United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2013 No. 74

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 23, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN YODER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Pastor Frank Hampton, Jr., Church of God, Jackson, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we are eternally grateful for the opportunity to approach Your throne as we open this session of Congress in prayer.

We pray for Your particular blessings on those in authority. Please give them guidance, the understanding to recognize the gravity of their responsibilities, and the courage to be unwilling to compromise integrity and moral convictions for any political advantage.

Lord, we are cumbered with critical issues and we are exhausting our resources. In this time of chaos and confusion, we need Your mercy and divine assistance as no other time in our Nation's history. And You said, if we would acknowledge You in all our ways, You would direct our path.

Although circumstances are mounting, Your Word gives us hope. It says, ''If My people, which are called by My name, will humble themselves and pray, and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.''

So Lord, at this time we are honestly appealing to Thee in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore 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 pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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 PASTOR FRANK HAMPTON, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Pastor Frank Hampton, Jr., has been praying over his congregation at the Church of God in Jackson, Michigan, since 1967. Today, it's an honor to have him praying over the U.S. House of Representatives.

Back in Michigan, Pastor Hampton has lived, worked, and served the Jackson community for over 45 years and is a well-respected man of God. Local business owners, elected officials, and pastors from around the country seek his counsel on matters of faith and life itself. I'm grateful for the opportunity to learn from his wisdom and to call him my friend.

I first met Pastor Hampton in 2003 and admire him for his sincere faith and heart of service. His impact has been long and consistent, whether in his church, community, the family barbershop, or his ministry to prisoners in the court system. Pastor Hampton's influence has extended beyond the State of Michigan, speaking at venues in Panama, the Cayman Islands, Honduras, Haiti, and Jamaica.

I sincerely appreciate Pastor Hampton's presence today and his thoughtful prayer. My hope is that Pastor Hampton will continue to have many opportunities to share his faith and uphold this great country in prayer.

May God bless you and all the work you do.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 5 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

Printed on recycled paper.

IT'S TIME TO BUILD THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

(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, for over 1,700 days, the administration has delayed the Keystone XL pipeline application. According to a recent Pew Research poll, two-thirds of the American people from both political parties support the project. Last night, there was a bipartisan vote to promote the pipeline from Canada, America's best energy partner. The completion of the Keystone XL pipeline will create 120,000 jobs and produce 830,000 barrels of oil each day, helping to grow our economy.

Two years ago, I had the opportunity to visit Fort McMurray, Alberta, Canada, and I witnessed firsthand the Canadian oil sands and positive impact that exploration has for American families. In South Carolina's Second Congressional District, companies like Michelin Tire Corporation of Lexington and MTU Detroit Diesel of Aiken County will create jobs due to Keystone's production.

As the American people and a bipartisan Congress support it, let's create jobs and build the Keystone pipeline.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy goes to our British allies in this war who were cowardly attacked at the Royal Artillery Barracks in London yesterday.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF RECENT TORNADO IN OKLAHOMA

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest sympathies for the victims of this week's tornado in Moore, Oklahoma, and the surrounding area. I want to especially pay my respects to my colleagues, Congressmen TOM COLE and JAMES LANKFORD, and their constituents as they begin the difficult work of rebuilding their community following this natural disaster. All of us in this Chamber mourn today for the 24 individuals who were killed, including 9 children, 7 of whom died in their local elementary school. Our thoughts and prayers remain with them and their families.

In the face of such loss, we ask how so many American lives could be taken so quickly. But as we have in the past, through scores of other natural disasters, our country will get through this difficult time, confident in our capacity to persevere through any trial and committed to doing all that we can to help each other. If the spirit of America, in one Nation, indivisible, means anything at all, it means all of us will come together to help Oklahomans through this difficult and painful time.

On behalf of all of the residents of Rhode Island's First Congressional District, I offer my thoughts and prayers to the people of Oklahoma.

PASS THE FARM BILL

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NOEM. Today, I rise in support of passing a 5-year farm bill for rural and urban America. The House Agriculture Committee acted last week to pass a bipartisan farm bill by a vote of 36–10. It saves nearly $40 billion and makes substantial reforms to the food stamp program and farm programs. The bill eliminates direct payments and consolidates many of the conservation programs. Through this, it also saves money but promotes a strong safety net in a way that is accountable to taxpayers.

We recognize that the agriculture community will take some cuts, given our Nation's fiscal situation, but we need to continue to support good policies that support our ability to grow our own food in this country. The farm bill we passed out of the committee represents the first reforms to the food stamp program since 1996. We've put a lot of work into this reform and making sure the money goes exactly where it's needed. It closes loopholes in order to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse. The reforms we make ensure that we can keep integrity in the program. It ensures assistance goes to those who need it most.

I believe we need to hold the Federal Government accountable to the taxpayers, and this bill is a step in the right direction. Our number one industry in South Dakota is agriculture. I'm proud of the families in my State that have dedicated their lives to growing our food.

□ 0910

JOBS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week, the class of 2013 graduates from college. This Congress is offering them a terrible graduation present. The bill we're voting on today would increase the long-term cost of student loans in order to pay for a budget deficit that college students did not create. But worse, this Congress is doing absolutely nothing to address the core challenge in their lives: jobs, jobs, jobs.

The class of 2013 is entering the most difficult job market of any graduating class in memory. Many who have the good fortune to receive jobs will not be using their university-level skills or earning a living wage.

It has been 872 days since I arrived in Congress, and not one vote on jobs. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the class of 2013, I urge you to bring the American Jobs Act to the floor for a vote. It deserves a vote. Our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

ENERGY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as House Republicans continue to get to the bottom of what happened last September in Benghazi, it's important to bear in mind how events around the world affect such things as your family's gas bill here at home.

We import a lot of our energy in this country—that's a fact. It's just a natural part of our global economy. But considering how volatile things can get elsewhere in the world, wouldn't it be a good idea to develop as much energy as we can right here at home? You'd think that would be a commonsense idea, but apparently it hasn't occurred to the Democrats who run Washington.

The Keystone XL pipeline, for instance, would be able to transport 830,000 barrels of oil per day. That's about half the oil the U.S. imports from the Middle East.

The more energy we can produce right here in America, the more jobs and more secure future we create. It's time for the President to approve this pipeline.

STUDENT LOAN BILL

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of affordable student loans for America's students.

I attended California's public schools from kindergarten through undergrad, through medical school. I could afford to go because of Federally funded student loans. My country made an investment in me, and we need to make that same investment in the next generation of students.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee, and they rejected it. This amendment would have made student loans more affordable for today's students. That's what we have to do, invest in the next generation.

Unfortunately, the bill that is coming to the floor today is going to make college less affordable for the next generation. We must make education more accessible. Vote ''no'' on the Making College More Expensive Act.

FOREIGN MANUFACTURERS LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1910, the bipartisan Foreign Manufacturers Legal Accountability Act, which I've introduced

this term with Representative MIKE TURNER of Ohio. This is a bill that will help level the playing field for American manufacturers and retailers and protect American consumers.

Current law allows foreign companies selling defective products in the United States to dodge service of process, and they do. When a foreign company does that, it puts all of the burden on American retailers to account for any harm that is caused because of the defective product. That is not fair to American companies, and it's not fair to American citizens.

This bill streamlines service rules so foreign companies selling products here in America can be served with process here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to support H.R. 1910. Let's make sure that everyone benefiting from the American marketplace plays by American rules.

MENTAL HEALTH MONTH

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, May is Mental Health Month—has been and will continue to be. It is an opportunity to raise awareness and encourage others to get help and to recognize the symptoms and warning signs of mental health issues.

There is a lot of stigma. We must accept it as an illness. We've got to reduce that stigma. We must expand mental health services and give it the parity needed because it does not know boundaries. It affects everybody in every segment of our communities.

It is all right. It's okay to ask for help and learn to recognize the symptoms and to learn about the service providers in your area. We must expand more mental health services to our community. We need it for the military, because one in five suffer from major depression or PTSD.

Youth—suicide, the third leading cause of death; second for college students. School-based mental health services are greatly needed for early intervention. Minority communities—Native Americans highest ethnicity for suicide.

Mental health services must be provided in languages also.

Thank you to the mental health professionals, the 500,000 licensed certified professional counselors that work for us and throughout the United States. Thank you, President Obama, first U.S. President to declare May Mental Health Month.

SMARTER SOLUTIONS FOR STUDENTS ACT

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

Ever since 2006, student loan interest rates have been set by Congress through legislation. As I'm sure all of us remember, about 1 year ago we were affected by the artificially low interest rates that were ready to expire. But instead of finding a viable solution, Congress temporarily extended the rates and put off a permanent decision for another year.

Now, here we are again. And if we do nothing, we will be here in the same exact place again with the fight again at the expense of our college students. Congress should not be in the business of setting interest rates, and H.R. 1911 fixes this problem and prevents Congress from playing political games with our young Americans' future.

The college experience has always been a large part of the American Dream. We want the best for our children. We want them to have the opportunity to pursue a college education and create a better life for themselves. We owe it to our younger generation. We owe it to those high school seniors. And I believe that this bill will take care of that issue.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1911, SMARTER SOLUTIONS FOR STUDENTS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 232

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-12 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 Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. In the engrossment of H.R. 1911, the Clerk shall—

(a) await the disposition of H.R. 1949;

(b) add the text of H.R. 1949, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1911;

(c) conform the title of H.R. 1911 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 1949, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(d) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and (e) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from May 24, 2013, through May 31, 2013—

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

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

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

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 6 p.m. on Wednesday, May 29, 2013, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Agriculture may, at any time before 6 p.m. on Wednesday, May 29, 2013, file a report to accompany H.R. 1947.

□ 0920

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 232 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

As many of us know, on July 1, today's 3.4 percent subsidized Stafford loan interest rate is set to double to 6.8 percent for millions of current students, all because elected officials made a promise they couldn't afford to keep for the long haul. Student borrowers shouldn't have to ride the roller coaster of political largess, wondering every year whether Congress will intervene in time to keep their student loan rates low. And taxpayers shouldn't be expected to foot the bill whenever Members of Congress promise more than they can deliver.

For the sake of students, families, and taxpayers, before July 1 we need to move our Federal student loan programs away from politics. Student loan rates should not be subject to the whims of Washington or seized as bargaining chips.

The Smarter Solutions for Students Act will remove politics, uncertainty, and confusion from the rate-setting equation and instead anchor student loan interest rates on the 10-year Treasury note, not just for 4 years, but for good. By tying rates to the market, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act establishes a predictable rate for loan calculation insulated from the politics and posturing of Washington.

House Republicans aren't alone in finding the answer for predictability in

the market. President Obama offered a similar market-based interest rate plan in his 2014 budget proposal, and some of my colleagues across the aisle have voiced openness to utilizing the market to set interest rates as well.

In developing this legislation, the committee has attempted to build on this common ground and work in good faith with the administration to improve the Smarter Solutions for Students Act and get it to the President's desk by July 1. Students, families, and taxpayers deserve a long-term solution, not more can-kicking from Washington. The Smarter Solutions for Students Act puts an end to the temporary fixes and campaign promises that have failed to deliver the best rates to students.

This legislation offers predictability, simplicity, and the ability for students to take advantage of low rates, even after graduation, a need particularly acute in today's jobless economy. The American people deserve the clarity, certainty, and protection the Smarter Solutions for Students Act offers.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On July 1, interest rates on federally subsidized Stafford student loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. At a time, as everybody said this morning, when job prospects for students remain few and far between, we must not—or should not—let student loan interest rates rise.

That is why it's so disappointing that instead of helping the college students, the majority is doing ''go-nowhere'' legislation—because the Senate will not take this up—that would actually increase loan costs for the Nation's students.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, a student who borrows the maximum subsidized Stafford loans for each of the next 4 years would actually pay $1,056 more under the majority's plan than they would if Congress failed to act and interest rates doubled. That's a rather sobering idea.

This is just the latest example of putting politics and special interests ahead of the American people. As we speak, the majority is preventing a budget from being finalized even though they have been calling for a budget for years.

Currently, both the House and the Senate have passed the budget resolutions, which means the only step left—and everybody who knows how a bill is passed knows this—the only step left is to organize a conference committee to finalize the conference report; yet the majority of the House refuses to appoint conferees and begin the conference process.

Now, why is the majority suddenly abandoning their quest to produce a budget? Is it because their desire for a budget is nothing more than to make political points?

It is clear the majority is consistently choosing to put political interests before the welfare of the Nation, even if it means that the American people will and are suffering. This obstructionism must come to an end.

I urge my colleagues, once again, to reject today's rule and the underlying legislation that will never go past the House so that we can get busy solving the American student loan debt crisis in a bipartisan way. Let's protect our Nation's students from a doubling of student loan interest rates and work together to craft a solution that will end the growing mountain of student debt and ensure college is more affordable for our Nation's students. Our Nation's future depends on it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

It's important to remember how we landed in this predicament to begin with. Why are we now facing this student loan interest rate cliff?

In a push to win votes during the 2006 campaign cycle, Democrats pledged to cut student loan interest rates in half across the board permanently. After gaining control of Congress in 2007, they realized this campaign promise was far too expensive. Instead, they championed legislation to phase down gradually the interest rate on one type of Federal student loan—subsidized Stafford loans made to undergraduates—from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent over 4 years. Once the law expired in 2012, the interest rates would jump back up to 6.8 percent.

Instead of working with Republicans on responsible solutions that would help make higher education more affordable for students in the long run, the Democrat Congress chose to make false promises to borrowers and kick the can down the road.

Democrats had an opportunity to fix this problem. In 2009, they passed the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, which produced large budgetary savings by eliminating the private sector loan program. ''Savings'' should be in quotation marks, Mr. Speaker. But instead of making good on their campaign promises of lower student loan interest rates, Democrats spent all of the funds on other pet projects, including siphoning $8 billion from Federal student aid programs to pay for ObamaCare.

It is time for a long-term solution that gets politicians out of the business of setting student loan interest rates. That is why Republicans approved a 1-year extension of the 3.4 percent interest rate last year to allow time to work on a comprehensive solution. The Smarter Solutions for Students Act is the result of our efforts.

□ 0930

Republicans and Democrats should come together to pass this legislation and ensure students and families don't have to worry about politicians setting arbitrary interest rates or kicking the can down the road for years to come.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her work on this rule last night in the committee.

It has already been said that, in a little more than a month, the interest rates on loans for millions of the neediest students will double to 6.8 percent from the current 3.4 percent. This morning, unfortunately, the Republican majority has put forth a bill that is even worse than if the Congress does nothing.

Think about it. If Congress does nothing, the interest rates go from 3.4 percent for those most in need of the student loans, for those families most in need to finance their educations, and will jump on July 1 to 6.8 percent. We're trying to avoid that because we know what that means to students who have to borrow money and families who have to borrow money to try to pay for their college educations.

What's the remedy of the Republicans?

The remedy of the Republicans is to do something that is worse than letting the interest rates double. Understand that. They've made a choice that's worse than if the interest rates double. It's no wonder that, beyond the Republican caucus, it's very hard to find anybody who is supporting this legislation. In fact, yesterday, the President said, if this bill is sent to his desk—I hope it will not be—that he will veto it.

Why would we do that?

Because it's very clear that this is going to add $4 billion to the debt of our students who Members of Congress lament are so deeply in debt because of the money they have to borrow that goes to education. It's not necessarily a choice for students or families if you want to get a college education, but why would you add $4 billion onto the backs of these students and their families?

Now, the majority had a number of alternatives last night in the Rules Committee. Mr. COURTNEY went there and said, We'll pay for it. We'll raise additional revenues to keep it at 3.4 percent. Then the Education and the Workforce Committee of this House can do its job, which is to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, and we can put in place a long-term program for helping families finance their educations. We have to also understand that we've got to do something about

the State support and the cost of college at the institutional level, but they turned Mr. COURTNEY down.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I offered to have the Obama amendment made in order, the legislation by President Obama, which actually saves students about $30 billion in interest rates over the next 6 years. It saves students and families over $30 billion. They wouldn't make that amendment in order.

Mr. HECK of Nevada came before them and said, Why don't we do like the market does? If you pay your loan on time for 4 years, we'll provide you an incentive to continue to be a good payer of your loan—important to the Treasury, important to the students' credit ratings. Let's try that. They turned Mr. HECK down.

Mr. RICE came before the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, and he said he would like to reduce the interest rates. He understands what students and families are struggling with. They turned him down. They turned down every attempt to try to help students and families.

I appreciate people talking about being through the recession. Well, let me tell you, for a lot of middle-income families, they're not through the recession yet. They've still lost the equity in their homes. They still have their credit problems. But do you know what? Recession or no recession, their kids are graduating from high school, and they want them to go to college. What the hell is this Congress doing making it more difficult for those kids to go to college? But that's the choice the Republicans have given us.

I would hope on a bipartisan basis we would reject this effort and that we would go to work on legislation that is long term, that's in the interest of the students, and stop crushing the aspirations of these families and these students, which this legislation does. It should be rejected. This isn't an interest in the market rates. This is using the market to crush these families by extracting billions of additional dollars off of their school loans.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in my career before coming to Congress, I was the director of an Upward Bound special services program. I was an adviser for students at Appalachian State University. I was the president of a community college. For all of my life, I have devoted my time to helping students—particularly disadvantaged students—who wanted to go to college, who wanted to do the same kind of thing that I did as a disadvantaged person, and that is to get a great education and use that education to better my life.

I am offended that my colleagues would say that what I want to do is to stop people from going to college or to hinder them in any way from achieving the American Dream. My whole goal all my life has been to help other people, particularly young people, and I believe my experience shows that.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's not what this bill is about. This bill is about taking away the arbitrary control of Members of Congress who think of themselves as smarter than everybody else in the world, and it is about allowing the market to work.

The current Federal loan program is broken. An overwhelming majority of students are stuck with interest rates on loans that do not match the current low interest rate environment because of failed Democrat campaign promises to cut student loan interest rates in half permanently. These students are also often confused about why most of their Federal loans are fixed at nearly 7 percent when the market rate is much lower, and they question why each type of student loan has a different rate. To put it simply, student borrowers are getting a raw deal, and they know it.

Under the legislation, student loan interest rates would reset once a year and move with the market, much like they did from 1992 to 2006. This bill is the only viable plan on the table that is fiscally responsible, that helps students and protects taxpayers. We should pass this bill immediately. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the proposal does not cost any additional revenue to implement over the next 5 or 10 years.

H.R. 1911 will provide stability and certainty for students making decisions about how to finance their postsecondary education. They will be assured year after year that the interest rate on their student loans will be similar to market conditions, and they won't have to wonder whether Congress is going to make arbitrary changes to interest rates. The bill offers students the ability to take advantage of interest rates when they're low, and it protects them with affordable caps in high-rate environments. The bill continues current law in which students have the option to consolidate their loans after graduation and to lock in a fixed interest rate for the life of the loan. Mr. Speaker, these are commonsense provisions that will benefit student borrowers greatly.

The legislation also ensures students can continue to take advantage of a number of generous Federal repayment options and debt management programs available to help those experiencing difficulty in repaying their loans. For example, students can enter one of the income-based repayment plans that caps their monthly payments at affordable levels and provides forgiveness after 20 or 25 years. For students in the public sector, the program allows loan forgiveness after 10 years. The Smarter Solutions for Students Act is a long-term, comprehensive solution that gets Washington politicians out of setting interest rates on Federal loans, and it will better serve the interest of students. We should pass this rule and the underlying bill now.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlelady for yielding time, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue and here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 1911. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule to prevent this flawed legislation from moving forward.

We have a student loan debt crisis to be sure, but this is not the solution. A free market approach will not solve this problem, and Mr. MILLER was so accurate in his statement just a moment ago. For my constituents in eastern North Carolina, paying for higher education has never been more difficult.

□ 0940

I represent a very low-income district. One in four people in my district lives below the poverty level. While the economy is recovering, my region's 8.9 percent unemployment rate remains higher than the national average. At the same time, the cost to attend our colleges and universities has been steadily increasing. The cost to attend college is 1,100 percent more expensive than it was 30 years ago. Access to affordable Federal student aid can be the difference between constituents attending college or not.

Just last year, despite strong opposition from Republicans, Congress voted to continue to keep interest rates on federally funded Stafford loans at 3.4 percent, instead of doubling to 6.8 percent. If those rates had doubled, Mr. Speaker, more than 7 million students each would be saddled with an average of $1,000 in additional debt. Once again, the rates are set to double on July 1 unless we act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and this misguided approach. This legislation would tie loan interest rates to the 10-year Treasury note but require that rates adjust each year. That variability, Mr. Speaker, would lead to higher interest rates and increase the debt our students face. In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service indicates that students will pay more than if interest rates were to double. Mr. MILLER was absolutely correct in that assertion. That's right: passing this rule and this bill would be worse than doing nothing at all.

This bill is a step in the wrong direction and will saddle students and families with unnecessary debt.

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

During the 2006 election cycle, Democrats made student borrowers a promise they did not keep. As a result, interest rates on student loans are set to

double in a matter of weeks. The Smarter Solutions for Students Act will provide student borrowers with the certainty and stability they need to finance their education.

Today's graduates are facing severe economic headwinds that make finding a job, repaying student loans, and starting a family extremely difficult. These students want nothing more than the opportunity to earn their own success. That's the American Dream. But for many of them, that dream seems hopelessly out of reach. We can do better, Mr. Speaker.

The overall unemployment rate is 7.5 percent. That's hardly better than the day President Obama took office. Twelve million Americans are unemployed and anxious to get back to work, and 7.9 million Americans are underemployed.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, the slight decline in the unemployment rate is largely a mirage created by declining labor force participation. If the labor force participation rate had not declined since January 2009, the unemployment rate would be 10.9 percent instead of 7.5 percent. As we all know, this is well above the officially reported rate and the stimulus promise of 5.1 percent.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of involuntary part-time workers increased in April by 278,000 to 7.9 million. These are people working part time because their hours were cut back or because they are unable to find a full-time job.

There were 835,000 so-called ''discouraged workers'' in April alone. Discouraged workers are those ''persons not currently looking for work because they believe no jobs are available for them.''

Mr. Speaker, these people aren't just jobless; they're hopeless and they deserve better. It's time to get America working again. But the failed policies of President Obama and Senate Democrats—higher taxes, more spending, and bigger government—are designed to continue to fail to create jobs or spur economic growth. The effects of President Obama's runaway spending, spiraling deficits, and mounting debt are being felt by every American.

When President Obama took office, there were 31.9 million Americans using food stamps. Today, 47.3 million Americans use food stamps. That's an increase of 15.4 million people. Today, 15 percent of the entire U.S. population receives food stamp assistance. That is, by far, the largest number in history.

Mr. Speaker, the policies of this administration are taking us in the wrong direction. The Republicans are focused on creating jobs and making things better for all Americans, and we need to pay attention to those policies. We can pass this rule, pass this bill, and get us going in the right direction for college students.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. I want to thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this rule and discuss the importance of protecting college affordability.

One of my top priorities is to ensure that all students have the opportunity to get a high quality education and acquire the skills needed to compete in the 21st century economy.

