. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Committee Meetings

REVIEW OF THE SNAP PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing to review the past, present and future of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE MILITARY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on quality of life in the military. Testimony was heard from Command Sergeant Major Daniel A. Dailey, United States Army; Master Chief Petty Officer Michael D. Stevens, United States Navy; Sergeant Major Ronald Green, United States Marine Corps; and Chief Master Sergeant James A. Cody, United States Air Force.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary budget. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Agriculture officials: Thomas Vilsack, Secretary; Robert Johansson, Chief Economist; and Michael Young, Budget Officer.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on Internal Revenue Service oversight. Testimony was heard from J. Russell George, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, Department of the Treasury; and Nina E. Olson, National Taxpayer Advocate, Internal Revenue Service.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Department of Health and Human Services budget. Testimony was heard from Sylvia Burwell, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AND NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Justice, Department of

Commerce, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration oversight. Testimony was heard from Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, Department of Justice; Todd J. Zinser, Inspector General, Department of Commerce; and Paul K. Martin, Inspector General, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of the Interior budget. Testimony was heard from Sally Jewell, Secretary, Department of the Interior; and Mike Connor, Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Housing and Urban Development budget. Testimony was heard from Julian Castro, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, AND UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on House of Representatives, Government Accountability Office, and United States Capitol Police budgets. Testimony was heard from Ed Cassidy, Chief Administrative Officer, House of Representatives; Karen L. Haas, Clerk, House of Representatives; Paul D. Irving, Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives; Gene Dodaro, Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office; and Kim Dine, Chief of Police, United States Capitol.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a hearing on Department of State and Foreign Operations budget. Testimony was heard from John Kerry, Secretary, Department of State.

HOW IS DOD RESPONDING TO EMERGING SECURITY CHALLENGES IN EUROPE?

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''How Is DOD Responding to Emerging Security Challenges in Europe?''. Testimony was heard from General Philip Breedlove, USAF, Commander, Supreme Allied Command Europe and U.S. European Combatant Command; and Christine Wormuth, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET REQUEST FOR SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing entitled ''Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces''. Testimony was heard from Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition); Vice Admiral Joseph P. Mulloy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Integration of Capabilities and Resources; and Lieutenant General Kenneth Glueck, Jr., USMC, Deputy Commandant for Combat Development, and Integration, and Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS AND PROGRAMS: SUPPORTING CURRENT OPERATIONS AND PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE THREAT ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled ''Information Technology Investments and Programs: Supporting Current Operations and Planning for the Future Threat Environment''. Testimony was heard from Terry Halvorsen, Acting Department of Defense Chief Information Officer; Lieutenant General Robert S. Ferrell, United States Army, Chief Information Officer/G–6; Lt Gen William J. Bender, United States Air Force, Chief, Information Dominance and Chief Information Officer; John Zangardi, Acting Department of the Navy Chief Information Officer, and Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Information Operations and Space; and Brigadier General Kevin J. Nally, United States Marine Corps, Director, Command, Control, Communications, and Computers (C4)/Chief Information Officer of the Marine Corps.

MEMBERS' DAY

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Members' Day''. Testimony was heard from Chairman Goodlatte, and Representatives Nugent, Schweikert, Edwards, Wilson of South Carolina, Larsen of Washington, Gabbard, Foster, Hill, Salmon, Esty, Beatty, Barr, Posey, Kildee, Schakowsky, Jackson Lee, McGovern, Hoyer, Love, Hahn, Takai, Amodei, and Mooney of West Virginia.

THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 EPA BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power; and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, held a joint hearing entitled ''The Fiscal Year 2016 EPA Budget''. Testimony was heard from Gina McCarthy, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE OF THE INTERNET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''The Uncertain Future of the Internet''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy''. Testimony was heard from Janet Yellen, Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS IN A TROUBLED WORLD: THE FY 2016 FOREIGN AFFAIRS BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Advancing U.S. Interests in a Troubled World: The FY 2016 Foreign Affairs Budget''. Testimony was heard from John F. Kerry, Secretary of State, Department of State.

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT'S CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING PROPOSAL

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining the President's Cybersecurity Information Sharing Proposal''. Testimony was heard from Suzanne Spaulding, Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Phyllis Schneck, Deputy Under Secretary, Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; and Eric Fischer, Senior Specialist, Science and Technology, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF OBAMA'S EXECUTIVE ACTIONS ON IMMIGRATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Unconstitutionality of Obama's Executive Actions on Immigration''. Testimony was heard from Adam Laxalt, Attorney General of Nevada; and public witnesses.

A REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY'S POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE APPREHENSION, DETENTION, AND RELEASE OF NON-CITIZENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security; and Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules, held a joint hearing entitled ''A Review of the Department of Homeland Security's Policies and Procedures for the Apprehension, Detention, and Release of Non-Citizens Unlawfully Present in the United States''. Testimony was heard from Scott R. Jones, Sheriff, Sacramento County Sheriff's Department; and public witnesses.

PREVENTING ANOTHER MH370: SETTING INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR AIRLINE FLIGHT TRACKING

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Transportation and Public Assets held a hearing entitled ''Preventing Another MH370: Setting International Standards for Airline Flight Tracking''. Testimony was heard from Christopher A. Hart, Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; Michael A. Lawson, Ambassador, United States Mission to the International Civil Aviation Organization; and a public witness.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5, the ''Student Success Act''. The committee granted, by voice vote, a rule providing for further consideration of H.R. 5 under a structured rule. The rule provides no additional general debate. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–8, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by its proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The

rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Scott of Virginia, Pocan, Jeffries, DeSaulnier, Garrett, Maxine Waters of California, Dold, Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Sewell of Alabama, Collins of Georgia, Polis, Bridenstine, Jackson Lee, Gibson, Butterfield, Walker, Tonko, Richmond, Titus, Bera, Castro of Texas, and Lawrence.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''An Overview of the Department of Energy's Budget Proposal for Fiscal Year 2016''. Testimony was heard from Ernest Moniz, Secretary, Department of Energy.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1030, the ''Secret Science Reform Act of 2015''; and H.R. 1029, the ''EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015''. H.R. 1030 and H.R. 1029 were both ordered reported, as amended.