I know personally how important this is. When I was young, my father lost his job and my parents never got back on track financially. But thanks to student loans and financial aid, I was able to get a great education and build a successful career as a businesswoman and entrepreneur.

I'm very disappointed that the proposal we are considering today makes college more expensive. If we did nothing and let interest rates double in July, we would actually save students more money in the future than if we pass the underlying bill. It's incredibly disappointing that in our work to make college more affordable, this bill instead makes the problem worse.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule so we can work together on a long-term solution that supports our students and their families.

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

In my last comments, I talked about statistics and the effect of the policies of this administration. These statistics ultimately say the same thing: the Obama economy is making life more difficult for all Americans, especially young people.

Fortunately, House Republicans have a plan to restore economic growth and spur job creation so that graduating students can find employment.

Job creators are being stymied by mountains of regulatory red tape, crippling tax rates, a perplexing Tax Code, needlessly high energy prices, and rampant uncertainty caused by the President's failed leadership. Mr. Speaker, there is a better way.

House Republicans are hard at work passing legislation to help grow the economy and create jobs. Our goal is to tear down the barriers to job creation and unleash the power of American ingenuity so that today's graduates can prosper and succeed and achieve the American Dream.

As part of this plan, we're working diligently to make life easier for student borrowers, cut job-killing red tape that costs small businesses $10,585 per employee each year, reduce gas prices, and create jobs by producing more American energy, which is important since every penny increase per gallon of gas costs consumers $4 million per day. We also need to simplify a job-killing Tax Code that cost Americans $168 billion in 2010 just to comply, prevent job-killing tax hikes on small businesses, and reduce uncertainty by tackling the debt crisis with responsible spending cuts.

The Republican plan will demolish Washington's self-made roadblocks to prosperity and put American job creators back on offense.

The trick to growing our economy is getting politicians out of the way and letting American workers and entrepreneurs do what they do best: create shared prosperity through freedom and innovation. The Smarter Solutions for Students Act is an important part of this plan. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for yielding the time and for being a consistent voice on behalf of families and students across America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' Making College More Expensive Act and the rule, and I rise on behalf of students all across America, particularly back home in Florida and in the Tampa Bay area.

□ 0950

Mr. Speaker, we know that a college education is key to success in life, and that the rising costs of attending college can be an impediment to a student's ability to get into the classroom and get the courses that they need.

About 10 days ago, I was at Tampa's Robinson High School talking with graduating seniors, and they implored me to please stand up for them and be a voice because they see the direct connection on the money that their families have to spend and on their ability to attend college. That is why this Republican Making College More Expensive Act would be so detrimental to the future of our country and to those families and students that really want to get ahead in life.

For example, the GOP's bill is projected to nearly double student loan rates by 2016, and by the time next year's freshmen graduate and start repaying their loans in 2017, the interest rate is expected to more than double beyond today's current rate.

So I think about the 34,000 students in my district who rely on loans, whether they're at Hillsborough Community College, St. Pete College, the University of South Florida, the University of Tampa, or wherever. This Congress has got to stand up for families and students for a change.

So I urge my Republican friends to cross over and join us and to block this student loan increase that the Republican leadership is proposing, side with students and families, oppose the rule and oppose the bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from New York, a good friend; and I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. This comes down to an important question of American domestic policy: how important is it to us as a country to make college possible and accessible for students so they can improve their lives and improve our country.

Some of the great historic moments of American policy, the creation of the land grant colleges, the GI Bill, providing student loans, were directed toward increasing access to higher education. And today, the House will vote on a bill that would reverse decades of progress. It would, in effect, transform the Federal Government into a greedy Wall Street bank, charging students punitive and wildly variable interest rates while banking billions in profits. Yes, the government would reap profits derived from students and recent students.

The authors of this bill see this as government revenue. Instead of collecting taxes, they do it through a back door, trying to pay down the deficit on the backs of students.

So today we have a choice: Do we make college more expensive for our low-income and middle class students? For me, the clear answer is ''no.'' It's wrong. It's shortsighted. It's not right for students. It's not right for families, and it's not right for our economy.

The Rules Committee could have given us a bill to lock in low rates for student loans, in the national interest, not to collect interest from students. But instead, they want to balance the budget on the backs of students and recent students.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleague is accusing Republicans of increasing taxes on students. That is a laughable accusation, especially when you look at the number of proposed tax increases included in the Democrat budget resolution. It's almost as disingenuous as their calling for dedicating the 10-year savings generated by the underlying bill to higher education. After all, in 2010, House Democrats passed the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, SAFRA, which included language that put $13 billion in savings toward deficit reduction. In the final version of SAFRA, Democrats siphoned approximately $9 billion of the $19 billion in savings to pay for ObamaCare. The rest of those savings went to deficit reduction.

The Smarter Solutions for Students Act is a fiscally responsible plan that generates a small amount of savings based on CBO estimates. It stabilizes Federal loan programs for future generations of students and gets Washington out of the business of setting student loan interest rates.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady from New York and the gentlelady from North Carolina. I thank the gentlelady from New York for her persistent leadership on this issue.

I rise today to first ask the question how you can have legislation that sounds positive, but in actuality literally puts the education system of America upside down.

First, let me tell you how frustrated Americans are as they see the drip, drip, dripping of the sequester; and I join the gentlelady in her frustration on why we have not gone to budget reconciliation. I just want to mention the pathway of education so we can see that families are being pounded upon. Sequestration is causing 70,000 children to lose Head Start and Early Head Start. And, unfortunately, 950,000 military children will lose teachers. I live in a State where we have a lot of military bases.

So when I rise today to oppose H.R. 1911, I rise with a high degree of overwhelming frustration for the people who live in my State. I am sorry that this rule did not accept an amendment that I had that would have submitted a report to Congress on the feasibility of offering loan forgiveness for those who put businesses in economically depressed areas. That truly provides for jobs.

But then the real thing is to cap the interest rates at 4 percent. As was indicated by my colleague, Mr. HOLT, he indicated how the numbers would go up for the students. Well, let me talk to you about Parent PLUS. Now, you can really see the oppression on parents who are trying to help their children go to school. In addition to the $100 billion of debt that students are carrying, we now eliminate the feasibility of Parent PLUS loans. Right now in current law, they're $27,956. But if we go into this bill, they'll go up to almost $36,000. Imagine a parent with four children.

I've spoken in the last couple of weeks at the University of Houston-Downtown, the University of Houston, Texas Southern University, Houston Community College. I've spoken at Lone Star colleges, all of these colleges in our districts, St. Thomas.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. All of this does not answer the question when this bill will be passed. I ask my colleagues to oppose the rule, oppose the underlying bill. Cap this. This is not the President's message. The President had an extended life to be able to provide for parents and students. All you have to do is look at the red—$36,000 is what this bill is going to cost parents, and that means that we're going to close the door of opportunity for women, for minorities, and for Americans to get a higher education.

This is not the way in graduation season to say thank you to our children for being successful and graduating from college. Let's oppose this bill and do the right thing for Americans.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'll continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for giving me the time.

We approach July 1 with a problem where if the Congress does nothing, interest rates will double on student loans from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. There are three options that are before the country and before the Congress. The first is to just let it happen, to let the rates go up to 6.8 percent and make higher education less affordable for people in the country.

The second option is the option that's on the floor which will make it worse, to raise the interest rates over the long term higher than 6.8 percent, and cost students and families an additional $3.7 billion to pay for a higher education.

There is a third option offered by Mr. COURTNEY from Connecticut. That option would say let's leave the rates at 3.4 percent for 2 years, let's pay for that decision so it doesn't add to the deficit, and then use those 2 years to negotiate a sensible, long-term solution to the problem.

□ 1000

Now I know that there are those who disagree with Mr. COURTNEY's approach. I know there are those who agree with the Republican approach. But what I don't understand is why all three options aren't before the Congress.

See, what we have in front of us today is to either do nothing and let the rates go to 6.8, or do something and make them go even higher. There's a third and better choice that the majority has refused to let the Congress vote on. I suspect the reason we can't vote on that choice is it would win. It would prevail.

This is supposed to be a body where a majority rules. Instead, it's a body where paralysis rules. This bill will probably pass the floor.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

This bill will probably pass the floor. It will go nowhere, and we will be back sometime in late June trying to solve this problem.

Let's have a democratic vote with a small D. Let's let the House vote on all the options, and I believe Mr. COURTNEY's option to leave the rates at 3.4 percent would and should prevail.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to this bill. Why?

It increases the cost of student debt for millions of Americans just trying to continue their education. It is just another example of the House majority who would put a further burden on the middle class and working families.

Without broad access to a good college education and the opportunities and the social mobility that it provides, there will be no middle class in America. The compact will be broken that allows hard work to pay off and allows future generations to do better.

The costs of college are high today. Over the last 30 years, the average tuition at a 4-year State university has almost quadrupled. Sixty percent of Americans now borrow money for college.

Student loan debt last year passed the trillion dollar mark. The average student loan debt among graduating seniors is over $26,000, a heavy burden to carry into a tough job market.

This bill would compound those costs. A student with that level of debt would pay over $5,300 more in interest than they would if the current interest rates were extended, leaving them at 3.4 percent.

But this is characteristic of the Republican majority. Let me just give you an example and what they view about the opportunity for education.

In the last election, their standard bearer, Mitt Romney, when he was asked the question about increasing the student loan interest rate, this is what he replied. He said that if students need to borrow money, let them go to their parents.

Well, if your father is the head of American Motors, then, in fact, you can go and get a loan from your parents. But if they are not, and what struggling parents are doing today, if their jobs have either gone or their wages are down, or their health benefits are gone, or their home may be underwater on the mortgage because of the crushing recession that we have had, they're telling their children that they can't afford to send them to college. They can't go to their parents for a loan.

That's where my Republican colleagues would take this issue. And instead of us, here, adding further to students' debt, we should work harder to make college more affordable for families. Let us not let those interest rates double this summer.

This bill moves us in the wrong direction. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are concerned about the predictability of the market. What about the predictability of Congress?

Congress is the source of this volatility. Our bill protects students if interest rates rise with caps. Not even President Obama's plan does that.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding me the time, and really appreciate her leadership on this issue.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I tell the young people when I speak to them back home, I say, turn on C–SPAN. If you don't have cable, don't buy cable; go to your friend's house to watch it. But turn on C–SPAN, and every person who comes to the House floor is going to say whatever they're doing today, no matter what it is that they're doing, they're doing it for the young people. They're doing it for that next generation, so the next generation can have a better life.

And I hear that from every single one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We want to come down here and we want to defeat this rule today and we want to defeat this bill today, and we want to do it for the young people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm down here for the young people of my district too. The young people of my district say, ROB, what about our prosperity? What about our future? What about fiscal responsibility?

Why are you and previous generations doing to us what you're doing?

How can we have a guaranteed access to opportunity, not guaranteed success, but guaranteed access to opportunity, going forward?

And the answer is, when we get out of the business of playing political games with every single issue, every single day, and we get back into the business of providing some certainty.

Mr. Speaker, you remember how we got in this predicament today. We got in this predicament because when my friends on the left were in control and they began to deal with student loan rates, at the time they said a 6 percent rate would be good. At the time they said a 4.5 percent rate would be good. Now, suddenly, only a 3.4 percent can be good.

With every single one of these changes, Mr. Speaker, there are economic consequences. We now know in America today student loan debt is greater than all credit card debt combined. It's an amazing burden that we're passing on to the next generation. We're not giving them opportunity; we are ensuring decades of servitude.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, begins to realign marketplace rates with student loan rates, giving every student a tremendously subsidized Federal rate.

And here's the thing, Mr. Speaker. You hear this debate. It's as if this very small portion of the marketplace, these 3.4 percent subsidized loans, are the ''end all, be all'' to every student in America. Not true. Not true.

As my friends on the other side of the aisle know perfectly well but never say, more than 70 percent of all of our students take out both subsidized and unsubsidized loans. And as my friends on the left know perfectly well but never say, they leave those unsubsidized rates at 6.8 percent.

The bill that Ms. FOXX has worked on so carefully with Chairman KLINE brings those rates down to 4.5, maybe even 4.4. We'll see in that last week of Treasury markets in May. But we're tying the fiscal realities of this country to opportunities for our students.

I encourage students, Mr. Speaker, look at your bills, look at your rates. Look at the subsidized and the unsubsidized. You will see what this bill will do for you.

I rise in strong support, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

T-minus 38 days, 38 days until student loan interest rates are scheduled to increase from 3.4 to 6.8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in my district in Colorado, students trying to finance their education through Federally subsidized loans at the University of Colorado and Colorado State University and our other fine universities and, indeed, across the country simply can't afford, in a low interest rate environment today, with the sluggish economy, to have their rates double—double—in 38 days.

Look, there's been a lot of good ideas that have been presented that would allow student loan rates to remain the same or even get better. We had, in our committee, the Education and Labor Committee, a Courtney amendment, which I supported, our Democratic substitute, to keep them at 3.4 percent.

There are even proposals to lower them beyond that. I have a bipartisan bill with Representative PETRI that moves the program over to earnings-contingent education loans, so that repayment amounts are contingent upon how much somebody is earning.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule because it hasn't allowed any of these ideas to be brought forward to the floor.

□ 1010

I was glad to see our ranking member, Mr. MILLER, bring forth the President's proposal, which includes Earnings Contingent Education Loans. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not make it in order under this rule, which is why I oppose it.

The underlying bill is a step in the right direction towards the President's proposal. I think it provides the framework which we need to improve upon in the Senate and work with the administration over the next 38 days to prevent student loan rates from doubling.

First of all, to be clear, the proposal before us on the underlying bill is not the President's proposal. It does not include a robust earnings contingent income-based repayment program. It also

charges a higher rate of interest above the 10-year Treasury note. To its credit, the Kline-Foxx bill does include a cap on interest rates, which is very borrower friendly and student friendly. Again, what's critical here is it provides a framework for moving forward over the next 38 days to resolve this issue and prevent student loan rates from doubling.

The Washington Post editorialized on this 2 days ago and said that the Education and Workforce Committee bill is ''a similar policy'' to President Obama's policy, namely, pegging the student loan rates to a rate at which the government borrows, providing more certainty to borrowers, and helping make sure that college can remain affordable.

I call upon my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

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

America's college students, especially those who have studied math, understand that if Washington can't get its act together, their generation will be stuck paying the tab. So they have little sympathy for elected leaders who refuse to face reality by pretending that recklessly spending money we don't have will somehow translate into economic prosperity. It's time to face the simple truth: government spending won't fix our economy.

America's growing debt is real, and Congress has the responsibility to deal with it. The first step must be reining in government spending by passing a balanced budget. That is why House Republicans took the lead and passed H. Con. Res. 25, the Path to Prosperity Budget. Our budget brings spending discipline back to Washington, which balances the budget in 10 years, provides for comprehensive tax reform without raising tax rates, and removes many of the regulatory barriers that prevent employers from hiring new graduates. The House Republican budget stops spending money we don't have by cutting waste, fixing our broken Tax Code, and balancing in 10 years.

A balanced budget will promote a healthier economy, create more jobs for graduating students, and put more money in Americans' pockets. Our budget provides economic security for workers and families, ensures a secure retirement for the elderly, repairs the safety net, and expands opportunities for graduating students entering the workforce.

Republicans have passed a bold budget that tackles America's most pressing fiscal challenges and grows our economy today to ensure the next generation inherits a stronger, more prosperous America.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best things we can do for college students now and in the future is to provide a stronger economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope my friend's comments mean that the Republicans are ready to appoint conferees.

I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE. Today, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1911, Smarter Solutions for Students Act, the so-called Republican solution to address the impending student loan interest rate raise.

Despite their rhetoric, the Republicans do not want the American economy more competitive. If they did, they would not have introduced this bill. Under the current law, student loan interest rates are fixed. However, H.R. 1911 would change that and student loan interest rates will become variable rates based on the Treasury interest rate plus additional percentage points. This is truly a bait and switch. Students could start their college careers with a 5 percent student interest rate, but by the time they reach their senior year, have a 7.7 to 8.5 percent student loan rate.

Education has traditionally been and still remains a path out of poverty and into the middle class. And it is middle class that has historically been the backbone of America society. Instead of doing the right thing by permanently lowering student loan interest rates, the Republicans have once again decided to do things the wrong way. The Republicans just don't get it.

Oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

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

My colleagues allege, ''The Republican bill raises interest rates on students when we should be providing them with relief from their student loan debt.'' But let me respond to that, Mr. Speaker.

The Smarter Solutions for Students Act will lower the interest rates for all new borrowers in the Stafford loan and PLUS loan programs rather than just extend an artificially low rate to a small subset of borrowers. This makes Federal loans more affordable for all incoming students and parents. The underlying bill helps all students, including those borrowers receiving subsidized loans, whose loans are slated to double, based on the irresponsible actions of the other side.

The bill includes a reasonable cap—something missing in the administration's budget—which protects borrowers in high interest rate environments. If Democrats think the 8.5 percent cap is too high, then let's see their fiscally responsible, paid-for proposal to back up their rhetoric.

The legislation also maintains current law allowing borrowers to take out a consolidation loan after graduation, where they can lock in their interest rate for the life of the loan. Students can also take advantage of a number of repayment plans and debt management initiatives such as the income-based repayment program, loan forgiveness programs, and opportunities for deferment or forbearance.

The Smarter Solutions for Students Act is a comprehensive, responsible solution that will benefit all students and parents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the Veterans Backlog Reduction Act. To discuss our proposal, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1739, the Veterans Backlog Reduction Act. As a retired military veteran, one of my top priorities is caring for our veterans. The sad fact is the VA is not honoring its commitment to our veterans today. There are currently over 900,000 claims waiting to be processed. The average wait for that backlog is now 272 days, or nearly 9 months.

These are real people, real American heroes, who deserve disability benefits because they sustained injuries in service to our country. One of these is Michael Boren of Energy, Illinois. Michael came home from Active Duty in Iraq and Afghanistan with nerve damage, an injured back, and other physical problems. By every measure, Michael is legitimately deserving of disability benefits.

The reason I know about Michael is because he contacted my office a few months ago when he was at the end of his rope and in danger of losing his home. Permanently disabled from his injuries sustained in service, he is unable to find gainful employment to sustain himself and his family. The VA couldn't coordinate his paperwork to make a ruling on his claim for nearly 19 months, all while he waited and worried without income.

Too many veterans like Michael are threatened with home foreclosure, having their cars repossessed, their credit cards cut off, all because the VA can't get its act together. It's shameful. And despite promises from the VA to reduce the backlog, just yesterday we learned the backlog is actually increasing and the VA hasn't met a single one of its benchmarks.

The solution is the Veterans Backlog Reduction Act. It says the VA has 125 days to process claims filed by disabled veterans. If the VA can't live up to a reasonable timetable on processing these claims, then disabled veterans will get a provisional payment until a final ruling is made. If the claim is ultimately deemed valid, then the remainder of the disability benefits will be paid out. If the claim is denied, then the veteran is held harmless and would not have to repay the provisional benefit, unless there would be a finding of fraud or bad faith on the part of the veteran.

□ 1020

The goal is to get these claims processed in a timely manner. And it's my belief that this legislation gives the VA a powerful reason to clean up its act and speed up the process.

This bill serves as a lifeline to countless veterans who can't wait months or years for this problem to be solved. Our veterans are demanding leadership now. This is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. Taking proper care of our wounded veterans is an American issue.

This is a national embarrassment, and we in Congress must meet it head on. It is my hope that we can restore the trust veterans have lost in their government to care for them when they need it most.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inquire of the gentlewoman from New York if she is prepared to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, if my colleague has no further requests for time.

Ms. FOXX. I'll reserve the balance of my time and allow my colleague to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish we were debating legislation that I thought might actually have a possibility of becoming law, but we are not.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question and to think about Memorial Day and our proposal to take care of the veterans' backlog. I hope that we are successful in getting that done.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to providing more opportunities for more Americans and helping make life work for more families. This legislation is a great step in that direction.

Student borrowers deserve more than platitudes and empty promises. They deserve real solutions that will improve their lives and help them achieve success.

Our conservative solutions to the challenges facing young Americans today are the right solutions, and the results will speak for themselves. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule and the underlying legislation because H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act would cause financial hardship for students seeking a higher education.

The Rule for H.R. 1911 did not fix the underlying legislation. In fact, the Rule we are debating accepted no amendments that were offered by Members of the Congress. I offered the Jackson Lee Amendment #1 that would have capped student interest at 4 percent. This would have removed the threat of the cost of education doubling at the beginning of July.

I also offered the Jackson Lee Amendment #2, which directed the Secretary of Education to submit a report to Congress on the feasibility of offering student loan forgiveness to those who start businesses in economically depressed areas such as HUBZones.

This amendment would have encouraged young people from low income areas who get college degrees to return home to start businesses. This would establish economic opportunities for young graduates as an option for employment and at the same time bring businesses and job opportunities to target areas.

Students who are graduating across the nation are departing colleges and universities this spring with immense debt. Student borrowing is widespread with more than $100 billion in federal education loans distributed every year. In total, student loan debt adds up to $1 trillion. As a direct consequence of a weak economy, more than ever students and parents must rely upon loans to pay for higher education.

The American family has been under financial pressure for twenty years resulting in longer hours, less pay and more debt. The only reliable way in today's economy to earn more is to learn more. During difficult economic times adults seek new careers by going back to school. Parents who want a better life for their children will take on college loan debt because the cost of education requires it.

In the City of Houston, this spring I have participated in commencement exercises for the University of Houston, Texas Southern University, Houston Community College and Lone Star College North Harris. There are thousands of new graduates just in the City of Houston alone who are ready to pursue their dreams, but who will wake up to the reality of tens of thousands of dollars in debt.

On July 1, 2013 the student loan interest rate will rise from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. As Members of the Congress we know what this will mean for students in our districts and what it will mean for colleges and universities in our Congressional Districts.

Some may try to tell you this bill does what President Obama proposed to do, but it does not. The President's proposal would have fixed the rate on student loans based on the actual Department of the Treasury's cost of borrowing. The Administration's plan would set the repayment costs for the entire life of the student loan, which would have created certainty for the borrower. The President's plan would tie student loan repayments to what graduates were earning after starting their careers. This would have supported a student's dream to become a teacher, social worker, artist, lawyer, doctor or engineer.

Finally, President Obama would extend these favorable loan options to those already in the workforce who still have student loan debt. Paying a reasonable rate that is fixed over the life of the loan and would be based on what you can afford to pay—that is what the President proposed, but this is not what this bill does.

The need for education from cradle to grave should be a national priority, not an afterthought. This is a bad bill that will not solve the problem of out of control student loan debt. For all of these reasons, I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the Rule for H.R. 1911, and the underlying legislation.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2013.

Re Oppose the Smarter Solutions for Students Act (H.R. 1911)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the over 150,000 bipartisan members and supporters of the American Association of University Women (AAUVV), I urge you to vote against the Smarter Solutions for Students Act (H.R. 1911). While AAUW supports preventing the doubling of interest rates on subsidized Stafford loans, scheduled to occur on July 1st, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act fails to provide stability in borrowing for students, and would not ensure that rates stay low in the foreseeable future.

With changes in the workforce over the century, higher education is becoming less of a luxury and more of a necessity. At current rates, the U.S. will add over 16 million jobs by the year 2020 that require at least some postsecondary education. Moreover, the number of jobs requiring a graduate degree is estimated to grow by at least 2.5 million by that same year. Since many students cannot pay for their degrees out-of-pocket, student loans are an important option and a worthwhile investment. College graduates have fared better in the recent recession and current recovery, and have higher wages and better job prospects overall. Students rely on Stafford loans as a part of the financial aid they use to finance higher education. Subsidized Stafford loans are only offered to students with demonstrated need. Specifically, about 30 percent of undergraduates in 2007–08 received a subsidized Stafford loan, and a majority of those recipients were women.

Many graduates struggle to repay their loans. Loan repayment is an even more significant burden for women, who earn less on average over the course of their lives than their male counterparts. AAUW's research report, Graduating to a Pay Gap: The Earnings of Women and Men One Year after College Graduation, found that the median student loan debt burden was slightly higher in 2009 for women than men. In addition, among full-time workers who were repaying their loans in 2009, nearly half (47 percent) of women one year after college graduation were paying more than 8 percent of their earnings toward student loan debt. Only 39 percent of men were in the same position. Furthermore, just over half of women (53 percent) and 39 percent of men, were paying a greater percentage of their income toward student loan debt than AAUW estimates a typical woman or man could afford.

Keeping interest rates low on student loans is important and the Smarter Solutions for Students Act would fail to do so. At the current interest rate of 3.4 percent the government earns almost 12.5 cents per each dollar loaned in the subsidized Stafford loan program. This underscores that there is no reason rates should increase at all for students. Under the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, over the next 3 years interest rates are projected to rise to as much at 7.36 percent. Not only would Fixed rates ensure that when students borrow, they know upfront what their monthly repayment amount will be, as the rate is consistent through repayment. AAUW knows that this is a key component of ensuring students are smart borrowers when it comes to financing their higher education. If they must take out a loan, knowing the repayment schedule of that loan is necessary for their planning purposes.

Allowing the interest rates on subsidized Stafford loans to double on July 1 would have a real impact on students. The interest rate increase could mean as much as $1,000 in additional debt. But, the Smarter Solutions

for Students Act is not a real solution. Under this proposal interest rates would be projected to increase, and students and graduates would be faced with annual uncertainty as their rates at origination and during repayment would vary based on the market. I urge you to vote against the Smarter Solutions for Students Act (H.R. 1911). Votes associated with this legislation may be scored in the AAUW Action Fund Congressional Voting Record for the 113th Congress. If you have any questions or need additional information, feel free to contact me or Anne Hedgepeth, government relations manager.

Sincerely,

LISA M. MAATZ,
Director,
Public Policy and Government Relations.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 232 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 7. 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. 1739) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay provisional benefits for certain nonadjudicated claims, 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 Veterans' Affairs. 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. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1739 as specified in section 7 of this resolution.

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.

Ms. FOXX. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 195, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins

Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Bonner
Clyburn
Cole
Culberson
Gibson
Herrera Beutler
Horsford
Lewis
Markey
Miller, Gary
Speier
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

□ 1046

Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 180, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 193, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Bonner
Clyburn
Cole
Conyers
Culberson
Gibson
Gutierrez
Herrera Beutler
Lewis
Markey
Miller, Gary
Roybal-Allard
Speier
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

□ 1058

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 258. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military decorations or medals.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress:

The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

□ 1100

SMARTER SOLUTIONS FOR STUDENTS ACT

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 232, I call up the bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, 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 232, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce

printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–12 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1911

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 ''Smarter Solutions for Students Act''.

SEC. 2. STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES.

Section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting '', AND BEFORE JULY 1, 2013'' after ''2006'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and before July 1, 2013,'' after ''2006,'';

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''and before July 1, 2013,'' after ''2006,''; and

(D) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''and before July 1, 2013,'' after ''2006,'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7), the following:

''(8) INTEREST RATE PROVISION FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2013.—

''(A) RATES FOR FDSL AND FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to—

''(i) the high-yield 10-year Treasury notes auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1; plus

''(ii) 2.5 percent,

except that such rate shall not exceed 8.5 percent.

''(B) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for any Federal Direct PLUS Loan for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to—

''(i) the high-yield 10-year Treasury notes auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1; plus

''(ii) 4.5 percent,

except that such rate shall not exceed 10.5 percent.

''(C) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation Loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2013, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent.''.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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. 1911.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

We're here today to address a crisis of Washington's own making. Several years ago, Congress decided politicians, not the free market, were better equipped to set student loan interest rates. Politicians set a fixed rate of 6.8 percent for all loans and then decided to advance legislation based on a campaign promise that would temporarily phase this rate for subsidized Stafford loans down to 3.4 percent.

Last summer, with the expiration of the lower rate scheduled for July 1, 2012, debate about student loans reached a fever pitch. The President began touring college campuses, calling on Congress to prevent the increase that his own party set in motion back in 2007.

As I said at the time, no one wanted to see interest rates double—particularly at a time when one out of every two college graduates was struggling to find a full-time job. But we need to move away from a system that allows Washington politicians to use student loan interest rates as bargaining chips, creating uncertainty and confusion for borrowers.

When Congress approved legislation to temporarily stave off the Stafford loan interest rate increase, my colleagues and I lent our support with the promise that we would use this time to work toward a long-term solution that better aligns interest rates with the free market.

The Smarter Solutions for Students Act accomplishes this goal by simply moving all Federal students loans, except Perkins loans, to a market-based interest rate system. This responsible legislation builds upon a proposal that was actually put forth by the President earlier this year.

The Smarter Solutions for Students Act is a narrow piece of legislation that will provide a lasting solution to the problem facing the Federal student loan program. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, some critics would rather kick the can down the road and simply extend the current arbitrary rates at a taxpayer cost of roughly $8 billion. They want to continue the failed status quo and leave politicians in charge of setting rates.

Earlier this week, The Washington Post called it a ''weird fact'' that student loan interest rates:

> Aren't pegged to anything real, just to the whims of Congress, which inevitably uses student loans as political playthings.

Students deserve better. They shouldn't have to watch as Washington holds their interest rates hostage each election year. They shouldn't have to deal with the uncertainty that comes with waiting for politicians to cobble together another temporary fix to keep interest rates in line with the market.

We have an opportunity today to get politicians out of the business of setting student loan interest rates. We have an opportunity to provide students with more stability in the long run by putting an end to quick fixes and campaign promises, and we have an opportunity to build upon common ground with the administration and advance a bipartisan solution that's a win for both students and taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in little more than a month, the interest rates on loans to millions of the neediest students will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. With that doubling, those that can afford it least will be burdened with more debt. With total student loan debt already surpassing $1 trillion, this Congress needs to stop that interest rate hike, that doubling of the interest rates.

But rather than make it more affordable for students and families to pay for college, this Congress this day in this Chamber is debating a bill—I know people won't believe this—but we're debating a bill to make it more expensive for families and students to achieve a college education. At a time when college costs are rising and historic low interest rates, the majority is asking us to accept a bill that would increase interest rates. And even though the student interest rate is scheduled on July 1 to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, the bill presented on this floor today is worse than that for students and their families. It increases the drag on the economy that the student debt is to families and to young people trying to seek a job and to seek to form family.

This bill is so bad that it means more than the doubling of the interest rates. How do you think that has anything to do with the market rates? According to the Congressional Research Service, when they look at this bill, you can see that under current law interest rates, they would pay $4,000. And they are doubling to 6.8 percent, so they'd pay $8,800 in interest rates. And under the Republican bill, families would pay more than $10,000 in interest. How can that possibly be in the interest of these families? How can that possibly be happening in this economy when people are struggling with interest rates? It cannot be allowed.

You can see here that the parents who may have to contribute something, they would take out a loan to

help their child complete a college education, they are going to pay more than $35,000 over the life of those loans than under the current law, and that's what we've got to stop from happening.

And so what you see is when it is all said and done, this bill asks students over the next few years to pay more than $3.7 billion, almost $4 billion, in increased interest rates. No wonder this poor student has a headache. No wonder this parent is pounding on his head thinking, What am I going to do?

But what do they say? They say we have a market rate here. We have a market rate. Well, many in America, certainly middle class families and many low-income families, will remember the last time when we had this kind of market rate because what they have, they have a teaser rate. For your first year, they'll have a lower interest rate. So you have a teaser rate. But you know that next year that teaser rate adjusts so you don't get that rate because next year you get a new rate. And when you're a sophomore in college and you take out another loan, you get a new rate, a higher rate. And when you're a junior, you take out a loan, and you get a higher rate. And when you graduate, they take all of your loans together and give you a higher rate. Does that sound familiar to people? That's the marketplace. That's the marketplace when you choose to crush the people who are borrowing the money.

The President has the market rate. The chairman has said many times the President is looking to use the markets to set a realistic rate. But as he sets the rate, it's deficit neutral. As he sets the rate, the amendment we tried to offer was deficit neutral. He saves those students and families about $30 billion over the life of those loans. You get the difference? Yes, the market's the market. But you can pick the worst of the market, and you can pick the best of the market. They've chosen to pick the worst of the market for these students.

Now they had options. Republicans last night in the Rules Committee had options. Mr. COURTNEY offered an amendment to keep rates at 3.4 percent. They rejected it.

I offered the President's market approach. They rejected that.

Then Mr. HECK from the Republican side of the aisle from Nevada offered to say let's provide an incentive to make sure that students in fact continue to pay on time, as they should, as the market would do because you want to incent good behavior because you get more of it. They rejected that.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina went before them. He's a member of the Republican caucus, very concerned about interest rates in this legislation, very concerned about what's going to happen to these families. He thought he could lower the interest rates within their bill, within the market rates, stick with the market principle. They said ''no.''

So all you get today is whether or not you want a solution that is worse than the doubling of the interest rates on July 1. That's not an answer for America's families. That's not an answer for America's students.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1110

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the vice chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. PETRI. I rise today to support H.R. 1911 because it would put in place a long-term, market-based solution to Federal student loan interest rates.

Some on the other side wish to engage in endless debates on the level of student loan interest rates. This is the wrong debate to be having, however, and distracts us from real reform. By taking this issue out of the hands of politicians, H.R. 1911 moves the discussion forward.

I believe there are better ways to help students manage the repayment of their loans than ever-higher interest rate subsidies. Income-based repayment, an idea that originated with Milton Friedman and was subsequently advocated by Presidents Reagan, Clinton and Obama, is better for students and taxpayers.

While we have an income-based repayment option now, it doesn't do enough to protect our taxpayers. Therefore, working with Representative JARED POLIS, I've introduced legislation to make needed reforms.

With today's bill, we can break free from this debate over interest rates and focus on real reform to help students struggling with student loan debts. So I'd urge passage of H.R. 1911.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1911, the Republican bill to make college more expensive. In America, we often speak of the importance of expanding educational opportunity and supporting students in achieving the American Dream. Unfortunately, our student loan debt crisis is crushing the dreams and aspirations of students and college graduates.

As Congressman MILLER said earlier, today student loan debt exceeds $1.1 trillion. According to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, student loan debt surpassed total outstanding credit card debt for the first time in 2010. These staggering figures are truly unacceptable and must serve as a wake-up call for developing a long-term solution that helps, not harms, current and future borrowers.

As a result, it is shocking that the majority party would bring a bait-and-switch scheme to the House floor, a bill that would force students into loans with skyrocketing interest rates.

I find it shameful that H.R. 1911 would reduce the Federal deficit on the backs of students and parents by saddling them with almost $4 billion in additional loan interest charges, and leave students worse off than if Congress simply allowed student loan interest rates to double on July 1.

High levels of student loan debt can limit where college graduates live and work. It can affect the kinds of careers that students can follow. High levels of debt can create obstacles for young people who hope to start a family, to purchase a home and save for retirement.

To be clear, students and families deserve more from the U.S. Congress, not less.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. HINOJOSA. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose H.R. 1911. I suggest you do two things: one is work to prevent interest rates from doubling on July 1, and second, work to make college more affordable and accessible through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Dr. ROE), the chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

I rise in support of the Smarter Solutions for Students Act. Student loan debt, I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is a huge issue in this country.

And how did we get to the current rate of 6.8 percent, I asked myself. I went back and reviewed it, and in 2006, the Congress decided that interest rates were too high, so they wanted to lower the interest rates, but found out they couldn't afford the cost of it.

So gradually, stepwise, it went down last year. In 1 year we had a 3.4 percent student loan rate tied to nothing other than the whims of Congress. It created a fiscal cliff for loan rates. So we voted to extend it for 1 year to give us time to have a permanent solution for this.

The permanent solution that we're offering is to simply treat a student loan like any other loan and tie it to a Treasury note plus 2.5 percent for a Stafford loan.

Now, what does that mean?

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, very eloquently, Mr. MILLER spoke just a moment ago about how rates can go. Variable means rates can change. That's absolutely true. But rates can also go down. It doesn't necessarily mean that rates will go up. And in acknowledging this, an 8.5 percent cap was put on those loans.

I checked the student loan rate if you went to your local bank or credit union to see what a loan rate would be, and it's about 7 percent now, higher than that.

And I agree with my good friend, RUBÉN HINOJOSA, who believes that we

should work for ways to help make college more affordable. I could not agree more.

The Secretary of Education, just this past Wednesday, said he agreed and supported a permanent solution. The President said he supported a market-based approach. This will give certainty to it, and certainly I would urge my colleagues to vote and support this very-needed piece of legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

The question before the House this morning is whether we should make college more affordable or less affordable, which is better for the country.

If we do nothing by July 1, interest rates double on student loan rates from 3.4 to 6.8 percent. This bill makes it worse. It will actually increase college costs for a typical student by $5- or $6,000 over a 10-year period, $3.7 billion across the country.

There's a better way. The government's borrowing money today at 1 percent. Why don't we borrow the money at 1 percent, factor in the cost of administering the loans and setting aside a reserve for default, and charge that amount to the students, rather than run a profit-making enterprise on student loans?

Mr. TIERNEY and others have taken the lead on this, Mr. COURTNEY has, and that's the bill that I think is the appropriate long-term solution.

But I do know this. If you listen to any corporate leader, any business leader in America, they tell you this: we will only grow and prosper with a skilled workforce, and we will only have a skilled workforce if higher education is affordable.

The simple question before the House is, if you think higher education should be less affordable, vote ''yes.'' If you think it should be more affordable, vote ''no.''

''No'' is the right vote. There's a better way. We should put that on the floor and proceed that way.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Absent congressional action, interest rates on student loans will double from 3.4 to 6.8 percent on July 1. It's not that far away. We need both parties and both Chambers working on solutions now. We can't afford more last-minute, backroom deals and political brinksmanship.

The Smarter Solutions for Students Act is a commonsense approach. This bill prevents the rate hike from happening and ends what has become an annual debate within Congress on how to set the rates for student loans.

This bill puts in place a rate that is more predictable and affordable. It builds on a proposal put forward by President Obama in his fiscal year 2014 budget request.

Now, both these proposals move to a market-based interest rate, not one set by politicians in Washington. We have a responsibility to America's youth to put forward a long-term plan for college affordability. This bill is a good first step. It will offer students the lowest possible rates for higher education by ensuring the solvency of these important loan programs. And I encourage my colleagues to join in support of this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1120

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the Making College More Expensive Act. In 2007, Congress cut the interest rate on student loans in half, from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent, for 5 years. Last year, we extended that benefit for 1 more year. In a few weeks, on July 1, if Congress chooses not to act, the interest rate is scheduled to double back to the rate of 6.8 percent.

Incredibly, this bill is so bad that, according to the Congressional Research Service, students will actually be better off if Congress were to let the rate double to 6.8 percent than to adopt this legislation. This bill is also bad because it makes rates variable for the life of the loan, therefore forcing students to sign for an interest rate that will fluctuate over time so they don't even know what it's going to be from one time to the next. This proposal essentially asks students to sign up for loans without knowing what they're signing up for.

This is different from the Democratic proposals on variable interest rates, because the President's proposal and the Democratic alternative that was offered in committee have a variable rate; but once you sign the loan, that rate is fixed for the duration, so you know what you've signed up for. With the historic low rates now, you can sign up for a loan rate that's probably much lower than any of the numbers that are being considered. But this rate is so bad that the Congressional Research Service estimates that if we return to normal rates, the students will actually be worse off than if we just let the rates double to 6.8 percent.

So I ask my colleagues to work diligently to improve access to quality education by making higher education more affordable and ensuring that the interest loan rates are reasonable, and that starts with defeating this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Workforce Protection Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the opportunity to meet with more than a dozen of Michigan's private colleges and university presidents. They're working hard, as you might guess, to address the rising costs of college education with their institutions and other institutions and with students who desire an education. At the same time, this House, under the direction of this committee, is working hard to address student loan interest rates in a way that brings long-term stability to the program.

The interest rate for federally subsidized Stafford loans is currently set to rise to 6.8 percent on July 1, 2013, matching it to the current unsubsidized Stafford loan rate. Other Federal loans have rates as high as 7.9 percent. Any further temporary extension of the current rate only kicks the can down the road. We've done this already. In politicians versus markets, markets will always produce better long-term results, and only those who refuse to deal with the truth of history and reality would say otherwise.

Congress has a unique opportunity to institute long-term, bipartisan reforms. Why not? We know in our hearts it's the right thing to do. Both President Obama and the House have favored market-based solutions to current rates. The Secretary of Education desires a long-term solution like this as well.

Instead of another short-term fix, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act provides a long-term solution to the student loan interest rate problem. It returns all Federal student loans, except Perkins loans, to a market-based interest rate and takes politics out of this part of our children's education.

The only way this plan won't work is if the liberal, progressive, central planners that control our government policy now are allowed to continue their failed approach. And it is a failed approach. Pass this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I draw the point that was mentioned earlier that the Democrats made a promise to keep these loans at 3.4 percent, and the promise is being broken. It's being broken by this bill, this proposal by the Republican Party. We kept our promise through the entire reauthorization of the Higher Education Opportunity Act, and 2 more years in addition. This is the proposal now. We say stay at 3.4 percent. Republicans say, no, jack it up more than double on that basis.

I join with millions of students and parents and organizations that represent them in strong opposition to this Making College More Expensive Act that's before us here today.

My Republican friends talk about how this bill is simple and predictable. It's predictable all right. I predict the rates are going to go right up beyond the 6.8 percent rate. We've already seen

that from the Congressional Research Service, a nonpartisan group that says, if we pass this Republican bill, those rates will go up more than double on that basis. It is not simple.

They would have you believe through this debate that the rates are going to go down to market rates, which, at the current time, are lower. They would if you followed our bill at 3.4 percent. But if you went with this bill of Making College More Expensive Act, it sets it low for the first year but it rewrites the second year, and it resets the third year and it resets the fourth year. So at the end of 4 years, you get the whole package with the higher rate. And that is going to be almost $4 billion more in cost for these students and parents than it is for people right now.

The Congressional Budget Office said these interest rates would be almost $4 billion. We know that to be the case. These are the same people that tell us they don't want to burden our next generation with the debt, but they apparently have no problem at all burdening the next generation by burying them in student loan debt year after year after year.

I have been hearing from people all over my district. In fact, one woman from Wilmington wrote me and said that, when her son graduates from college, his loans will equal what her husband and she paid for their first home. With the interest rates he'll pay, it will be even more. Something is not right with the system, she says. Both college tuition costs and student loan interest rates are wrong.

She's right. This bill is wrong. Let's do the right thing. Let's have 3.4 percent now. In the interim, do a Higher Education Reauthorization Act that takes care of this problem going forward.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, in order to balance the speakers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a member of the committee.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today against the Making College More Expensive Act. Let me tell you why.

I represent a pretty large minority area, and over the last several years, we've seen those scores in those students going up and up. For the first time, we're seeing a higher rate of young people going to college. This is not the time to be looking at making college more expensive. They are first-time-generation students going to college. This is wrong. This is supposed to be a family-friendly bill. For whom? It's certainly not for my constituents.

I'm sorry also to say that what we're going to be seeing is that after this bill passes—and it will probably pass today—it dies. The Senate is not going to pick this up. So, again, we have wasted all our time instead of working together to come to a solution.

Again, as you heard, according to the CBO, if Congress did nothing and let student loan rates double on July 1, students would be better off.

This is not a good bill. I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, student interest rates are set to double in a little over a month unless Congress stops it, and that's why I rise today in opposition to the Making College More Expensive Act. We should be considering legislation like the one my colleague, Mr. COURTNEY, introduced to extend low interest rates for 2 years; but, instead, we're debating a bill that makes students worse off than if Congress does nothing. That's because, under this bill, student interest rates would be subject to the whims of the market.

Today, interest rates are at an all-time low, but what about 5 years? what about 10 years? what about 15 years from now? This bill lures students in with a low variable rate, only to trap them with a higher rate upon repayment. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've seen this bait and switch before, only usually it was by credit card companies setting up shop outside of college sporting events, not by the Federal Government.

We are not subprime lenders. The Federal Government should not be profiting from students. It shouldn't be making $4 billion off of students.

Mr. KLINE. I now yield 1 minute to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. DESJARLAIS.

□ 1130

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1911. This commonsense bill, aptly named the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, brings the student loan interest rate program back to reality.

Instead of coming back each year to partake in the Washington tradition of putting last year's failures off to the next year, this bill gives students and their families the certainty that their loan rates won't be subjected to the whims of bureaucrats in Washington or legislators on Capitol Hill.

This legislation ties student loan interest rates to the 10-year Treasury note. In fact, the President's fiscal year 2014 budget request included language very similar to this bill. H.R. 1911 goes even further toward protecting students and families from high interest rate environments by including caps on interest rates.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I thank Chairman KLINE and VIRGINIA FOXX and their staffs for their hard work in bringing this commonsense legislation to the floor.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. May I inquire of the Chair of the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from California has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing. At a time when we know that student loan debt now has skyrocketed above all other forms of consumer debt—credit card debt, car loan debt—and students are now graduating, on average, with over $25,000 of student loan debt, a ticking clock 38 days away where the rates are going to double, the bill that the majority has come forward with makes the problem worse, not better.

Again, the analysis from independent sources—the ones that we rely on to make decisions in this body, the Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Office—make it clear that if we do nothing, the interest costs for the average Stafford loan will add $4,000 in interest payments. If we pass this bill, the interest will rise by $5,000. So the notion that this is somehow a solution to the problem, the misnomer that this bill is given, the reverse is true.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the Senate is not going to move over the next 38 days; they're doing the farm bill, they're doing immigration reform. It is time to protect students by extending the 3.4 percent rate, a rate, which I hasten to add, that was passed in 2007 with a large bipartisan majority, signed into law by George Bush, was extended again last year with large bipartisan majorities, signed by President Obama. Let's do a 2-year extension, and then let's get to work with a 5-year Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

The problem with higher ed is not about Stafford loans only; it's about Pell grants, it's about Perkins loans. It's about students not being given good information in high school. It's about allowing graduates to refinance their debt, which they are now confronted with large barriers to. That's the real work to solve the higher education challenge and issue in this country. In the mean time, let's extend the 2-year rates.