THE SBA BUDGET FOR FY 2016: DOES IT MEET THE NEEDS OF AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES?

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The SBA Budget for FY 2016: Does it Meet the Needs of America's Small Businesses?''. Testimony was heard from Maria Contreras-Sweet, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET REQUEST FOR COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''President's Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Programs''. Testimony was heard from Admiral Paul F. Zukunft, Commandant, United States Coast Guard; Paul ''Chip'' N. Jaenichen, Sr., Administrator, Maritime Administration; and Mario Cordero, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; MAINTAINING THE DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND'S SOLVENCY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress and a hearing on maintaining the Disability Insurance Trust Fund's solvency. The subcommittee successfully organized. Testimony was heard from Charles P. Blahous III, Public Trustee, Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees; and public witnesses.

WORLD WIDE THREATS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''World Wide Threats''. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Senate Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the American Legion, after receiving testimony from Michael D. Helm, The American Legion, Washington, D.C.

SERBIA'S OSCE LEADERSHIP

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Serbia's leadership of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), focusing on priorities and insights regarding the ongoing work of the OSCE, after receiving testimony from First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, Ivica Dacic, Belgrade, Serbia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Commerce, 10:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to resume hearings to examine worldwide threats, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Forest Service, 9:45 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''End Modern Slavery and Trafficking Initiative Act of 2015'', 9:30 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine medical and public health preparedness and response, focusing on future threats, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, S. 166, to stop exploitation through trafficking, and the nominations of Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be Attorney General, Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alfred H. Bennett, George C. Hanks, Jr., and Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., each to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Jill N. Parrish, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, and Nancy B. Firestone, of Virginia, Thomas L. Halkowski, of Pennsylvania, Patricia M. McCarthy, of Maryland, Jeri Kaylene Somers, of Virginia, and Armando Omar Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for Veterans' programs and fiscal year 2017 advance appropriations request, 9:30 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Nutrition, hearing to better understand the SNAP population through published research, 1 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on Department of Energy budget, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Agriculture, Food Safety and Inspection Service budget, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on United States Navy budget, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, oversight hearing on the vital responsibility of serving the nation's aging and disabled communities, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on Environmental Protection Agency budget, 1 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Transportation budget, 1 p.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, hearing on Architect of the Capitol and Library of Congress budgets, 1:30 p.m., HT–2 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Outside Perspectives on the President's Proposed Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Strategic Forces'', 1:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections; and Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled ''The Blacklisting Executive Order: Rewriting Federal Labor Policies Through Executive Fiat'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Examining the FY 2016 HHS Budget'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Update: Patent Demand Letter Practices and Solutions'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, hearing entitled ''The Future of Housing in America: Oversight of the Federal Housing Administration—Part II'', 10 a.m., 2220 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled ''Across the Other Pond: U.S. Opportunities and Challenges in the Asia Pacific'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled ''The President's New Cuba Policy and U.S. National Security'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations; and Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, joint hearing entitled ''The Shame of Iranian Human Rights'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled ''Assessing DHS's Performance: Watchdog Recommendations to Improve Homeland Security'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, hearing entitled ''Addressing Remaining Gaps in Federal, State, and Local Information Sharing'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, hearing entitled ''ISIL in America: Domestic Terror and Radicalization'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing on H.R. 870, the ''Puerto Rico Chapter 9 Uniformity Act of 2015'', 11:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The U.S. Copyright Office: Its Functions and Resources'', 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules, hearing entitled ''From Health Care Enrollment to Tax Filing: A PPACA Update'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Interior, hearing entitled ''Examining the Impacts of EPA Air and Water Regulations on the States and the American People'', 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''IRS: TIGTA Update'', 7 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled ''Overview of the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Proposals for the National Science Foundation and National Institute of Standards and Technology'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1021, the ''Protecting the Integrity of Medicare Act of 2015''; H.R. 284, the ''Medicare DMEPOS Competitive Bidding Improvement Act of 2015''; H.R. 876, the ''NOTICE Act''; and H.R. 887, the ''Electronic Health Fairness Act of 2015'', 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Thursday, February 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 240, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, post-cloture.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, February 26

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 5—Student Success Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Aguilar, Pete, Calif., E251
Barr, Andy, Ky., E247
Bost, Mike, Ill., E247
Capps, Lois, Calif., E252
Cárdenas, Tony, Calif., E246
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E247
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E251
Cook, Paul, Calif., E249
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E248
Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E245
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E249
DesJarlais, Scott, Tenn., E251
Fleming, John, La., E252
Forbes, J. Randy, Va., E249
Foster, Bill, Ill., E246
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E251
Harper, Gregg, Miss., E247, E250
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E247
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E246, E250
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E250
Langevin, James R., R.I., E249
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E249
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E248
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E251
McGovern, James P., Mass., E249
Olson, Pete, Tex., E248
O'Rourke, Beto, Tex., E246
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E250
Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E245
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E250
Smith, Jason, Mo., E248
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E249
Walters, Mimi, Calif., E245
Wilson, Frederica S., Fla., E245
Young, Todd C., Ind., E246, E248

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 Publishing 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 Publishing 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 Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.