Mr. Speaker, I have letters from 21 campus-based organizations representing real live college students all across America who support the Democratic measure to extend those rates, get a good higher education authorization bill, and totally—totally—reject the measure that's on the floor today, the Make College More Expensive Act.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a member of the committee.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Making College More Expensive Act, a bill that

will potentially make college more expensive for thousands of students and families across the country.

Across America, students and graduates are trapped under a trillion-dollar mountain of student loan debt, and with this bill, the problem is about to get worse.

On July 1, interest rates will double for millions of students entering college. But this bill is not a constructive solution; in fact, this bill will make the problem worse.

Rates are currently 3.4 percent, and they will double to 6.8 percent if we do nothing. But under this bill, the rates will be uncertain because they will be variable, and will be as high as 8.5 percent.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this legislation will force students to pay thousands more in interest than if Congress simply does nothing and lets the rates double.

It's just not fair. On average, middle class families haven't seen a raise in years. Many are working harder for less money. They're struggling to buy everything from groceries to gas. They're relying more on the Federal student loans programs to finance the growing cost of college.

But instead of debating how much we should lower rates, instead of considering comprehensive reforms to address college costs, we're actually considering legislation that would be worse than if we did nothing at all.

Mr. Speaker, this is unproductive, unreasonable, and unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I would like to thank Chairman KLINE for his hard work on this bill. I'd also like to thank Subcommittee Chairwoman FOXX for her hard work.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

This debate is about a fundamental question: Who do you trust more—the promises of Big Government or the private market setting rates in the marketplace?

I believe we must return to a market-based policy rather than keeping Congress in the business of fixing interest rates by throwing darts at a dart board.

Let me make two simple points to this Chamber. First, markets work. The President has recognized this, Education Secretary Duncan has recognized this. They both have called for a return to market-based rates and policies on our student loan interest. Families deserve the security of knowing that the marketplace will be setting their interest rate, not the results of the next mud wrestling match in Congress.

We've heard a lot of rhetoric on the other side of the aisle about how rates will rise if we change this policy. Lost in that rhetoric is the fact that over the course of the last decade there have been times where interest rates would have been much lower had we had a market-based approach to interest rates.

In 2002, student groups lobbied Congress to set student loan interest rates at a fixed 6.8 percent, beginning in the 2006 academic year. At that time, rates on student loans were variable and at historically low levels. However, student groups believed that a 6.8 rate would result in a better deal. It turned out they were wrong. Through that period, interest rates—had we stayed at a variable rate—would have been 2.36 percent. I don't think it's fair to those families that accumulated loans during those times that we had the government in the way.

The second point I think that needs to be made in this debate is that while we need to have low interest rates for students—and we're all concerned and want to make sure they don't rise—the real threat to young people in this country is not a few dollars on their interest loans.

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. MESSER. The real threat is the explosive growth of debt in this country, the fact that we are adding $1 trillion of debt each year, $6,800 of debt per taxpayer each year. It's dragging down our economy and hurting our ability to create jobs.

Let's return to commonsense policy on interest rates. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1911.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Making College More Expensive Act.

Mr. Speaker, what we're doing is just not right. The Federal Government is borrowing money at 1.8 percent. Then we're lending it—now—at 3.4 percent. If we do nothing, it goes to 6.8 percent. And under this bill, it probably will hit up around 10 percent. We're ripping off kids. I mean, we're making money off of these kids. A confident Nation will invest in the dreams of our young people, it won't crush those dreams.

Why are we doing it? You know what? We're borrowing money as a government at 1.8 percent. The Federal Reserve is lending money to the big money center banks at 0.75 percent. But we're going to be charging up to 8 or 10 percent to our kids? I don't get that.

Families are sitting around the kitchen table having discussions—if they have three kids, which two can we send to college?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. Parents who thought they had equity in their home and were going to be able, after working 30 years of work, to finally take that cruise or that vacation, they're refinancing their home to help their kids. And despite that—which compromises their retirement—their kids are getting out of college in Vermont with an average debt in the range of close to $30,000.

It's tough on the kids, it's tough on the parents, it's bad for our economy, and it's just not right. We borrow, the Federal Government, at 1.8 percent, and we're going to charge up to 8 percent for families? We're lending to the banks at 0.75 percent.

□ 1140

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I rise in opposition, Mr. Speaker, to the Making College More Expensive Act.

How short are some of the memories of my friends on the other aside, for it was market-based principles, unregulated market-based principles, that led to the housing crisis that we are just now getting out of.

Doubling the student loan rate is an attack on students. The increased debt that they will take on will build a great wall around our middle class. There's no better way to have a healthy, growing middle class than access to education.

Today, our middle class is shrinking. If you're in the middle class, you're making about $5,000 less than you were 10 years ago. If you're in the middle class, you owe about $25,000 more in debt than you did 10 years ago. Doubling the rates will increase the debt that our middle class has.

I know a thing or two about student loans. I have thousands of dollars of them myself. This is not just dollars on interest rates. We are talking thousands of dollars that individual borrowers like myself and the people that grew up with me in a middle class town called Dublin will take on.

Let's tear down this great wall that the GOP and the House leadership are trying to build around our middle class. Let's not double the rates.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Making College More Expensive Act that we're considering today. Market-based systems will drive up the cost for millions of middle class families but will, of course, also benefit some of our biggest banks and other financial institutions.

If we want to get our country back on the right track, put men and women

back to work and ensure that we remain competitive in the global economy, we have to do more to make higher education more accessible and more affordable, not more expensive.

Without Congressional action, the interest rate on Federal subsidized Stafford loans is scheduled to increase from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for more than 7 million students. We should not be making a profit on student loans—period.

We have proposals that will end this practice and give students access to college at the lowest cost possible. Unlike this bill, the Student Loan Relief Act, the Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act, and the Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act would each preserve low interest rates for students.

The bill before us today is a bad Republican idea that will make college more expensive for working families and will benefit some of America's largest financial institutions who will earn billions more in student loan interest. Hidden within this bill is a blatant bait-and-switch scheme that will allow students to borrow money at one rate before the interest rates skyrocket.

Let's reject the Making College More Expensive Act and find a serious, long-term solution on student loans that will make college more affordable for millions and millions of American students.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I'm puzzled. This is not the America that I know. It can't be.

When we were growing to make ourselves a great Nation, we were talking about trying to make sure that our young people had a free education. I can't figure out what's going on here. So many Americans that are doing well now, when I talk to them about when they were going to school back in the forties and the fifties and the sixties, it was a free education. Now we want to ask our young people, the ones that are going to be the middle class, the ones that are going to strengthen this country, to be more in debt than ever.

How could we say to our students—when we're talking about financial literacy everyplace and trying to teach them how to be financially able—that you've got to take a bait-and-switch loan? Didn't we learn anything from this last financial crisis?

What are homeowners doing now? All who had these adjustable-rate mortgages, all of them are running to make the adjustable-rate mortgages fixed-rate mortgages. And yet we take what we say are our precious resources—our children—to say that you've got to pay these resources is ridiculous. Some are wealthy, some are not.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I have no further speakers.

Is the chairman the last speaker?

Mr. KLINE. I am prepared to close.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who entered into the debate here this morning on this legislation. I think it is clear that there is a very big difference between our positions on this legislation; there's a very big difference between the President's bill, who is trying to use a market system, and this bill before us, Mr. KLINE's bill, that uses a market system.

The fact is that the President's bill saves students billions of dollars, but the Republicans would not make President Obama's bill in order for consideration. Why not? They say it's like they're doing the same thing as the President. Well, they're not. In fact, they're adding $4 billion worth of debt onto the backs of students over their program.

And how can they possibly do that? You've heard my colleagues on this side of the aisle speak to the issues that we hear all of the time when we go home. The struggle of students, the struggle of families, be they low-income, be they middle-income, to get access and to be able to complete a college education, to get access to a community college, to a State college system, to get a certificate, to get a degree that will allow them to participate in the American society, in the American economy. That's part of the American Dream.

Yes, we lowered the interest rates to 3.4 percent, and they've held over a period of years. And they held over those exact same years when families were under the most stress because of this recession that was created on Wall Street and the scandals that took away 70 percent of the wealth of African American and Hispanic families in this country, that destroyed the equity and good chunks of middle America because of teaser rate loans, subprime loans.

And what is happening today in the private market? The banks are getting money from the Treasury at 0.75 interest, and they're loaning it to families in private student loans. If you have good credit, they'll loan it to you for somewhere around 7 percent.

Bankers used to go die and go to heaven if they could get a 7 percent spread. That's how you become a billionaire. Get it at 0.75 and put it out at 7. And if your credit rating is not so good, those statistics sort of suggest you drift towards 13 percent.

Obviously, the students and middle class can't survive in that market for the most part, and that's why we have a student loan program. That's why we took this program away from the banks a number of years ago. We took the $60 billion that we were giving to the banks to loan the public's money to students and we said why don't we put that to use for families, and we did.

And we lowered the interest rates, and we increased the participation in the Pell Grants, made it available. We increased some loan limits. We gave people a chance to manage their debt after they graduated, so the more you earn, the more you pay, but you don't get crushed on your first job that may not have the best salary, even though it's the career you want to go in and it takes time to get that salary. We made it more affordable for America's families.

Yes, we lowered the debt to 3.4 percent. It was paid for, and that's all we could afford. Congress will make that decision. Last year, the Congress made a decision to extend it. This year, they've decided that they don't want to extend it on the other side of the aisle. So, fine, come up with a plan. But the plan they came up with is worse than having the 3.4 percent double on July 1.

How can you develop a plan that's worse for students? I guess maybe if you go home and everybody in your district is working and everybody is participating in this slow-growing economy that's getting better. I don't know. Families I represent, they're still struggling. The recession hasn't left town. The recession hasn't left the country.

If you pick up The Wall Street Journal today, there's greater concern about what's happening in China dragging down the world economy, there's greater concern about the Europeans dragging down the world economy. America is trying to struggle and the students are trying to struggle, and we're going to come along and more than double the rate.

We're going to give them a teaser rate, though. This next September when families go out and they get a rate, it will be probably somewhat lower than the current rate. But that loan will be adjusted, and they don't know what those rates are going to be. As long as they're paying on that loan, that loan will continue to be adjusted. We just saw that history in America. We saw what that did.

I don't have a problem going to a market system. How about a fair one? When the President went to a market system for the subsidized Stafford loan, he said on the market system we'll go to 0.9. They said they would go to 2.5—10 years plus 2.5. The President said 10 years plus 0.9.

□ 1150

There are a lot of ways to go to a market system. You don't have to punish the American family. You don't have to punish the students in school to go to a market system. I wish the President had a cap. The gentleman has a cap. This could be worked out, but we don't do things bipartisanly anymore in the Congress of the United States. So, because we can't get the President and the majority on the Education and the Workforce Committee to sit down and work out the market system—because that's not allowed and

we don't do bipartisan work—the victims are going to be the families and the students, and, in the long term, our Nation.

Every Member of Congress has come to this floor and has said how important this education system is to our future economic growth, to competing in a globalized world, to have innovation, to have discovery, to have job creation. We're now creating a drag on job creation. We're now creating a drag on the opportunities for families. We are creating a drag on the ability to achieve the American Dream—and a college education is part of that dream, but a college education is also critical to keeping this economy and this society moving.

I would hope that my colleagues, whether they are committed to a market rate or not, would understand that this is a very flawed market rate.

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as always in these debates, there is a lot of confusion, and there is a lot of misinformation. We are using that old thing about ''figures lie and liars figure,'' and you've got different guesses for interest rates and reports and all those sorts of things, and I want to get into some of that, but some of it is at the core of our differences here. Let's get a couple of things straight.

We watch what has happened as Congress tries to chase an interest rate and gets in political battles year after year. You'll remember that the 6.8 percent that was put in law was considered a good deal. Then there was the plan to take it from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent for all loans. It didn't work. It costs a lot of money, and it's added to the debt, which is a problem that is still nagging us to this day. So interest rates were taken from 6.8 to 3.4 percent gradually over years. It got down to the point where, for 1 year, the interest rate on subsidized Stafford loans—not the unsubsidized Stafford loans, not the PLUS loans, because we didn't have the money for that—took it down to 3.4 percent for 1 year, and then there wasn't enough money. So, by law, the interest rates on those loans went back up to 6.8 percent, and last year, an election year, we had a big political fight, and that's what you can anticipate, apparently, forever as politicians try to use this as a political pawn and fight over what the student loan interest rates ought to be and what can be afforded.

Mr. Speaker, what can be afforded counts because a problem, as I said, that is continuing to nag us is we have a mountain of debt in this country. We've been running deficits year after year of over $1 trillion. We've got over $16 trillion in debt. We have to face that issue here coming before us. So, while we would like all student loan interest rates to be low and as we want to get them as low as we can, we don't want to add to the mountain of debt that's out there.

We thought that it would be a good idea to let the free market determine what those rates ought to be, and we came forward with a proposal, and we talked about our proposal with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—staff to staff, hour after hour—trying to beat this out staff to staff and in talking to the White House and the Department of Education about what we're doing and what they're doing and what might work out. I talked to the Secretary of Education before this bill was ever introduced because I agreed with the President and the Secretary that we needed a long-term solution and to get out of kicking this can down the road with annual—or maybe it's semiannual or biannual—political battles.

So we moved to the market. We used a 10-year Treasury that the White House was proposing using—center Republicans wanted to use a 10-year Treasury—and then we worked it, Mr. Speaker. We worked it and worked it to get it as close to budget-neutral as we could possibly get it because we want to help students, and we wanted to give them certainty, and we wanted them not to rely on the whims of politicians here, and we wanted also not to put the burden on the American people and the taxpayer, and we wanted not to add to that debt. So we tried to get it close to zero.

We've seen charts down here—I love charts, particularly colored charts. We've seen charts down here that say that our bill is adding billions of dollars to student debt. Well, we've got a counterproposal over there. I think the gentleman from California offered it. It's the President's proposal, President Obama's plan. That additional debt to students is $3.1 billion—ours is $3.7 billion—over 10 years. We tried to come together on this. Mr. Speaker, I think we can continue to try to come together on this, and we need to move this forward.

There are a lot of things we need to do to help students. Certainly, one of them is to help graduates get to work. Half of all college graduates now are underemployed or unemployed, doing things, working in places, employing none of the skills that they learned in college. We need to get the economy going. We're still asking, Where are the jobs? We need to get Americans back to work. You can't get Americans back to work if you just keep piling on mountains and mountains and mountains of debt and piles of regulations, but that's a fight for another day. Income-based repayment systems we didn't touch in our bill, but there are some interesting proposals out there we want to look at. Right now, with this bill, we're just trying to determine who is going to set interest rates—politicians here or the market.

So here is what we've heard from the other side today: that Washington should be in charge of setting interest rates on student loans, that Washington should be in the business of creating confusion and uncertainty for student loan borrowers. Washington cannot agree to a long-term solution that will serve the best interests of students and taxpayers. I think we need to keep working to do that.

It was pointed out that the Senate won't act. Well, for many of us in this body, that's not a lot of news, but July 1 is still July 1, and there is an incentive over there, and I believe the Senate must take action. I look forward to working with them to achieve the long-term solution that I think that we all need to see.

It was pointed out that we have a variable rate. The President has a variable rate but then his fixes. Certainly, under our law, when you graduate, if you're in a low-interest environment, you can consolidate those loans and fix them for the duration of however long you're taking to pay off those loans. If it's in a high interest rate environment, you may not want to do that. In the other plan, you've already got a fixed rate.

We believe we can work together. The only way we can continue to work together to solve this is to pass this legislation. Pass it today. I urge my colleagues to reject the failed status quo and to embrace a responsible long-term solution on behalf of students, families, and hardworking American taxpayers. I urge my colleagues to support the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1911, the wrong approach to a very real problem for our nation's students.

As we all know, the interest rate on student loans will double in July if Congress does not act. But today's legislation is not the solution. In fact, today's bill will make student loans more expensive, not less.

Student loan debt already tops $1.1 trillion, burdening recent graduates with high monthly payments even as they struggle to find jobs and start their lives. With that much debt at the start of their careers, they may put off purchases like a home or a car. But rather than address that problem, today's bill would add $3.7 billion in additional loan interest charges over the next ten years. In fact, if we did nothing and allowed the student loan interest rate to double, students would be better off than they would be under H.R. 1911.

Today's bill also makes it difficult for students to accurately predict their college costs. Under this proposal, the interest rate on loans would be recalculated every year for the life of the loan. According to Congressional Budget Office estimates, interest rates will be higher than current rates for seven of the next ten years. A borrower who takes out a loan next year under the Republican plan would see his interest rate more than double by the time he starts repaying that loan in 2017.

Mr. Speaker, we need a comprehensive solution to the problem of student debt that includes affordable financial assistance and works with states and colleges to keep costs

down. It is time to reauthorize the Higher Education Act—let's take this opportunity to negotiate a sustainable, long-term plan that works better for students.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Making College More Expensive Act that we are considering today. If we are serious about getting our country back on the right track, putting people back to work, and ensuring that we remain competitive in the global economy, we have to do more to make higher education more accessible and more affordable, not more expensive. Without Congressional action, the interest rate on federal subsidized Stafford loans is scheduled to increase from 3.4% to 6.8% for more than seven million students.

The United States Government should not be making a profit on student loans. Period.

And there are several proposals pending before the House today that would give students access to college at the lowest cost possible. Unlike this bill, the Student Loan Relief Act, the Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act, and the Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act would each preserve low interest rates for students. But the bill before us today is a bad Republican idea that will make college more expensive for working families. This bill before us today will make college more expensive to millions of Americans.

According to the independent, non–partisan Congressional Research Service, students with five years of subsidized Stafford loans borrowed at the maximum amount would owe $4,174 in interest under current rate and $8,808 if we allow interest rates to double on July 1st. But under this proposal, students would owe a total of $10,109 in interest payments on their loans.

Hidden within this bill is a blatant bait and switch scheme that will allow students to borrow money at one rate before their interest rates skyrocket. Our friends on the other side of the aisle like to claim that putting student loans into the ''marketplace'' is a cure–all for increased student debt. But in this case, ''marketplace'' is code for billions of more dollars in interest payments as this bill would prevent students from enjoying the lowest available interest rates.

Let's reject the Making College More Expensive Act and find a serious long–term solution on student loans that will make college more affordable for millions of Americans.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1911—the Smarter Solutions for Students Act. Mr. Speaker, this terrible bill should instead be called the Making College More Expensive Act because that is exactly what it would do if passed through Congress.

Instead of making college more affordable for students, H.R. 1911 would burden students with an additional $4 billion in loan interest charges relative to current law. According to a recent study by the Federal Reserve, there is plenty of evidence that student loan debt has negatively affected a student borrower's participation in our economy. With the national student loan debt already topping $1.1 trillion, H.R. 1911 would only deepen the college debt crisis students are now experiencing in America.

Over the past couple of years, legislators have been repeatedly warned about the impacts student loan debt has on economic growth. Even the Federal Reserve has identified that student debt is the likely cause of delays by American college graduates in purchasing homes and cars or starting families.

H.R. 1911 is a bait and switch scheme that does nothing to remedy this issue. This bill only makes it more expensive to attend by forcing students and families to accept loans with skyrocketing interest rates that increase annually.

Just this past weekend, students from all over the country in the class of 2013 graduated with an average debt load of $30,000 (Source: Mark Kantrowitz—publisher of FinAid.org analysis). When adjusted for inflation, that's roughly double the average amount of debt students graduated with 20 years ago.

The passage of this bill would continue this trend by changing student loan interest rates from year-to-year based on the 10-year Treasury note, marked up by 2.5 percent to 4.5 percent. As a result of this variable rate, federal student loans taken out by incoming freshmen class of 2013 would at first be at a lower rate; however, by the time this class of freshman graduates in 2017, the interest rate on their loans is projected to be 7.4 percent, more than double today's current 3.4 percent rate for subsidized Stafford loans.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, released a report this month citing the long-term impacts of high student loan debt. The CFPB found ''As a growing number of young consumers have been unable to participate more fully in the housing marketplace, the segment of young consumers that remains interested in becoming first-time homebuyers may face new barriers to homeownership. The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) stated that higher student debt burdens ''impair the ability of recent college graduates to qualify for a loan.'' According to NAHB, high student loan debt has an impact on consumers' debt-to-income (DTI) ratio—an important metric for decisions about creditworthiness in mortgage origination.

I have long championed the importance of developing the next generation of entrepreneurs and innovators to lead our country boldly in the 21st Century. Yet, the CFPB report found that student loan debt is poising a barrier to young entrepreneurs.

According to the report by CFPB ''For many young entrepreneurs, it is critical to invest capital to develop ideas, market products, and hire employees. Student debt burdens require these individuals to divert cash away from their businesses so they can make monthly student loan payments.'' Is this the future we want for our nation's student borrowers? Instead of building businesses, buying homes, and having families they are being crushed by the weight of student loan debt. This is not the future I want for current and future student borrowers.

Attaining an education is one of our Nation's founding principles. We should be working on finding solutions to lower the cost of education for our nation's youth rather than debating legislation designed to earn another $3.7 billion in revenue from struggling student borrowers. This bill is egregious.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to my Democratic colleagues and I that college affordability is still a pervasive issue in America. It is also clear, that this issue will require more than just a temporary fix. In order for us to maintain our competitive edge as a nation, we need to support every single American who desires to pursue a higher education. Congress needs to pass meaningful legislation that actually solves this problem and not perpetuate it. Let's start by voting no on H.R. 1911 and support our American students by not saddling them with insurmountable debt.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, once again House Republicans refuse to address the affordability of higher education head on and instead are using sleight of hand to make students think their interest rates will remain low. The awful truth is that H.R. 1911 will add even more to the already $1.1 billion of student debt in this country and further increase the cost of getting a college education.

As we continue to recover economically, we must ensure that students can afford a higher education. In 2007, as we were dealing with the worst of the recession, I voted in favor of legislation to reduce interest rates on Stafford loans from 6.8 to 3.4 percent. On July 1, interest rates will go back to 6.8 percent if Congress does not act.

An increase to 6.8 percent will add an additional $1000 in debt over the lifetime on a student's loans. However, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that under H.R. 1911 interest rates will rapidly increase to 7.7 percent by 2018. This bill does not guarantee lower interest rates. In fact, it does the opposite. The CBO does not project that interest rates will come down any time in the next 10 years. This is a hard truth students and their families cannot afford.

I am a proud cosponsor, along with 138 of my colleagues, of H.R. 1595, the Student Loan Relief Act by Representative JOE COURTNEY, which keeps the interest rate at 3.4 percent through 2015. That gives the Congress time enough to address comprehensive legislation to amend the Higher Education Act and develop long-term solutions to address student loans.

There are nearly 48,000 students attending a university or college in my district who have a Stafford subsidized student loan. Those loans total over $212 million. Increasing the interest rate will add an unnecessary burden on those students as they graduate and enter the workforce. We must do everything we can to help as they get started.

We should not have to choose how we are going to invest in our country's future. Republicans don't seem to realize that by not finding a compromise, they are playing politics with students, families, and the future of our country.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

This bill will return federal student loans to a system of market-based variable rates, an imprudent policy that seeks profits for deficit reduction at the expense of students struggling with the substantial and ever-climbing cost of post-secondary education.

With federal student loan interest rates set to double on July 1, 2013, Congress must act quickly to extend the current rate, rather than passing legislation that hurts students and families. According to the Congressional Research Service, H.R. 1911 will actually make it more expensive for students than if Congress did nothing and let the current interest rate expire. The Congressional Budget Office estimates this bill will cost students and parents an addition $3.7 billion in additional interest charges over the next 10 years.

This is unacceptable. Approximately 60 percent of students take out loans to attend college and increasing the costs of borrowing will prevent millions from being able to pursue higher education. Last year the total amount of student loan debt reached $1 trillion and the average borrower from the class of 2011 graduated with $26,600 in debt.

College educated students are the future engine of our country, and anyone who wants to pursue a post-secondary education should have the opportunity to do so without going into crushing debt. I urge my colleagues to extend the current interest rate of 3.4 percent for two years and find a true long-term solution to the cost of college worthy of our nation's young people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 1911, the so-called ''Smarter Solutions for Students Act''. I propose a more accurate title ''The Making Kindergarteners Pay for Our Mistakes Act of 2013.'' I must confess that every time I hear someone say they support austerity for the children, I am forced to question their understanding of economics. I try not to question their motives, but on a day like today—that is a struggle I am hard pressed to win. This bill does little more than turn the United States government into a payday lender—charging students interest that far outstrips the government's cost of lending. Instead of a fixed interest rate, that will let parents and students know how much their education costs, this bill sets interest at a variable, market rate—plus a nice little premium for the government. I wonder what fury my friends across the aisle would raise if we were to treat banks in a similar manner.

This fall's incoming class of students born in 1994 and 1995 was in kindergarten when Republicans seized control of our country and its surplus, and moved us quickly to deficit and debt. While these children were learning how rewarding it was to read, my colleagues across the aisle learned how remunerative it was to pass unfunded tax cuts and unfunded wars onto those children. While they let wages stagnate—an act which continues to this day—and they cut funding to schools—another policy which continues to this day—they reaped millions in campaign contributions from the billionaire's whose taxes they cut, the military contractors to whom they brought billions. Now, my friends across the aisle will vote to ensure students who were five when Republicans started running up the debt, will pay down that debt as the price of going to college.

Today a college degree is more necessary than ever, and more expensive than ever. Unlike my friends across the aisle, I remember that my own education was subsidized by the state. Unlike my friends across the aisle, I don't brag about paying for my college education during a time when our Federal and State governments looked out for students and the poor—when education was treated as a public good, and the minimum wage far outstripped its modern equivalent.

The modern Republican party—many of them bragging about their in-state educations when they want to stress how much they understand the common person's experience—have all but officially declared for the for-profit model of education. Cut funding, and cut funding, and cut funding to the school. Push more of the cost onto students. Use those students to profit. I apologize that we cannot politely agree to disagree, but treating our children as a cash cow while proclaiming concern about our children does not pass the test of well-meaning debate. If they want the government out of the educating children business, then say so. But don't treat public education as a chance to pay down the debt. Children born in 1995 aren't the reason for our problems—Republican policies are. Eighteen-year-old kids didn't force them to increase inequality; 18-year-old kids didn't force them to destroy American meritocracy by securing inherited wealth for the child of every billionaire and denying opportunity to low-income children; 18-year-old kids didn't make them destroy the middle class to secure greater wealth for those who line your pockets with contributions.

The promise of the American middle class was created when affordable education made the prospect of a good paying job possible for every child. If they want to destroy it, say so. If they want to take out on our children their own guilt about the haphazard, excessive spending of Republican administrations, say so. If they don't care about our children—at least not those who don't benefit from the millionaire tax cuts they pass at every opportunity—just say so.

I urge my friends across the aisle to look at their own actions, and reassess if they can in good conscience support taking more from children just entering into the adult world. I urge them to drop this bill and begin working on a real solution, one that provides the next generation the same opportunities they were provided.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act because this bill becoming law would be worse than allowing student loan interest rates to double on July 1, 2013.

If Congress does nothing the student loan interest rate will rise from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent on July 1st. As Members of the Congress, we know what this will mean for students in our states and what it will mean for colleges and universities in our Congressional Districts.

The bill H.R. 1911 does not fix the problem of higher interest rates for student loans, but places a greater financial burden on young professionals just starting out in life. The Treasury 10 year rate over the last several years is abnormally low due to the weak economy, but in years when the economy was strong the rate was consistently above 6 percent or more. This is the rate that H.R. 1911 would use to calculate student loan repayment not over the life of the loan, but each time funds were provided.

I have a strong interest in how student loan repayment plans impact graduates. During the last Congress, I introduced the College Literacy in Finance and Economics Act of 2011 or College LIFE Act to address the challenges faced by African American and Hispanic students who sign loan agreements, but may not have the financial literacy to comprehend the significance of taking on long-term debt.

My bill directed that eligible institutions provide financial literacy counseling to borrowers within 45 days after students receive their loan.

Literacy counseling under the College LIFE Act would require: a minimum of two 4-hour counseling sessions, the first when a student receives a loan payment, and the second when student's complete their study.

The focus of financial literacy education under the College LIFE Act was to make sure students knew through counseling what they were agreeing to in signing up for and receiving a student loan.

Counseling would provide information on student education financial options that went beyond loans and included scholarships. Student financial literacy programs can provide insight into information on loan management and the basics of personal financial management.

The bill would have also provided financial education that taught students how to: make a budget, prioritize financial decision making related to how to balance income, expenses and personal spending, develop realistic goals based on income, and manage credit and debt.

Students would have learned how to understand credit scores, credit cards, and investing so that they could become better financial consumers.

The College LIFE Act would have benefited thousands of graduating students. In the City of Houston, this spring I have participated in commencement exercises for the University of Houston, Texas Southern University, Houston Community College and Lone Star College North Harris. There are thousands of new graduates just in the City of Houston alone who are ready to pursue their dreams, but who will wake up to the reality of tens of thousands of dollars in debt.

I am proud to call Texas Southern University a constituent of the 18th Congressional District of Houston Texas. Texas Southern University is the third largest Historically Black College and University in the Nation. I joined Texas Southern University's current president Dr. John Rudley at the school's commencement. Texas Southern University has a long proud history of success in the students it has sent forth.

The school was founded in September of 1927 with a loan from the Houston Public School Board. This was not a loan intended to saddle the school with a debt too great to survive. For this reason, along with hard work and the dedication of faculty, students and the Houston Community, the University will celebrate its 86th anniversary this year.

Texas Southern University's loan statistics for the 9700 students attending the school tells us why financial aid is important:

Eighty-one percent of the students attending the school receive some form of student financial assistance.

Texas Southern University received $85 million in student financial aid revenue for graduate and undergraduate students.

Due to a change in how the Department of Education determines eligibility for parent student loans, there are over 400 fewer students attending Texas Southern University this year.

Changes to student loan rules—no matter how minor—can result in major consequences for a young person's prospects for a college or university degree. A college degree can open up a world of opportunities that would otherwise not be available.

I spoke at Texas Southern University's commencement exercise and was pleased to be joined by Michael Strahan, a Texas Southern University Alum who is a co-host of Live with Kelly and Michael.

Not all Texas Southern University graduates are as famous as Michael Strahan, but many

of them pursue careers that lead to personal and professional success. The goal of attending a university should and ought not to be gaining fame and fortune.

The outcome of our work in Congress should not result in crushing financial debt, because that will end the dreams of college for otherwise college-ready students.

In 2008, 62 percent of students who graduated with a baccalaureate degree left college with more than knowledge—they were burdened with debt. Students of every race, ethnicity, and gender struggle with loans.

According to 2008 statistics: 92 percent of African-American students, 85 percent of Hispanic students, 85 percent of Native American students, 82 percent of multiracial students, 80 percent of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Island students, 77 percent of white students, and 68 percent of Asian students received financial aid.

Education is the surest path out of poverty. However, if the changes proposed by H.R. 1911, that would amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 are allowed to become law, the cost of education will become more uncertain and much more costly.

The reason, I introduced the College LIFE Act was to deal with the issue of personal financial education that has to proceed or come as a requirement when students take on college education debt.

The bill directed that eligible institutions provide financial literacy counseling to borrowers within 45 days after students receive their loan.

The focus of the financial literacy education under the College LIFE Act was to make sure students knew what they were agreeing to in signing up for and receiving a student loan.

Counseling would provide information on student education financial options that went beyond loans and included scholarships. Student financial literacy programs can provide insight into information on loan management and the basics of personal financial management, such as how to make a budget, prioritizing income, expenses and personal spending, as well as how to develop realistic goals based on income.

These students would have also learned about credit and debt management by understanding the importance of credit scores. Counseling would make sure that students understood credit cards and investing.

The need for education from cradle to grave should be a national priority, not an afterthought. We know that the United States is behind in a wide array of areas related to Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics known as STEM education. The Republican leadership must make the national interest for STEM education a top priority.

Students who are graduating across the Nation are departing colleges and universities this spring with immense debt. Student borrowing is widespread with more than $100 billion in federal education loans distributed every year. In total student loan debt adds up to $1 trillion dollars. As a direct consequence of a weak economy more than ever, students and parents must rely upon loans to pay for higher education.

The only reliable way in today's economy to earn more is to learn more. During difficult economic times adults seek new careers by going back to school. Parents who want a better life for their children will take on college loan debt because the cost of education requires it.

This is a bad bill that will not solve the problem of out-of-control student loan debt. For the reasons stated, I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act. I was displeased that the House Committee on Rules decided late last night to consider this bill under a closed rule and would not consider any amendments submitted to H.R. 1911. My amendment would have extended Pay As You Earn in order to give past borrowers the same benefits afforded to new borrowers.

Pay As You Earn, created under the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, reduces the monthly payment under Income Based Repayment, IBR, by a third, from 15 percent of discretionary income to 10 percent of discretionary income, and accelerates the loan forgiveness from 25 years to 20 years. However, it is only effective for new borrowers of new loans on or after July 1, 2014.

We need to protect students from high interest rates on these loans so they are not financially paralyzed for simply pursuing an education. In a global economy, putting a college education within reach for every American has never been more important. But it's also never been more expensive. On July 1, the interest rate on subsidized Stafford student loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent if Congress does nothing, increasing college costs for over 7 million students by $1,000 per student, per loan. Unfortunately, this bill does not adequately provide the assistance our students need and instead exacerbates the college debt crisis.

According to estimates by the Congressional Budget Office, interest rates under H.R. 1911 will be higher than current fixed rates for millions of borrowers seven of the next ten years. Even more troubling, H.R. 1911 also includes provisions the will provide $3.4 billion in debt reduction. It will be a sad day in American history if should the Congress decide to further burden struggling students to reduce a national debt they will already be paying for throughout the course of their lives.

In Texas and all across the country, students and recent college graduates are now facing the highest unemployment rate of any other group. By 2018, 63 percent of all American job openings will require some sort of postsecondary education. In order for our country to remain competitive, we need to make college more affordable and accessible. Political gimmicks such as H.R. 1911 will only discourage our Nation's students from pursuing an education.

With the cost of higher education continuing to skyrocket, I simply cannot support a measure that will increase the financial burden for millions of students and their families. If Americans fail to address this issue now, we will default on commitment to a better future for our children. We owe it to our young people to provide the opportunities that will allow them to become successful and productive adults.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker. I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1911, the Making College More Expensive Act. This misguided bill would actually increase the cost of student loans and make it harder for graduates to escape the crushing burden of college debt.

It is a matter of critical national interest that we ensure our colleges and universities are turning out a well-educated, highly-qualified workforce. Unfortunately, the ever-increasing cost of tuition is creating a permanently indebted generation of graduates who are too often paying off crippling debt instead of building fulfilling careers that will increase their financial mobility and our country's economic competitiveness.

We should be working together to solve this looming crisis. Regrettably, this partisan measure makes college more expensive by tying student loan interest rates to the 10-year Treasury note, plus an additional 2.5 to 4.5 percent, and prevents students from locking in a fixed rate. Since these rates will reset every year, by the time next year's freshmen graduate, they will be paying more than double today's current rate for subsidized Stafford loans. The Congressional Budget Office estimates this will produce an extra $3.4 billion in federal revenue, meaning the government will be profiting off the extra debt students incur. I find this completely unacceptable.

That is why I am a cosponsor of a bill, introduced by Congressman JOE COURTNEY, to extend the current rate of 3.4 percent on Stafford loans for an additional two years. Rather than waging another partisan fight on a bill that will not pass the Senate and the President is prepared to veto, we should consider legislation that has a real chance of becoming law and that will provide real relief to students and their families. What we have before us today is a bait-and-switch scheme, promising benefits that cannot be realized for another four years and that can in no way be guaranteed.

As part of the upcoming reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, we should take on student loans as part of a comprehensive effort to address student debt, college affordability and the financial aid system as a whole. We can take advantage of today's historically low rates without making empty promises to college students.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to a bad bill that increases the cost of financing a higher education and adds to the burden of debt for students and their parents. Without quick Congressional action, the interest rate on subsidized Stafford loans will climb from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent in July for all new loans. Students and families struggling to afford increasing college costs are relying on us to stop this dramatic increase now, and to work in a bipartisan way to find a long-term solution that will make financing a college education more affordable. Unfortunately, the Republican bill being considering today will do the opposite; it will actually make college more expensive for millions of young people and their families.

Chairman KLINE and House Republicans are bringing a bill to the House floor that creates greater uncertainty for students and their parents by instituting a variable interest rate over the lifetime of loans. Under this legislation, a college freshman starting school this fall who takes out a subsidized Stafford loan this fall would have no guarantee of what their interest rate would be at graduation! Tying Stafford and Parent PLUS loans to a market-based rate might sound good now, when market rates are low, but that could quickly change. In fact, according to projections from the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, in four short

years the Republican plan would have students paying an interest rate of 7.4 percent on the Stafford loans they take out this fall. Students graduating from college in 2017 would be worse off under this bill than if we did nothing at all!

Too many students and college graduates across this nation are already struggling with a crushing amount of student loan debt. Congress should not pass a bill that would burden them with $3.7 billion of additional debt, as this Republican bill will do. What college students and their families really need is a comprehensive approach that makes college more affordable. The Democratic proposal freezes rates in the short term so that Congress can incorporate a long-term solution to student loan rates into the upcoming Higher Education Act's reauthorization. Democrats are asking Republicans to work with us to reduce the cost of higher education instead of shutting my colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee out of policy discussions and bringing partisan proposals like this one to the floor.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, May is college decision time for high school seniors across the country. The excitement and joy of this decision is, increasingly, tempered by concerns about just how they are going to pay for this education. The cost of college has gone up 150 percent since 1995. In July, federal subsidized undergraduate student loan rates are set to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, following the expiration of a one-year extension of lower rates. I support action to create a permanent fix to hold down student loan rates.

H.R. 1911 would require that student loan interest rates change year-to-year based on the 10-year Treasury note rate. In effect, over today's rates, H.R. 1911 would increase student loans by 2.5 percent to 4.5 percent, depending on the type of loan. Because interest rates on Federal student loans will be reset every year, under the Republican plan, next year's freshmen would face an interest rate on loans taken out freshman year of 7.4 percent, more than double today's current 3.4 percent rate for subsidized Stafford loans. Those borrowing the maximum amount would pay approximately $2,000 more in interest payments under this plan during the life of those loans.

This is unacceptable in a time of rising tuition costs and growing student debt. Not only does it burden our students and bar some of them from pursuing higher education, it also burdens our economy and limits economic opportunity.

Instead, I support H.R. 1595, the Student Loan Relief Act, which extends the current lower rate. I also support H.R. 1979, the Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act. This legislation, championed by ELIZABETH WARREN in the Senate, would allow students to take out federal student loans at the same low interest rate offered to large financial institutions. The low rate enjoyed by big banks, currently about 0.75 percent, would make college more affordable for more students.

Interest costs on student loans, however, are only part of the problem. A college education is easily one of the best investments an individual can make and as a nation, educating our young people is the best investment we can make in the future of our economy. Yet, college has become so expensive in the United States that it is far out of reach for too many students and those who do attend often find themselves saddled in a heavy debt load for years to come.

We must work to make education more accessible and affordable to all of our nation's students. H.R. 1911 runs counter to this goal and for that reason I do not support it.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider yet another bill that will make secondary education even more expensive for students. I strongly oppose this legislation that would serve to deepen the student debt, and burden student borrowers with crushing debt, when we have the ability to find a temporary solution, creating the time to find a better solution that would allow student borrowers to thrive.

Pursuing higher education is becomingly increasingly essential to securing gainful and fruitful employment in the United States. Most students and their families cannot afford to pay for college outright and as such, rely on financial assistance from the government. This bill would offer these students the help they are seeking, only to later force them to accept sky-rocketing interest rates. It is projected that student borrowers entering school this fall would be subject to a 7.4 percent interest rate by the time they graduate in 2017. This is more than double the current interest rate of 3.4 percent. Approximately 81 percent of African-American students and 67 percent of Latino students find themselves graduating with both a bachelor's degree and a staggering student loan debt. This is in comparison to the 64 percent of white students who also graduate with student debt.

Students should be focusing on their studies and pursuing their dreams, not about whether or not they can afford to attend the next semester, or how they will be able to repay the tens of thousands of dollars of student debt awaiting them after graduation. Not only would the passage of the "Smarter Solutions for Students Act" create a crushing debt for those students and their families seeking to further their education, it would also create long-term negative effects on our already bruised economy. Student borrowers who are subject to the proposed variable interest rates would have little choice but to delay homeownership and starting families. Furthermore, subjecting students to such a drastic increase in, and variability of student loan interest rates would prohibit many students from returning to, and revitalizing their rural communities which are in need.

The "Smarter Solutions for Students Act" is entirely nonsensical. Student borrowers are being exploited, and turned into profit generators for the government. Over the last five fiscal years, the department of education has collected approximately $101.8 billion dollars in profits from student borrowers.

I urge the Republicans to find a short term solution to this issue and freeze the current interest rates, so that the House can work on a long term solution. We must make college more affordable for those students who wish to attend. Currently, the student loan debt is at $1 trillion. To allow the student loan interest rate to increase on July first would only serve to exacerbate this debt, and pile on billions of dollars to loan debt.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 232, 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

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

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

Ms. SINEMA. I am.

Mr. KLINE. 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:

Ms. SINEMA moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1911 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Redesignate section 3 as section 4.

Insert after section 2, the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM TEASER INTEREST RATES THAT LEAD TO HIGHER LONG-TERM COSTS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) authorize a student or parent borrower to be charged a teaser interest rate that entices the borrower with an initially low-interest rate that subsequently skyrockets, dramatically increasing the total amount of interest due on a Federal student loan for the student;

(2) authorize an increase in the total cost of postsecondary education for students;

(3) authorize false advertising that hides the true cost of any Federal student loan to a student or parent borrower, including possible interest rate increases from year-to-year, the total amount of interest that a borrower may owe on such loan, and the number of years that a borrower may take to repay such loan; or

(4) limit the authority of the Secretary of Education to include in any disclosure related to interest rates that the Secretary is required to provide to a borrower for a loan made under part D of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a) at or prior to the disbursement of such loan—

(A) an explanation that the applicable rate of interest for the loan is a variable interest rate and how such variable rate may affect the borrower's total cost of attending an institution of higher education; or

(B) estimations of the total amount of interest payments that a borrower may owe under all possible interest rate scenarios under this paragraph for each repayment option and length of repayment that is typical for borrowers under such Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

□ 1200

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill and will not kill it or send it back to committee.

I oppose H.R. 1911. While it's bad enough that student loan interest rates

are set to double on July 1, this bill actually makes interest loan rates even worse for our students. By allowing interest rates to rise dramatically on their loans, this bill steals from students and forces them to pay for Congress' debt. That's absolutely unacceptable.

The higher interest rates in this bill will force graduates, who are just beginning to plan their lives, to pay an estimated added $1,200 each year to the government over 5 years. That's in addition to what they're already expecting to pay. And not only that, the interest rate is not guaranteed, so they can't even plan for this bad news.

When you buy a car, you know what your interest rate will be for the life of the loan. Future graduates who are starting a family, looking for work, and hoping to contribute to our communities should at least have the same reassurance about their investment in their hard work as they would have when buying a car.

It is Congress' duty to stop student loan interest rates from increasing by July 1, and it is outrageous that we would force students to pay for the debt that Congress has created. Hard-working students shouldn't have to pay for Congress' mistakes.

Two weeks ago I shared the story of one of my students at Arizona State University, Ariel Carlos. Ariel and his wife, May, worked their way through college to pay for school and put food on the table for their kids. Ariel also took out student loans in order to make it.

Ariel has debt that he and his wife will pay for decades to come. Students of mine, like Ariel, will make about $30,000 a year when entering the workforce. They can't afford to pay down Congress' debt in addition to taking care of their families. When Ariel asks me to tell Congress not to make matters worse for families like his and then Congress responds with this so-called solution, we have failed him and his family.

My motion to recommit would help students. My amendment includes a truth-in-lending requirement that stops teaser rates. Teaser rates start low, but then skyrocket without warning and cost thousands of dollars more for students in the future. This amendment also requires the government to tell students the true cost of their loans, including the amount of their interest payments. This amendment allows students to plan for their future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, Representative GEORGE MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman for offering this motion to recommit. I think she goes right to the heart of the matter, and that is the uncertainty that is being presented by the legislation on the floor today.

Other Members tried to deal with this issue of uncertainty. Mr. HECK from Nevada tried to deal with this uncertainty by providing an incentive for those students who borrowed money and were able to pay 4 years on steady payments to give them incentive to continue to do that. Mr. RICE of South Carolina sought to have a lower rate.

This lower rate isn't chiseled in granite. This isn't the market rate. This is a choice of the Republican Members of the committee to choose these rates. Mr. RICE thought this time couldn't we have the lower rate to begin with, but the Rules Committee turned that out. Then Obama's plan was offered, and they turned that out.

So now we're stuck, and that's why we need this motion to recommit, to do as the gentlewoman from Arizona has said: to protect the students from the escalation of their interest rates, to protect the students from the escalation of the cost of college.

These are families and students. Companies and colleges create calculators to try to show students what it will cost over 4 years. This legislation takes all of that uncertainty out for families: how they set money aside, how they save money, how they borrow money. Those calculators don't work with this variable rate, and this variable rate can go on and on and on and on. That's the problem here.

This is a big choice for most families. I appreciate for some families that it's not a big deal as they've got enough money. From where I live, my family, people around me, my neighbors, this is a big choice and commitment to finance the education of your children. That's why this motion to recommit from the gentlewoman from Arizona is so important. There should be truth in lending for America's students, truth in lending for America's families, and we should get rid of the rates that will just punish them and crush them into the future as they graduate from college and they seek to participate in the American economy and in a career of their choice with the talents that we need as a Nation.

I want to thank the gentlewoman so very much.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Minnesota wish to still maintain his point of order?

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, we're trying to get to a long-term solution on how student loan interest rates are set. I believe the process for that is to pass the underlying legislation here, talk to our Senate colleagues, get them to act so that we can come together and come to a long-term solution.

The gentlelady's motion puts Washington squarely back in the middle of setting student loan interest rates. It's the wrong thing to do. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion and vote ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Ms. SINEMA. 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 approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 223, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—194

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

Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—223

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

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Bonner
Clyburn
Cole
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Herrera Beutler
Lewis
Markey
Miller, Gary
Speier
Stivers
Westmoreland
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1230

Messrs. BARLETTA, ROONEY, GRIFFITH of Virginia, COOK, and RYAN of Wisconsin changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CARNEY, VISCLOSKY, and COHEN, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KIND changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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 221, noes 198, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

AYES—221

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

NOES—198

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Bonner
Clyburn
Cole
Garamendi
Gibson
Herrera Beutler
Johnson (GA)
Lewis
Markey
Miller, Gary
Speier
Westmoreland
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1239

Mr. MAFFEI changed his 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker: On rollcall No. 180, (Ordering The Previous Question on H. Res. 232, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1911—Smarter Solutions for Students

Act) had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 181, (Adoption of H. Res. 232, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1911—Smarter Solutions for Students Act) had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 182, (Member (D–) Motion to recommit H.R. 1911 with instructions) had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 183, (Passage of H.R. 1911—Smarter Solutions for Students Act) had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 184, (Approval of the Journal) had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 182, on consideration of a motion to recommit with instructions for H.R. 1911, and rollcall vote 183, on passage of H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, because of a longstanding commitment to discuss compassionate approaches to assist the poor and hungry. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 182 and "aye" on rollcall 183.

FAREWELL TO AUSTIN BURNES

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members want to catch planes, and I will be brief; but I did want to take this opportunity.

From time to time we, in sadness, see one of those people leave who have served this institution very well, and served me, both in my role as majority leader and as Democratic whip. But I wanted to rise at this point in time to say thank you—and I know you want to join with me—to Austin Burnes, who is leaving as my floor director and as a valued friend and staff member.

At the same time, I want to thank those on Speaker BOEHNER's staff, on Majority Leader CANTOR's staff and on Whip MCCARTHY'S staff who have worked so well and positively with Austin Burnes, for helping us to do our job better. Obviously, there were differences from time to time—well, maybe all the time—but I thank you for that.

Austin, I want to thank you for the service you have given to this institution, to your country, to me, and to all the Members who appreciate very much your advice and counsel.

THE JOURNAL

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on 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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1773

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor on H.R. 1773.

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

There was no objection.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the 2013 State of the Union address, President Obama stated that every day we must ask ourselves: How do we attract more jobs to our shore? And how do we make sure that the hard work leads to a decent living? Well, this week the House considered and passed H.R. 3, the Northern Route Approval Act, legislation approving the Keystone XL pipeline.

Despite estimates showing thousands of new jobs resulting from the project, the administration has delayed approval. Despite the Democrat-led Senate passing an amendment recommending its approval, the administration has delayed approval. Despite an environmental review process that has been more rigorous than similar, previously approved projects, the administration has delayed approval. Despite two-thirds of Americans favoring its approval, this administration has delayed approval.

It's time for the President to move from asking the jobs question to answering it. He can do so by ending the bureaucratic delays blocking approval of Keystone XL and moving forward with this vital project that will bring thousands of high-paying jobs to America's shore.

IRREVERSIBLE DOES NOT MEAN UNAVOIDABLE—REJECT KEYSTONE XL

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to say that we have now passed 400 parts per million of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for the first time in human history—in fact, for the first time in several million years.

This is, indeed, a milestone, but it should not be a breaking point. We have done damage to our climate through human activities. If we continue to fill our atmosphere with carbon and other greenhouse gases, then, yes, we will begin to experience irreversible changes to the planet.

Over the last century, we have demonstrated how human actions—especially the unregulated consumption of fossil fuels—can harm our planet and upset human welfare, as we've seen with historic droughts, fires, floods, and superstorms more and more.

Yesterday, the House again voted to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, a project that represents a long-term reliance on fossil energy and would commit us to the path toward irreversible global warming and climate change.

The political decisions we make today will decide the future. We must reduce our dependence on conventional fuels and redirect our policies.

□ 1250

REMEMBERING OUR FALLEN HEROES AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day we take time to honor all those who sacrificed so much to secure our Nation's freedom, peace, and prosperity. This week, I came together with a bipartisan group of my freshman colleagues to lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery. We paid respect to our Nation's fallen heroes, especially those known only to God.

In my opinion, there is no more special place in our Nation's capital than Arlington. When you enter the gates, all labels but American are shed. And no words are necessary, for the countless rows of white markers speak volumes. With the sometimes vigorous debate in this Chamber, it is important to remember those who rest just 4 miles from here. There we find what holds our country together.

The Book of Wisdom teaches that: "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment shall touch them. They are at peace." What comfort, indeed, for our fallen heroes.

REDUCE THE COST OF COLLEGE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, higher education has always been the pathway to economic prosperity in this country. In fact, a Georgetown University study—my alma mater—shows that a college graduate earns

over $1 million more over a lifetime than a non-graduate. Yet, today our college students are graduating with debt despair instead of job security.

That's why Barbara Malloy called my office. She's a single mom, an elementary school teacher. She's got a son, James, in his freshman year of college. She is very, very worried that she's not going to be able to afford to keep her son in college because they're racking up tens of thousands of dollars in debt.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I oppose today's plan. I think we have to do better. We need to find a way to reduce the cost of college, not raise the cost of college, and I hope that we can in a bipartisan way do a better job.

MEMORIAL DAY 2013

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they are from every State and territory. They are of all races, both sexes. They are from farms, ranches, and cities. They are rich and poor, but generally they are young. They all to a person are volunteers, the all-American volunteers, volunteers to defend America. Some have gone off to war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Some have returned. Some have returned with the wounds of war, and some have returned with an American flag draped over their coffin.

Here are 37 warriors from the Second Congressional District in Texas who died protecting us from the forces of evil in Afghanistan and Iraq. You see they are very diverse. They are all races, they are young, they are old, they are from privates to colonels, enlisted to even West Point graduates, they are from different branches of the service.

So this Memorial Day we remember them all, those who gave all, and we thank their families for giving America their sons and their daughters, for the worst casualty of war is to be forgotten.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the list of the 37 warriors killed in Afghanistan and Iraq from the Second Congressional District of Texas.

SSgt Russell Slay, U.S. Marine Corps, 11/9/2004.
LCpl Wesley J. Canning, U.S. Marine Corps, 11/10/2004.
LCpl Fred Lee Michael, U.S. Marine Corps, 1/26/2005.
PFC Wesley R. Riggs, U.S. Army, 5/17/2005.
SGT William B. Meeuwsen, U.S. Army, 11/23/2005.
LCpl Robert A. Martinez, U.S. Marine Corps, 12/1/2005.
SSG Jerry Michael Durbin, U.S. Army, 1/26/2006.
TSgt Walter M. Moss Jr., U.S. Air Force, 3/30/2006.
PFC Kristian Menchaca, U.S. Army, 6/16/2006.
SSG Benjamin D. Williams, U.S. Army, 6/20/2006.
LCpl Ryan A. Miller, U.S. Marine Corps, 9/14/2006.
SSG Edward Reynolds, Jr., U.S. Army, 9/26/2006.
CPT Michael Fraser, U.S. Army, 11/26/2006.
LCpl Luke Yepsen, U.S. Marine Corps, 12/14/2006.
SPC Dustin R. Donica, U.S. Army, 12/28/2006.
SPC Ryan R. Berg, U.S. Army, 1/9/2007.
SSG Terrance D. Dunn, U.S. Army, 2/2/2007.
LCpl Anthony Aguirre, U.S. Marine Corps, 2/26/2007.
PFC Brandon Bobb, U.S. Army, 7/17/2007.
PFC Zachary Endsley, U.S. Army, 7/23/2007.
SPC Kamisha Block, U.S. Army, 8/16/2007.
CPL Donald E. Valentine III, U.S. Army, 9/18/2007.
LCpl Jeremy W. Burris, U.S. Marine Corps, 10/8/2007.
SSG Eric Duckworth, U.S. Army, 10/10/2007.
CPL Scott A. McIntosh, U.S. Army, 3/10/2008.
SGT Shawn Tousha, U.S. Army, 4/9/2008.
Lt. Col. Mark Stratton II, U.S. Air Force, 5/26/2009.
SPC Jarrett Griemel, U.S. Army, 6/3/2009.
Cpl Jeremy W. Johnson, U.S. Marine Corps, 5/11/2010.
P03 Zarian Wood, U.S. Navy, 5/16/2010.
Sgt. Brandon Bury, U.S. Marine Corps, 6/6/2010.
SPC Matthew Ryan Catlett, U.S. Army, 6/7/2010.
SSG Edward Loredo, U.S. Army, 6/24/2010.
SSG Jessie Ainsworth, U.S. Army, 7/10/2010.
SSG Leston "Tony" Winters, U.S. Army, 7/15/2010.
SFC Calvin Harrison, U.S. Army, 9/20/2010.
PFC Cody R. Norris, U.S. Army, 11/9/2011.

NFL ATHLETE SAFETY

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, there are few things Americans enjoy more than watching Sunday football with their friends and family. But the excitement of football, the clashing of helmets, the tackles, can cause long-term health damage to our Nation's athletes.

Last May, Junior Seau, a former Miami Dolphin and one of the top linebackers in NFL history, sadly took his life after battling a debilitating depression associated with repeated head trauma.

Last season alone, we saw high profile players sent back into the game immediately after suffering concussions. This is unfair to athletes, their families, and it is also unfair to taxpayers since they pick up the cost when these athletes can no longer afford the cost of their injuries.

The NFL has the power to ensure that the American pastime—this American pastime—becomes safe.

PATRICK HENRY COLLEGE'S NATIONAL MOOT COURT TEAM

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Patrick Henry College's National Moot Court Team on their fifth consecutive national championship this year. The team boasts two two-time national champions, as well as a national orator champion who holds the record for the most points earned in the history of the league.

Patrick Henry College, or PHC, has now won a total of seven national moot court championships and has built a strong reputation for success nationwide. I thank the coaches—Dr. Michael Farris, founder of PHC, and Dr. Frank Guliuzza—for their leadership and investment in these young leaders.

In a time when we are asking the government to get out of the way, PHC serves as a shining example of what can be achieved when freed from the binds of the government's purse strings. From day one, the college has not accepted Federal funding.

I congratulate Patrick Henry College, and its talented young people, for the example it has and will continue to set for higher education in America.

I also thank Congressman FRANK WOLF for graciously giving me the opportunity to make these remarks.

MEMORIAL DAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we leave here today, many of us will anxiously return to our constituency to be able to celebrate and pay tribute to soldiers, those who have fallen, and of course those who are now veterans.

As I look out—and will look out—into the vast audience at the Houston veterans cemetery, I can tell you that I will see an array of America; families who have come to say thank you to the fallen. Those who have no relatives at that particular site are just being Americans. And as we, as Members of Congress, are sent to the podium to say thank you and to talk about the work we have done, the beautiful sunshine will shine on those faces, and we will feel that America is a country that really understands the love and affection for our soldiers and those who are on the battlefield.

I want to thank the city of Jacinto City, which will be placing flags to honor our soldiers. And I want to thank the community of Heights, where I will go later and place flags at the World War II memorial and draw the community together.

It is a day when we bond together as Americans because we are not of any party, of any region, of any political persuasion. We are simply Americans saying thank you to the soldiers, God bless you to America. For those who have fallen, we will never, never forget you, never any day of our lives.

IN RECOGNITION OF DEPUTY CHRIS JONES

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Deputy Chris Jones of the Jersey County, Illinois, Sheriff's Department.

On April 23, Deputy Jones pulled a 67-year-old woman from a car that was being swallowed by floodwater. At 8:42 in the evening, Deputy Jones received a call to alert him of a driver in distress on State Highway 100.

When he arrived on the scene, he tried to make verbal contact with her, but her car was submerged in water that covered the hood and part of the trunk, and she was unable to respond. He proceeded to enter the water, where he found the driver still conscious and he assisted her from the vehicle. He later learned that the woman had been trapped for around 40 minutes.

Because of his valiant efforts and service to Jersey County, I am proud to honor the actions that Deputy Chris Jones took on April 23 of this year.

□ 1300

THE IRS SCANDAL

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, the IRS has broken faith with the American people. The agency responsible for administering our Tax Code has admitted targeting Americans for their political beliefs.

American families across the country are disappointed and fearful. They are disappointed that the administration that promised hope and change has used its enforcement power as a political weapon. They are fearful of a government that has expanded under President Obama at an alarming rate. They are disappointed that our President has not taken responsibility for his administration's shameful behavior. They are fearful of corruption that is the logical result of a rapidly expanding bureaucracy and an administration that confuses playing politics with leadership.

Hardworking families deserve better. Federal agencies have a responsibility to be above politics, and we have a responsibility to hardworking American families to hold accountable those who politicize decision-making and those who are untruthful about those decisions.

THE IRS

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Firings and jail time are in order. On Friday, May 10, the IRS admitted to the targeted scrutiny of conservative groups in their applications for tax-exempt status. Hundreds of groups have been targeted, and it went beyond those with just ''Tea Party'' or ''patriot'' in their names.

Since then, there has been a resounding opposition on both sides of the aisle against the IRS' abhorrent actions. The President called this incident ''outrageous.'' Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it's beyond outrageous. It is completely unethical. For those involved in this mess, I expect them to be held accountable for their audacious abuse of power.

Did I mention that firings and jail time are in order?

Thomas Paine said it this way:

> Government is at its best a necessary evil and at its worst an intolerable one.

I am RANDY WEBER, and that's the way I see it here in America.

MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Greetings to my friend Jim Withrow, whom I would like to recognize today, and I would just remind everybody of how important it is that we participate in this Memorial Day weekend in order to remember those who have fallen and honor those they've left behind.

It's a lot of times thought of as a weekend to go out and have barbecues or watch car races on TV or sports like that, but it's really rewarding for the heart for us to go participate on Monday in one of our communities. For those watching, just take that time in the morning to go out and honor those veterans. It will make you feel better as an American. Then our obligation as citizens is to fulfill our role as voters, as people who hold our government officials accountable, because when you hear veterans say that they don't recognize the America they once fought for 50, 60 years ago, it really hurts.

So let's uphold the honor of our Nation that they fought for and be participants in our government in the process and hold all of that accountable and honor them in that ultimate way. We give thanks for their service, and God bless them. Please participate on Memorial Day this weekend.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in strong opposition to the Making College More Expensive Act. This legislation is an attack on students, and it undermines the dream of higher education.

If we are serious about getting our country back on the right track, putting people back to work and ensuring that we remain competitive in the global economy, we have to do more to make higher education more accessible and more affordable, not more expensive.

Without congressional action, the interest rate on Federal subsidized Stafford loans is scheduled to increase from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for more than 7 million students. Rather than fixing this problem, this legislation makes it worse. This bill will hurt young people and middle class families who are already struggling with crushing student loan debt. The idea that as a country we make money on the pursuit by young people of their educations is plain wrong.

Simply put, the United States Government should not be making a profit on student loans, and there are several proposals pending before the House today that would give students access to college at the lowest cost possible. The Student Loan Relief Act, the Responsible Student Loan Solutions Act, and the Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act would each preserve low interest rates for students; but the bill before us today is a bad Republican idea that will make college more expensive for working families and millions of students.

According to the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, students with 5 years of subsidized Stafford loans borrowed at the maximum amount would owe $4,174 in interest under the current rate. It would rise to $8,808 if we allowed interest rates to double on July 1; but under this proposal, students would owe a total of $10,109 in interest payments on their loans. Hidden within this bill is a blatant bait and switch scheme that will allow students to borrow money at one rate before their interest rates skyrocket.

We've seen this before. Our friends on the other side of the aisle like to claim that putting student loans into the marketplace is a cure-all for increased student debt; but in this case, the ''marketplace'' is code for billions of more dollars in interest payments, as this bill would prevent students from enjoying the lowest available interest rates. This is just wrong.

Our young people deserve more. It's in the interest of our entire country to ensure that as many young people as possible have access to higher education. So let's reject the Making College More Expensive Act and find a serious long-term solution on student loans that will make college more affordable for millions and millions of Americans.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has been an interesting week here in Washington, especially here on Capitol Hill. We found out a great deal we didn't know before. We're getting more details. It's intriguing that we have the IRS official, Ms. Lerner, who knew—found out about—the outrageous practice of targeting what were perceived to be the President's enemies—people who wanted the Constitution followed, people who felt they had been taxed enough already, the Tea Parties, constitutional groups, pro-Israel groups, conservative groups, people who could have made a difference in the last election.

One reporter had asked before, Why would people even be bothering to get legal status? Why would they even apply to the IRS to get 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4) status?

The answer is: because that's the way the government has taken over people's political abilities, because you can't call people to Washington or call people to come state their opinions without normally raising money, and if you don't have a legally recognized group by the IRS, then the IRS will go after the individuals who engage in pooling money and in helping pay people's way to get them here. They'll go after the individual.

□ 1310

We have forced people who want to make their voices heard collectively into begging the IRS for legal status, and the threats are there if you don't get their legal status recognized. Then when we see what the IRS has done as just an arm, basically, of the Democratic Party to help defeat or help prevent people from having legal status, it is absolutely incredible, especially when you find out they wouldn't even give them an answer ''yes'' or ''no''; because these people at the IRS, the higher ranking officials, they knew if they denied a request, gee, that could be appealed and they might get an answer before the election, and they weren't going to let that happen in time, at least, to make a difference in the election. So it's what most people who care about the Constitution have been afraid of for so long.

I've heard some people, some friends, some Republican friends say they think Richard Nixon was a great President, but I've read transcripts of conversations. Anybody who will say one thing to one person and turn right around immediately thereafter and say exactly the opposite to another person and play them against each other, I just can't consider that to be a great President.

We know that under the Nixon administration the IRS was used to target an enemies list, but now we find that under this administration it's been used and abused as a process, as a political arm in ways that Richard Nixon would never have dreamed possible. He never would have dreamed that anybody would get away with this kind of activity before an election, especially after Watergate. And so it has been.

So we want to take this time to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that people are aware and the RECORD contains the stories of different Tea Party groups and the difficulties they've had. In that regard, I am quite proud to yield to my friend from New Mexico, Mr. STEVE PEARCE. Hopefully, it won't hurt his reputation for me to call him a dear friend. That's the way I figure him.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and we will hold those comments quietly between ourselves here.

You bring up a point that absolutely must be discussed in public. We need to highlight those things that are going on right now from our government towards its citizens.

Our Founding Fathers understood this policy very well, this concept. They said:

> When the people fear the government, there is tyranny. When the government fears the people, there is liberty.

I hear constantly from people in America right now that we fear the government, we fear the retribution, we fear that they're going to come in and take things from us, that they're listening to us at all times. Many would discard that as simply paranoia, until now.

An 83-year-old grandmother in Albuquerque, New Mexico, who I've known for the last 15 years, since I've gotten into political circles—she's probably the most joyful, ebullient person in all of politics because she's here for what comes in the heart, not for what it can do for her. You see, she's a naturalized citizen who was born in Indonesia.

She came here and ended up, from ages 12 to 16, spending time in the Japanese internment camps because of her origin, though she's not Japanese herself. She has experienced the government that would become heavy-handed in a time of war. But the government that would become heavy-handed over political processes is a completely different government than that during World War II.

She helped establish the Children's Freedom Scholarship Fund, where she hands out patriotic coloring books to youngsters in the Albuquerque area. And because of these activities that got the attention of the IRS, they came in and audited and harassed this 83-year-old grandmother.

I had an email before the scandal broke about one of my constituents in Socorro, who said: I was audited and we couldn't figure out why. I talked to my accountant. During the audit, we couldn't figure it out. There was no unusual question. But during the audit, I noticed a handwritten name across my file, and I just made mental note of it.

After an audit that asked nothing specific, the auditor asked, Do you know—and he read the name. The guy says, It doesn't ring a bell to me. It did not. On the drive home, he said, Wait a minute. That's that meeting I went to 3 years ago. That's the meeting where I said, I don't want to be a part of this group. They're interested in the Constitution and the debt. I know about all that stuff. He writes a small check, leaves and never goes back. One meeting with the guy who later formed the Tea Party—it wasn't even formed—causes an audit.

When our government knows this kind of minute information and is willing to single you out, to veritably persecute you, because persecution is when we're dealt with differently, we have a different set of rules, that then qualifies as persecution. When this government is willing to do that, it causes us to say, Wait. This is not paranoia. This is justifiable fear of our government.

A small school in my hometown wanted to charter itself and submitted a 501(c)(3) application. The application was never handled. It went on and on and on. Our office made a call, and then the person listed on the organizational chart was called in for an audit.

I will tell you that we were told by the administration spokesman yesterday, Mr. Lew, the Treasury Secretary, that there's absolutely no indication that this was anything political.

There's absolutely no indication that it was anything but political, Mr. Lew. Regardless of what you all say down the street, understand that the American people are frightened of the government. They also think, with respect to the idea that we're going to hold people accountable—we hear that: We're going to hold people accountable; we're going to bring them in; we're going to look; we're going to find the facts, and then we're going to hold them accountable.

The American people look with a little bit of curious disregard for those statements.

Why would Americans be suspicious of the government, that they won't actually do anything to the people who are involved, that they won't actually get to the bottom of it? Well, there's a track record in the last 5 years that has caused the American citizens to look with disdain at any promises that there will be penalties, that the wrongdoers would be punished.

You can start with the Fort Hood shooter. He has not yet been brought to trial. He murdered dozens of people, and he has drawn $287,000 in pay because they can't take him off the payroll until he comes to trial. Meanwhile, the victims can't get their pay from the government that they're supposed to receive, and the American people understand an injustice is occurring from this White House because they will not pursue convicting a man that everyone knows has committed murder.

Well, it's said that's one instance. We can, then, take a look at Fast and Furious. I was one of the first to call for Attorney General Holder to resign, and we should look more closely at his participation in the Fast and Furious,

where rifles were sent across the border and came back and killed an American employee of the Border Patrol. Yet no one has been held accountable for that action there.

Mr. GOHMERT. I think that it's worthy to note that apparently, when there was a Fox News reporter named Rosen that wanted to look into this Fast and Furious information and hopefully get the scoop, get to the bottom line of what really happened, instead of this Justice Department doing as it told the American people, as the Attorney General and all these other people said as part of this administration, ''We're going to get the people responsible for this,'' instead of being diligent and relentless in getting to the bottom of what happened—who approved these 2,000 or so guns being sold to criminals that would be in criminal hands and ultimately used to kill hundreds of Mexicans?

□ 1320

Mexico should be outraged at what this administration has done. Instead of doing that, they go after a reporter that wants to find out what happened. They end up going after his phone records. They go after his email, from what we've learned, apparently. Possibly other family members. And they still, all these years later, haven't given us real information on who was responsible, who authorized that, who forced the sale of those guns. All we know is that this administration has tried to use Fast and Furious to demand more gun control legislation.

And we have a President that goes down to Mexico in the last 2 or 3 weeks and tells them about how outrageous it is that America has been selling guns to criminals that are using them in Mexico. He should have donned his hat and said, Thank you very much, my administration did that to you, and I'm very sorry. But, oh, no, he blames America without actually saying, Please, I beg your forgiveness. This was my administration's doing.

They haven't even gotten to the bottom and, instead, go after the reporter that tried to find out what happened. That's even more outrageous, and it goes to just what the gentleman was saying about people wondering how can we trust this administration when they've said that they're going to get the people responsible and they've done no such thing.

Mr. PEARCE. I think the gentleman's points are well made, and to continue the discussion of why Americans might be skeptical about whether anyone will pay any price for what has happened in the targeting of certain groups in this country by the Internal Revenue Service, it's also important that we look at other cases that have not yet been prosecuted and in which wrongdoing occurred.

MF Global was a commodities trading firm. Jon Corzine, a Democrat-elected official, took over that firm. It's against the law, when you have your money in these trading accounts, whether it be Merrill Lynch or whoever, it is against the law to take your money out and use it for corporate governance activities, for corporate organizational activities. And yet Jon Corzine reached down into customer accounts and pulled out $1.5 billion of money from account holders and spent it trying to keep his failing organization together. His efforts failed. MF Global filed bankruptcy. That was in 2011, and still Mr. Corzine has not had to answer any questions, has been convicted of no wrongdoing, hasn't been brought to trial, and hasn't had a grand jury impaneled.

Bernie Madoff, we saw him take billions from investors. And for decades, the regulators had reports that he was doing it, and not one regulator has been held accountable for their oversights and omissions. No one has ever checked.

So when we hear the administration say, Trust us; we're going to get to the bottom of this IRS scandal and we're going to hold people accountable, there is an anger building among the American people that says we don't think that Washington will hold anyone accountable.

You have the AP reporters whose phone records were gotten, and not just the ones who were involved, but the broad pool of reporters, and yet nothing is happening to the people in the Justice Department who did that.

Benghazi is another element where we believe no one will ever be held accountable. In fact, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton says, What does it matter?

What it matters, ma'am, is that someone allowed American soldiers to be killed without reinforcements. C–130s were within flying time. Drones were there. Lasers were locked onto the artillery that were firing rounds into that compound, and no one says a word.

And so we have the Internal Revenue Service investigating and holding audits for law-abiding citizens like this 83-year-old grandmother. Meanwhile, there are over $1 billion of unpaid taxes by Federal employees. Why doesn't the Internal Revenue Service go after the Federal employees who refuse to pay their own taxes.

The highest profile case is Mr. Geithner, who became Treasury Secretary; and we were told that he's such an important person, he can't be held to account for small actions like that. Yet one political party, one political viewpoint has been singled out by this administration in order to put the chill on people who might be involved in activities that would disagree with the government.

We've seen governments like this before in American history. We've seen tyrants before. We've seen tyranny before in world history, and I think Democrats, Republicans, and Independents are going to stand up on these issues and demand accountability from Washington. I think the American people are coming together with a will and a backbone that will stand up and say, You, the people who perpetrated these evils and these crimes, will be accountable.

That's what makes this country great. That's what makes this country the envy of all other nations because we have a Constitution that our Founding Fathers put in place which gives the people the power. The government is working at the approval of the American people. I think the American people are coming together across racial lines, across party lines, across religious and cultural lines to say that we demand accountability from our government officials, that we will not allow any citizen to be treated this way.

The Nation spoke this way when it was Richard Nixon, and I think the Nation will speak this way under this administration. The parallels are extreme. When the government gets too strong, it's time for the people to stand up and say, No, you are not all powerful, that we the people do establish and ordain.

I think the people of this country are going to question this establishment and are ordaining. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, and I would like to yield to the gentleman for a question.

It's my understanding that the Albuquerque Tea Party was one that filed for 501(c)(4) status 3 years ago. I don't know if the gentleman is familiar with the Albuquerque Tea Party.

Mr. PEARCE. I am. I've been there many times. They're people concerned about small government. They're concerned about the debt and the deficit. They understand that these are the biggest risks that we face, and they speak articulately and coherently about that. They are also groups that hold elected officials accountable for their actions. I think those are positive things.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, apparently, after 2 years of waiting, they got a multipage letter from the IRS asking for really extensive, intrusive information that it sounds like the IRS should never have had to inquire about. But here again, it sounds like another case where the IRS knew if they ruled on whether or not they would have 501(c)(4) status, they could have appealed and probably had a good case based on what the IRS has been doing. They wouldn't give them an answer.

Mr. PEARCE. We had been listening. Before everyone recognized it was a nationwide scandal, we were hearing these reports. No matter that we disagreed with the Obama administration on policies, we never believed these reports to be true. So we investigated, but you could never substantiate. And now, then, 2 and 3 and 4 years later, to find out that it was systemic, that it was intentional, and that it was politically motivated causes one to fear for

the very institution that we call our Constitution and our government.

□ 1330

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming the time momentarily, it's interesting, you know, we find out, as people have been digging deeper over the last few days, that the President of the United States met with the anti-Tea Party IRS union chief the day before the agency targeted the Tea Party.

National Treasury Employees Union President Colleen Kelley commented on the relationship between the anti-Tea Party IRS union and the Obama White House, and made this statement: For me, it's about collaboration.

So it is also important to note, and I didn't know if my dear friend was familiar with Executive Order 13522, I wasn't until just the last couple of days, but redstate.com had done a job of finding this.

This was an executive order that the President ordered, beginning in 2009, requiring that government agencies collaborate, consult in pre-decisional discussions with union bosses that would have to be off the record, unrecorded, and private, beyond the reach of anyone seeking to get information about the conversations.

And, in fact, this administration said pre-decisional discussions, by their nature, should be conducted confidentially among the parties to the discussions. This confidentiality is an essential ingredient in building the environment of mutual trust and respect necessary for the honest exchange of views and collaboration.

Well, this is the President that was going to have the most transparent administration in American history; yet, I didn't know, in 2009, he ordered these agencies that ought to be completely transparent, ordered them, his employees, to have meetings before they make important decisions with union bosses.

So that tells us something too about the atmosphere that was being created, when a union boss gets to have secret conversations with government officials that cannot be retrieved by any of us wanting the administration to be transparent. And we know that those unions were anti-Tea Party. They wanted them eliminated, and they get to go talk to the IRS officials that are making decisions about targeting the Tea Parties. Something seems awry.

I yield to my friend for a comment.

Mr. PEARCE. Yes, I would agree with the gentleman. Something seems awry.

The American people have a fascinating intuitiveness about them. It's reported that the unions spent $40 million to defeat Scott Walker. The reason Scott Walker won, he won 40 percent of the union vote.

People who are supposedly represented by the union bosses understand that when their leadership begins to take this country in the wrong direction, that they will exercise their voices and they will speak up; and that's the very powerful reminder that we, as people, have at the ballot box.

When the American people are left without government interference, without government threats, without the IRS intimidation, the American people choose rightly an awfully big percentage of the time. So I have the ultimate belief, because I'm hearing Democrats here on Capitol Hill as outraged as Republicans. I heard Republicans under the Nixon administration as outraged as Democrats.

It's when we come together in a common belief that our Nation, regardless of political viewpoints, represents all viewpoints, that we all have a right to speak, that we all have a right to compel. That's what's made us strong through our history.

And so those Democrats who now are saying that the IRS and this administration have gone too far are the strength of this country, as Republicans were under the Nixon administration.

So I have the ultimate belief that we, as Americans, are coming together again in our core principles to understand that no government, no matter which party, is powerful enough to come in and have watchdogs over us, to allow members of their party to take $1.5 billion from segregated accounts without being held accountable for the criminal actions.

They understand that we cannot break the laws of this Nation and other nations, sending guns to a foreign country illegally; not even the government can do that.

And they understand there's something intrinsically wrong when we hear the pleas of our four embassy personnel saying we need help, and we refuse it.

The American people have had enough. It doesn't matter that it's Democrat. If it was a Republican, it would be enough too. And I think the American people are coalescing into an idea that we are a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

And I believe that coalescing is going to provide us the framework for a new political institution. Don't know what it'll look like, don't know how it's going to shape up, but the American people are saying that enough is enough. Enough corruption. Enough scandals. Let's start cleaning out the mess. And that's what I hear from constituents from both parties every week I'm at home.

We're going to continue our work here, but I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his bringing this issue to the floor.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you very much. It is an important issue.

We have a report here indicating the currently countless numbers, trying to get a count of groups that were targeted. We've seen reports that groups, Jewish and Christian groups, that were very supportive of Israel got heightened scrutiny by the IRS. They were deemed, apparently, not to be supportive of the President, as the IRS, apparently, at least their leaders, wanted them to be. And, obviously, that was after consulting with the union boss, the IRS employees.

Let me just say I know many IRS employees, and there are those who are afraid to comment because of concern over their repercussions; but they're outraged because they came into the IRS and they were taught and they were trained you cannot have any conflict of interest. You cannot make any decisions based on political bias. You cannot have ever owed the IRS any money if you're going to work for us.

In fact, there was outrage among some that were afraid to speak up because they were not allowed. They were told that you cannot underpay through withholding what you will ultimately owe on your income tax. Or if you file an amended return where you failed to initially include income, you may be fired from the IRS.

So the first thing that this President does is go out and hire a guy who swore, I believe it was three or four years in a row, he swore to his employer that he would pay the taxes that were due and owing. If they would just give him all the money, he would see that the taxes on that money was paid.

And lo and behold, those taxes were not paid, as he swore he would. And not only was he not barred from working for the IRS; he was made the boss over the IRS, the boss over the entire Treasury Department.

But the Greater Phoenix Tea Party in Arizona filed for a 501(c)(4) in October of 2010 and, after waiting 2 years, received a letter demanding an inordinate amount of information. And so far, even now, this Internal Revenue Service has refused to give them an answer on their 501(c)(4), effectively keeping them out of the political process for the 2012 election cycle, and now working, apparently, even now, to keep them out of the 2014 election cycle.

Amazing how effective the IRS can be when one administration can use them to further their goals.

□ 1340

The Mississippi Tea Party filed for a 501(c)4 status in 2009. On September 28, 2010, the group received a letter from the IRS wanting additional information, including what their relationship was with the Tea Party Patriots. But their analysis got rather abusive.

The Portage County Tea Party in Ohio applied for tax exempt status and they received incredibly onerous questions, harassing questions, and they answered them, gave them information that no one should have to provide. Four years later, they're still waiting on an answer.

The Mississippi Tea Party. They're still waiting. The Portage County Tea Party. They're still waiting. Anyway, it's just incredible.

The Alabama Tea Party we already mentioned. Really abusive requests were made by the IRS, harassing them. The Texas Patriots Tea Party filed for a 501(c)(4) status in June of 2012. They received numerous followup questions

and have not heard back from the IRS about their status. So they were effectively kept out of the 2012 political process.

Again, apparently there are reporters that are so far removed from how the political process has been forced to work. You've got to have IRS approval or they will come after you individually when you try to engage in any type of group effort. It used to be there was a freedom of assembly. You could gather people, assemble people as you want. You could pay for their bus fare. Unions do it all the time. But they have a very special status, obviously, with this administration.

One of the great scenes in video history was my old friend, Andrew Breitbart, coming out of the Coliseum and seeing all these protesters. He starts asking them about their signs, what they mean, can they give specific examples about when Glenn Beck lied or things they had on their signs. They couldn't. And it was amazing. I didn't see it in the beginning of the video but Andrew saw it immediately. These people were plants. They were handed these signs by their union. They were told to stand there and talk about people lying, and just demean individuals and organizations, as instructed by their union leaders.

When he got to the bottom of it, there was a note somewhere that it was produced by the union. So he got to the bottom of it. He had a camera that followed him as he would ask questions very pointedly. It became very clear they didn't know what they were there about, they couldn't give individual examples. They were told to go out there and be a protester. And the unions took care of it. And when the cameras were making them look bad, they were ordered to get back on the union bus and leave the area by the union bosses. Andrew had that gift. He could see right through all the baloney. It's a shame he's no longer with us. But what he has left is an organization that's doing even more amazing things.

You had the Ottawa County Patriots from Michigan file for 501(c)(3) status August 22, 2011. They're still waiting for a ''specialist'' to approve their application, despite numerous attempts to get clarification from the IRS. So they were totally kept out of the 2012 political process because of the partisan IRS leadership that would not even give a ruling on these things. It wasn't a problem for organizations that were supportive of the administration, apparently.

There were groups like the Louisa, Virginia, Tea Party in Virginia that decided not to apply after they heard from other Tea Party groups just how abusive the IRS was being. And their leaders didn't want to go through individually what other Tea Party leaders were having to go through. So the Louisa VA Tea Party never got their lawful status from the IRS. All of those people were effectively kept out of the 2012 political cycle by this partisan IRS work and effort.

The DeLAND 912 organization from Florida also heard about the horror stories of how abusive the IRS became if you applied for legal status as a Tea Party, so they didn't apply. Once again, the IRS was successful in their political endeavors in silencing another group of people from Florida during that political cycle.

Goose Creek 912 Project from South Carolina, they were preparing to file for a 501(c)(3) status or 501(c)(4) but after they heard about all of the harassment of other Tea Party groups, they voted unanimously not to file. The IRS partisan efforts worked. Another group of Americans were silenced because of the partisan political work of the IRS.

The McLean Tea Party in Illinois, another case where they decided not to apply after they got word of all the horror stories about the IRS abuses of individual Tea Party leaders and the individual Tea Party constituents themselves of the intrusive, abusive questions and information that was being demanded by the IRS.

The Lanier Tea Party Patriots from Georgia also heard about the widespread, massive abuse of Tea Parties that applied for legal status. So yet another group of people was silenced by the partisan, abusive Internal Revenue Service.

As I said, I know numerous employees of the IRS that would never think of being abusive like this. It is completely an anomaly to their way of thinking. It is counterintuitive to everything they have been taught and trained. But somehow this administration comes in and all of a sudden they see the IRS as the greatest political gift any partisan group could ever have and they use and abuse it after consulting, as ordered, by the President of the United States. They are ordered to have secret meetings with union bosses before they make decisions, which we now know occurred before they made decisions to go after the Tea Parties.

So the President of the United States signs Executive Order 13522 and orders an agency that is supposed to be completely nonpartisan, nonpolitical, to meet with an extremely political, extremely partisan boss before they make decisions. It is staggering.

So we know there's some that ask, Did the President know, did he not know? When you see that the President of the United States ordered meetings with partisan union bosses before decisions could be made by administrative heads at the IRS, it doesn't seem to me to matter much whether the President knew that they specifically targeted the Tea Parties. He ordered them to meet and to take in consideration what the union bosses said. If he ordered that those be completely confidential and beyond the scope of Freedom of Information Act requests, then there has to be some responsibility taken where the buck ultimately stops.

□ 1350

The Rowan County Tea Party in Tennessee—hopefully I'm saying that correctly—the good folks there filed for 501(c)(4) status in February of 2010. They received demands for excessive amounts of information, some of which is not required by law whatsoever.

Just 2 weeks ago, after over 3 years, and being kept out of the 2012 election cycle, having any input—not just on the President's race, but on issues—they didn't care about political candidates; they cared about issues. They knew if they could form these political Tea Parties, they could have an effect. Whether it was a Democrat, Republican, a Libertarian or an Independent that came forward, they knew that if they were a group as a Tea Party, they could get powerful enough and have their voices heard loudly, as they spoke loudly enough as a group, that somebody—Republican, Democrat, Libertarian, Independent—somebody would step forward and say I support what you believe, and I'm with you on the issues.

They were not about a party. They spent a lot of time being mad at the Republican Party, like I do. They weren't about a party; they were about the process. They wanted a constitutional country and a government that acted within the confines of the Constitution. And the IRS was determined to subjugate them, to punish them, to abuse them, and abuse the process of the IRS to make them pay for having the audacity to speak up or try to speak up, as did our Founders.

I can't help but note, I was tickled, some left-wing drone organization—drone basically being unmanned; they're not using their brains; they're just doing as they're directed—came after me for saying here on the floor, gee, the IRS might have shot the original Tea Party participants. Well, obviously that's hyperbole. But I found in Washington if you use sarcasm, you speak metaphorically, allegorically, use hyperbole, that it's often lost here.

We were having a discussion, for example, about endangered species. And I mentioned, gee, I understood—wasn't sure if it was true—but I understood there had been a pair of spotted owls that we were told for years couldn't mate anywhere but virgin woods, untouched by human hands, that may have been seen mating in a Kmart sign. In sheer sarcasm, in irony, I said, you know, a lot of Kmarts have been out of business. Maybe we need to see if that's really true and, if so, maybe get Kmart signs and see if they ought to be declared endangered and maybe have a Kmart sign forest where these little owls could mate like crazy out there in the Kmart sign.

And I look over at people and reporters, folks sitting there, and you could see people looking at each other: Do you think he's serious? Anyway, it's an interesting place to—not live, but work here in Washington, D.C.

You have the Rochester Tea Party Patriots in Minnesota. They filed for 501(c)(3) status in August 2010. The group finally received their 501(c)(4)

status 2 years later in 2012, but not soon enough to have the kind of effect that they could have to make nominees, potential nominees, accountable for abiding by the rule of law and following the Constitution, as they wanted to do.

The Chattanooga Tea Party in Tennessee, they filed for 501(c)(4) status in November of 2009. The group received a letter from the Cincinnati IRS office in July 2010 with extensive, intrusive, abusive questions and demands. After 4 years, they received notification that they were approved. Apparently, as this scandal was about to break, the IRS realized, gee, well, we got what we wanted; we kept them out of the 12 election cycle so they could not have any influence whatsoever there. And we're about to get in trouble, so why don't we start giving approval to some of these folks. And we're seeing that happen.

The San Angelo Tea Party—the town that my parents lived in briefly right after they got married, San Angelo Tea Party back in Texas—they filed for tax-exempt status. But after receiving the intrusive, abusive, mean-spirited demand for information that the IRS had no business inquiring after, they withdrew their application. Once again, the IRS didn't have a chilling effect; they had a freezing effect. Froze them out and kept them from being able to participate as a group in the 2012 election cycle.

The San Fernando Valley Patriots in California filed for 501(c)(4) status in the fall of 2010. The group heard nothing from the IRS until February of 2012, when they received a packet from the IRS in the mail giving the group a 20-day time period to respond. After the abuse, the demands, the intrusiveness, the outrageous activity of the IRS, the San Fernando Valley Patriots in California finally, in August of 2012, felt like they had no choice but to crater under the abusive weight and power of a partisan, mean-spirited IRS leadership; and they pulled their application in order to protect their members from this kind of abuse.

So you've got to say, the executive order in 2009 by the President of the United States—current President—ordering the extremely partisan union bosses to be consulted on decisions by the IRS, find out that the union boss met with the President right before the decision was made as well. I guess when you're the President, you don't have to sign an executive order requiring that you have secret, confidential meetings with union bosses before you make decisions. You just do it, appears to be the case.

Then we find out, gee—and this is a brand-new story, this one by David French dated May 22, yesterday afternoon—that it wasn't just Tea Parties; it wasn't just constitutional groups; it wasn't just pro-Israel groups. The article title is ''IRS Morality: Defend Planned Parenthood, Deluge Adoptive Families With Audits.'' In the article, skimming on down, it says:

During the 2012 filing season, 90 percent of the returns that claimed a refundable adoption credit were subject to additional review to determine if an examination was necessary.

□ 1400

The most common reasons were income and a lack of documentation.

It notes that:

Sixty-nine percent of all adoption credit claims during the 2012 filing season were selected for audit.

Of the completed adoption tax credit audits, over 55 percent ended with no change in the tax owed or refund due in fiscal year 2012. The median refund amount involved in these audits was over $15,000 and the median adjusted gross income of the taxpayers involved is about $64,000.

These would be considered middle class Americans.

The average adoption credit correspondence audit currently takes 126 days, causing a lengthy delay for taxpayers waiting for refunds.

It's interesting because we get word—as the article said—that the IRS has harassed a number of pro-life groups, including at least one alleged demand that a pro-life group not picket Planned Parenthood in order to have or keep their tax exempt status.

It points out this statistic:

In 2012, the IRS requested additional information from 90 percent of returns claiming the adoption tax credit and went on to actually audit 69 percent.

And that more details can be obtained from the Taxpayer Advocate Service.

It's really outrageous. And it's pretty clear to anybody familiar with the political process here in Washington that most people that are very supportive of adoption are not in favor of abortion. So if you want to go against—as the IRS, if you want to go after the opponents of Planned Parenthood, you want to go after the opponents of killing babies in utero, then if you go after parents that adopt children—a very, very costly process—you can have a very chilling or freezing effect on those parents who just want to adopt a child, adopt children, give them a loving home.

And this IRS' morality—as the article points out, because of the current leadership that is now under scrutiny—go after these middle-income folks that are not supportive of abortion and want to adopt, we'll teach them a lesson. It's very clear, it just screams from the statistics and information that we get from the IRS.

It's also worth noting—as prior articles have—that people have claimed, not the adoptive tax credit, but the child tax credit has been claimed—as has been shown many times—by people who did not legally come into the country. And there have been articles about that. Of course, I guess, everybody knows they'll never get a Pulitzer Prize for incredible investigative reporting on the billions of dollars that may be obtained by people who come into the country illegally and then have learned you can claim a tax credit and get more money back than you put in. Oh, no, even if you don't have a Social Security number—as the law currently requires—to get that child tax credit, the IRS thought: Hey, we've got a good idea, we don't care that Congress said you've got to have a Social Security number, hey, we want to get all the tax income in we can, and we hear from some of the folks in Congress that there are people somewhere out there in the shadows, so we'll just give them a taxpayer number, even if they don't have a Social Security number, and let them get that child tax credit from there. So there are plenty of people that have come out of the so-called shadows to claim a child tax credit.

That's why Robert Rector, in talking with him this week, he says the projection probably that if people who are here undocumented, illegally, whatever you want to call it, are given legal status, then it will likely cost the country around $10 billion that these individuals will be able to get back in child tax credit once they're legally here and that many are getting even now. An estimated $1 billion—one estimate I read was $4 billion—that we're currently paying out from the Treasury to people that are getting more back than they paid in who are not legally here, don't have a Social Security number.

So they're not going after those folks. Not auditing, not going in and demanding to know where are all these children you claim to get all this money back—$20,000, $30,000 you're getting back from the government for a child tax credit—where are all the children? Oh, no, they're not going after them. No. They much prefer to go after what some of these partisan political leaders in the IRS see as their political enemies.

When you have people like that heading up the IRS, you don't have to have an enemies list, like Richard Nixon had. You've got your friends at the IRS that are doing it for you.

So when we hear claims of outrage and we see that these people have suffered absolutely no consequences from this President—the boss—as a result of their outrageous, illegal, unconstitutional activity, then it seems that maybe the outrage is not as loud as we were being told that it originally has been.

And then when you find out that the AP—certainly hasn't helped me any, but that doesn't matter, we're supposed to have a free press—if they want to go after a guy that's conservative that has a southern accent, that's their prerogative. But we find out that the White House—the Justice Department at least—the Justice Department went after the AP, just like they did Rosen at Fox News, they go after the AP and get hundreds of phone numbers because they say they're after this egregious leak. The Attorney General told our committee last week, Gee, it's one of the most egregious leaks—not the most egregious, one of the most egregious

leaks—he had ever seen. Turns out all of the leaks that allow him to go after a conservative group or to intimidate a group like the AP, to them they're egregious. When we find out, Mr. Speaker, he could have just looked at the records of a handful of people in the administration—he chose not to do that, it might have embarrassed the administration—he abuses the freedom of the press.

It's time that people who are responsible are made accountable.

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

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives to raise the issues of our time and have this opportunity for this dialogue that I know that you turn a focused ear to, as well as do the other Members, their staff, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor here, one thing is to support the statement made by the gentleman from Texas across the spectrum of the topics that he addressed. He does see the world through a clear set of eyes and isn't afraid to say so, and we need more Members like Congressman GOHMERT, who is fearless and courageous and a constitutionalist and a rule of law Member, and he understands the Constitution and the law, being an attorney and a judge and a member in good standing of the Judiciary Committee for a number of years now, where one can learn a few things about those topics, as well as bring their own expertise in.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's the committee, the Judiciary Committee, where the immigration issue is likely to process through—or up to and, perhaps, not through.

□ 1410

There is a tremendous amount of, I will say, a hurry up, urgency momentum that has been created on the immigration issue over in the United States Senate. We can count it in hours the time that it has been since the Senate passed, I call it, an amnesty bill, a comprehensive immigration reform bill, which is the more modern vernacular for ''amnesty.'' That's phraseology that was manufactured by people who couldn't quite bring themselves to say the truth on this, and that was the case back in 2006 and 2007 when it was George W. Bush and his people who were pushing this comprehensive immigration reform-amnesty.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, was that we had an election last November, on November 6 to be precise, a Tuesday we would all know. There was a great expectation that Republicans would win the majority in the United States Senate and a great expectation that our Republican nominee, Mitt Romney, would be elected as President because, after all, who could imagine a second term for a man who refused to carry out his oath of office in his first term.

So the voters went to the polls, and there was a bit of a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the people on my side of the aisle, and a good number of them stayed home, a number that is calculated to be about 8 million voters; and about a million voters who normally would have voted for Barack Obama stayed home, but that's more than the difference between the election in the popular vote, and it may well have translated into a difference in the election in the electoral vote.

However, we know what happened in the election. The President was reelected. There were some seats that were lost by Republicans, a net seat lost by Republicans in the Senate. Republicans lost some seats here in the House, but maintained still a strong majority in the House and would expect to do so at least into the foreseeable future.

But the results of that election were overreacted to by many people on my side of the aisle. They looked around and asked, How did we lose? Of course, the people who were the architects of these kinds of campaigns wouldn't want to take on the blame themselves, so they looked around to see where they could cast the blame elsewhere. They settled upon this theory in the middle of the night, so I would say it was in the morning, which started at 12:01 a.m. on the morning of November 7, 2012.

That theory that they settled on was that Mitt Romney would be President-elect that morning and President today if he just had not been so strident on immigration, if he just had not said those two words: self-deport. Their theory was that that was the reason that Mitt Romney is not the President today.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I think that's a manufactured theory, that it's a flawed theory, that it's not based on fact, in polling, in logic. If it's likely true that the Hispanic votes were the decision-maker on this election and then if the Hispanic vote went 71 percent for Barack Obama, I would ask those folks who think that you'd turn that vote around the other way by passing amnesty, Can you tell us how it is that Republicans can capture a majority of the African American vote when typically African Americans in this country will vote 92 percent for the Democrat or 95 or 96 percent for the Democrat if it's Barack Obama on the ballot?

So, if they can't tell me how one should reach out to the African American vote when we are the party of the abolition of slavery—and I can stand here and tell you my great grandfather five times great—and for the record, because people get things intentionally confused, that's great, great, great, great, great grandfather—was killed in the Civil War. He was killed in the Civil War, fighting to put an end to slavery. They were an abolitionist family, and 600,000 Americans gave their lives in that struggle to put an end to slavery, roughly half on each side, roughly 300,000 on each side—more on the Union side than actually on the Confederate side by the data that I'm looking at.

Mr. Speaker, the emancipation of the slaves and an end to slavery and the blood that was spilled by the sword that was to be compensated for the blood that was spilled by the lash seems to be forgotten in the political parties of today. When you look to see what it took to pass the Civil Rights Act in the sixties, it took Republicans in greater numbers in the House and Senate to pass the Civil Rights Act than it did Democrats. There were a lot of Southern Democrats who were segregationist Democrats, I would remind people.

Nonetheless, the promise of what's coming out of the U.S. Treasury—and some of it's borrowed money from the Chinese and the Saudis and others—seems to have eroded the support for Republican fiscal conservatives among the certain minority groups in this country and others who are struggling to make a go of it. It's hard for them to see down the line a little ways as to how much more opportunity there is in America if we recreate the opportunity society that is being replaced by the cradle-to-grave welfare state that we have in America today. Not only is it a cradle-to-grave welfare state, but it is a cradle-to-grave welfare state that promises a middle class standard of living.

I look at some of the numbers that have been rolled out by, for example, Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, who is the most accomplished, senior, respected, and definitive researcher on these topics that I know, and I deal with many, many of them. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the executive summary of about a 102-page report that was issued by Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation. It's a special report dated May 6, 2013, and the title of it is ''The Fiscal Cost of Unlawful Immigrants and Amnesty to the U.S. Taxpayer.'' The data that's in here should cause anyone in this Congress to pause before they would begin to look in any positive way on the Senate bill that is their 844-page comprehensive amnesty bill. Some of this data that's in here, Mr. Speaker, is shocking to people who haven't at least been numbed by the reality of it for some time.

The average illegal household in the interim phase of this bill would be a net cost to the taxpayer. They'd pay taxes and draw down welfare. Some will say that folks who are in this country illegally don't qualify for welfare. No, the truth of that is there are

at least 80 different means-tested welfare programs, and those who are in this country illegally just qualify for some of those 80, not for all of those 80. That is the truth, and it has been often distorted. So the net cost to the taxpayer per household in the interim phase for people who are unlawfully here now and who would be granted the amnesty status by the Senate version of the bill would be $11,455. That's borrowed against our children's labor, I might add, Mr. Speaker.

After that interim, when they qualify for a larger number of those 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs—''post-interim'' is how it's defined by the researcher Robert Rector—then the net cost per household is $28,000. The taxpayers will be subsidizing these households in the interim for $11,455, and when they qualify then for more of the welfare benefits, that net cost goes to $28,000. The average retirement, because they are going to retire just like anyone else, is going to be a net cost to the taxpayers per household of $22,700.

Robert Rector in his report—and I'm going to quote from it because I think the language is very powerful—says:

> Regrettably, many policymakers also believe that because unlawful immigrants are comparatively young they will help relieve the fiscal strains on an aging society.

Regrettably, this is not true. Now here is where I focused on this, Mr. Speaker:

> At every stage of the life cycle, unlawful immigrants on average generate fiscal deficits, and that's benefits exceeding taxes. Unlawful immigrants, on average, are always tax consumers. They never once generate a fiscal surplus that can be used to pay for government benefits elsewhere in society. This situation obviously will get much worse after amnesty.

That is an irrefutable fact. There are others who will argue that there is a dynamic economy, and you can calculate this growth and dynamic economy. Well, they're not calculating the cost to society. They accept that we are a cradle-to-grave welfare state.

I've had this debate with Art Laffer, who I have great respect for. He is the author of Ronald Reagan's, I'll call it, ''Laffer curve.'' I agree with that theory to cut taxes and stimulate the economy. That worked when Ronald Reagan came in in the early part of the eighties and was sworn in January of 1981. Art Laffer was there, and I'm glad he was. The economy grew and we recovered, and the Reagan years are looked back on as the transformative years when America was pulled from the abyss of the malaise.

□ 1420

So I give him great credit. Not only that, he's intelligent and he has a fantastic sense of humor. But here's where I disagree with Art Laffer and why I disagree with some people in Cato and why I disagree with the purist of Libertarians is this:

Many of them believe that labor should flow back and forth across the border as if it were any other commodity like corn, beans, gold, or oil, and that the marketplace will determine where labor will go just like it will determine where you send these other commodities that I've listed.

The flaw in that rationale, Mr. Speaker, was spoken to by Milton Friedman, whom I'm confident Art Laffer knew well and probably had this debate with him. But Milton Friedman, the University of Chicago economist, famed internationally, said a welfare state and open borders cannot coexist. You might actually turn that around the other way, but the principle is the same. Yet we have a cradle-to-grave welfare state that guarantees a middle class income. If you don't work at all, you can draw down enough benefits to live as if you were working at a modest wage.

Milton Friedman understood that, that the welfare magnet will draw people in and they won't have the necessity to work in order to maintain that standard of living because it's being bought down, bid against by the welfare system.

And my debate with Art Laffer came out to be essentially this:

When I make that point to him that open borders and a welfare state cannot coexist, his answer is, Then end the welfare state.

Well, that would be nice if we could do that, Mr. Speaker. If we could at least rachet it down and take that hammock that used to be a safety net—it was as safety net to keep people from falling through. That was the original welfare system that we had. Now we have people in this Congress that continually rachet in another program here, another program there, manufacture this one here and that one there. There was only one welfare program out of an entire 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs that required work.

Some of us will remember the intense welfare reform debates in the nineties when this Congress so aggressively and eagerly required the Welfare-to-Work program. Most of us in America have forgotten that the Welfare-to-Work program really was only one program, the TANF program, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. All the rest of them, none of them require that there be work, only TANF. And the President of the United States, even though the law is specific and he doesn't have the constitutional authority to do so, the President of the United States simply waived the work requirements in TANF. So this country now has no requirement of Welfare-to-Work, not even in one of the 80 different means-tested programs that we have.

We're seeing wealth transfer in this country. We're seeing class leveling in this country. We're seeing work and production and wealth punished and extracted from the sweat of someone's brow to pass it into the bank account, or, should I say, the EBT card, of someone else. When that happens—John Smith saw that that didn't work. He said, No work, no eat. Jesus said essentially the same thing, that you've got to work and earn your way. It's in numerous places in the Bible. It's in numerous places in our history.

Think about it in your family. If you have one family member that won't do anything, they want to sit on the couch and they want somebody to bring them food and bring them entertainment and they don't want to go out and mow the lawn or carry out the garbage or scrub the floors or do the things that you do around the home, let alone go punch a time clock and earn a living, how long does it take before that family says, I'm tired of that? I'm going to send you out into the world to earn your own way because you're digressing here; you're not developing your skills.

That is the way of the family. It's the way of the tribe. It should be the way of the Nation. Gently and compassionately take care of the people that can't take care of themselves, and nurture those that have an ability to contribute to our GDP out to go contribute to the GDP.

But we've lost that because there's a class-envy wedge that's being driven from the White House on down. It existed before Barack Obama became President. It was driven hard in here when we had the previous Speaker of the House, these class-envy wedges driven in and the effort, because somebody has something more than you have, to take from them and give it to somebody that has less.

Perhaps I can find this while I talk, Mr. Speaker, but that was well-articulated by Adrian Rogers, who has since passed away. But the principle of why people work and why they won't is an important principle to make, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Adrian Rogers was talking about wealth and work and stated:

> You cannot legislate the poor into freedom by legislating the wealthy out of freedom. What one person receives without working for, another person must work for without receiving. The government cannot give to anybody anything that the government does not first take from somebody else. When half of the people get the idea that they do not have to work because the other half is going to take care of them, and when the other half gets the idea that it does no good to work because somebody else is going to get what they work for, that, my dear friend, is about the end of any nation. You cannot multiply wealth by dividing it.

That was the late Adrian Rogers, from 1931 to 2005. I never met him, but with clarity, he spoke to this issue, and more articulately than I am able to, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate his contribution to the discussion in our society, but there are people here that see this; they see that there is a political gain to be made by expanding the dependency class in America. So they decide that they're going to punish the rich, tax the rich.

Remember, the tax rates had to go up on the upper-income bracket. That was

a demand of the President of the United States. He could have gotten just as much revenue by cleaning up the loopholes and it would have given a more balanced tax plan than we have, but he had to raise the taxes on the highest bracket because that was a notch in his belt, a feather in his cap to punish the rich.

There's been a political gain to do that. That's been the motive because it gathers votes and it expands the dependency class. When you do that, that keeps people dependent upon one party with one-party rule. And this country and this society has one place where we block bad ideas. That's here in the House of Representatives where there is a Republican majority, where there's still a majority of us, I believe, that support and will defend free enterprise capitalism.

Anybody that's going to take the naturalization test to become a citizen of the United States can go look at the flashcards that CIS—Citizen Immigration Services—hand out. They're a glossy flashcard like that on a red backing, and you can pick them up. On one side it will say, Who's the father of our country? Flip it over, George Washington. Who emancipated the slaves? Abraham Lincoln. What's the economic system of the United States of America? Flip that over, and it says, Free enterprise capitalism.

Newly arriving immigrants, to-be-naturalized citizens study that and know that, but I suspect there are a whole lot of people over on this side of the aisle that, if they know that, they don't believe it. They don't understand how supply and demand is answered by the marketplace, how people need to be rewarded for the work that they do.

I take you back, Mr. Speaker, to 1976 when Jimmy Carter, one of the least successful Presidents in our history, said something that I'm happy to quote. He said this in Iowa, as he traveled all over Iowa and made the first-in-the-Nation caucus an effective venue for Presidential candidates. He said:

> I believe the people that work should live better than those that don't.

That's probably going to be labeled ''offensive'' in today's Congress. But it was Jimmy Carter's statement back then in 1976, and I believe it.

And we have people in this party, my party, that looked at that theory that popped up in the early morning hours of November 7 and concluded, We're never going to win another Presidential election, another national election if we don't first pass comprehensive immigration reform. That's based on Barack Obama getting 71 percent of the Hispanic vote because that number has—it's gone up and down, but it's crept up for Democrats over time.

What they have forgotten is that tens of millions of dollars and very much organizational effort has been put into it by the Democrats to call Republicans racists; and my colleagues on my side of the aisle, they seem to disregard all of that money spent, all of those dishonesties perpetrated. They think that if it exists at all, it didn't have any effect. It all was just those two words that Mitt Romney said, ''self-deport.''

□ 1430

We need to look at the actual facts. The actual facts are Bob Dole had the lowest percentage of Hispanic vote when he ran for President in '96. It was 21 percent. It is also true that Ronald Reagan, who signed an amnesty act in 1986, didn't get George H.W. Bush, Bush 41, a higher percentage of the Hispanic vote. It got him a lower percentage of the Hispanic vote.

If they're going to correlate this thing, I tell you, here's how you correlate it, Mr. Speaker, and it's this:

There were about 800,000 people that originally were to qualify for the amnesty in 1986 that Ronald Reagan signed. That number crept up to about a million. That's kind of the settled historical number. There were about a million that were here that fit the qualifications to receive amnesty from the '86 act that Reagan was honest enough to call the Amnesty Act.

And then once he signed that bill, then there was document fraud and people who came across the border. The magnet of amnesty drew more people in, and that number now, the lowest number that I see of those who received amnesty in 1986, or from the 1986 Amnesty Act, is about 2.7 million people. A lot of times you see 3 million as the quote. It'll go up to 3.5. Well, let's just settle on 3 million people.

If 3 million people received amnesty under Ronald Reagan's 1986 Amnesty Act, and then on average each of them—and this is data that can be chased down, and bigger numbers than I'm about to quote are available out there in certain studies, but on average a low number for family members brought in because of those that received amnesty is about a factor of five, or a little bit more. So let's just hold it down on the low end.

Three million received amnesty. They averaged bringing in five people by the family reunification plans that are there. Now, that's 15 million people. Some of them have died, and some perhaps have gone back to their home country, but there are a large block of voters there that have shifted over to vote for whom, Mr. Speaker? Barack Obama. Barack Obama.

I will make this statement. If the theory of those who believe that they can reverse the trend of Hispanic vote, if their theory is correct, then I would suggest to them, if they can provide amnesty and somebody is going to benefit from that, if their theory is correct, they have to admit that Ronald Reagan's signature on the 1986 Amnesty Act brought about Barack Obama's election. If you take those numbers of people out of the polls and you calculate that percentage of 71 percent—so let's just say we take 15 million people out of the rolls and say they wouldn't have been here without the 1986 Amnesty Act, or at least they wouldn't be voting, and if 71 percent of them voted for Barack Obama, then it's clear to anybody that can do any kind of statistical analysis that Barack Obama wouldn't be President of the United States without Ronald Reagan's 1986 Amnesty Act.

And if that's the case, then how do the people on my side of the aisle think they're going to fix that problem? If it was created by amnesty, you create a bigger problem by amnesty by a factor of, let's say, four. And I'm just rounding 3 million times up to about 12 million, or 2.7 times 4 gets you in that 11.5 million range.

That's the facts of what we're dealing with here, Mr. Speaker. They've suspended their logic. They've suspended their reason. They've suspended their ability to look at data, surveys, polls. They've suspended their respect for the intelligence of the American people who honestly want to see the rule of law.

And all of us have compassion for all humanity, and I believe in the dignity of every human person. It's commanded by my faith. But also, when those who use religion to advocate for amnesty say, ''For I was a stranger, and you let me in,'' Matthew 25:35, when you look at the interpretation, you have to go back to the Greek. ''Stranger'' in English, in Greek is ''xenos.'' Xenos in Greek means invited friend, invited guest. It doesn't mean intruder. There's no religious commandment that says when someone comes into your house that you have to welcome them in. You're not commanded by God to do so. That's why we have a man's home is his castle. That's why we have nation-states with borders.

In fact, it says in Act 17:

> And God created all nations on Earth, and he decided when and where each nation would be.

That's his commandment. And I'd suggest to those people that say to us, ''For I was a stranger, and you let me in,'' they should understand also what Jesus said when they tried to trick him on that question about whether to pay taxes or not. And they showed him the coin and he said:

> Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and render unto God the things that are God's.

Civil mercy is not something that can be delivered by religion, and mercy is not something to be delivered by government. We have civil law. Civil laws are set up by the judgment of the people. That's why we have penalties that are written into these laws, and that needs to be applied evenly. And, yes, people can have their dignity and still respect our laws; but somehow, some of the religious movement in the country believes that mercy should be delivered by civil law, that we can grant amnesty in the name of mercy to give a legal status to people here that

are unlawfully here in the United States.

And so I'd ask them to go back and peruse through their Bible, Old and New Testament, and show me where the word ''mercy'' is used. And wherever mercy is advocated in the Bible, next to it you will see the word ''repentance.'' Mercy is never delivered biblically without repentance as a prerequisite, a requirement.

I don't see repentance out here in the people advocating for U.S. citizenship and the reward for that, but I can tell you, they and their descendants will remember who offered it, as they did in 1986.

And when the President of the United States came to the Republican Conference and he said to us, You must pass comprehensive immigration reform as Republicans or you will never win another national election; I'm trying to help you—that's the President of the United States. He's not trying to help Republicans.

We have some people who will take the bait on that, and the hook has already been set and they're trying to reel that amnesty bill over from the Senate and line it up here in the House of Representatives. It will split this party in half. It will pit Republicans against Republicans. The Democrats know that. That is a clear tactic in politics to divide the other party down an issue if you can. Republicans are falling for that. We should not take up anything until the President keeps his oath of office and enforces the laws that we have.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), I am pleased to re-appoint of The Honorable Betty McCollum of Minnesota to the National Council on the Arts.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today until 11:15 a.m. on account of a family obligation.

Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of traveling to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, to serve as the senior guest speaker for the 82nd Airborne's All-American Week Division Review.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 24, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1596. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Horse Protection Act; Requiring Horse Industry Organizations to Assess and Enforce Minimum Penalties for Violations; Correction [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0030] (RIN: 0579-AD43) received May 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1597. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: System for Award Management Name Changes, Phase 1 Implementation (DFARS Case 2012-D035) (RIN: 0750-AH87) received May 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1598. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Government Support Contractor Access to Technical Data (DFARS 2009-D031) (RIN: 0750-AG38) received May 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1599. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clarification of ''F'' Orders in the Procurement Instrument Identification Number Structure (DFARS Case 2012-D040) (RIN: 0750-AH80) received May 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1600. A letter from the Director, Office of Public and Congressional Affairs, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting NCUA 2012 Financial Statement Audits for Temporary Corporate Credit Union Stabilization Fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1601. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Centers Collaborative Research Project [CFDA Numbers: 84.133A-7.] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1602. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Immigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended (RIN: 1400-AC86) received May 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1603. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1604. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for Eriogonum codium (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and Physaria douglasii subsp. tuplashensis (White Bluffs Bladderpod) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2012-0017] (RIN: 1018-AX72) received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1605. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Eriogonum codium (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and Physaria douglasii subsp. tuplashensis (White Bluffs Bladderpod) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2013-0012] (RIN: 1018-AZ54) received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1606. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2013 and 2014 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications [Docket No.: 130104009-3416-02] (RIN: 0648-XC432) received May 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1607. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 50 [Docket No.: 130219149-3397-02] (RIN: 0648-BC97) received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1608. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Three Synthetic Cannabinoids Into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-373] received May 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1609. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tentative Eligibility Determinations; Presumptive Eligibility for Psychosis and Other Mental Illness (RIN: 2900-AN87) received May 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1610. A letter from the Assistant Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Proportional method for OID on pools of credit card receivables (Revenue Procedure 2013-26) received May 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1611. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule

— Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2013-32] received May 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2122. A bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 2123. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the Medicaid rules regarding supplemental needs trusts for Medicaid beneficiaries to trusts established by those beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 2124. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve worksite enforcement, prevent crime, and gain operational control of the borders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Ways and Means, Armed Services, and 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 Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2125. A bill to prevent implementation and enforcement of Obamacare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and House Administration, 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. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2126. A bill to facilitate better alignment, cooperation, and best practices between commercial real estate landlords and tenants regarding energy efficiency in buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 2127. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing any rule imposing any standard of performance for carbon dioxide emissions from any existing or new source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit unless and until carbon capture and storage is found to be technologically and economically feasible; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2128. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Home Energy Savings Retrofit Rebate Program, 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. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 2129. A bill to amend the Defense Base Act to require the provision of insurance under that Act under a Government self-insurance program, and to require an implementation strategy for such self-insurance program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2130. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for treatment of heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine, 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (ecstasy), and phencyclidine (PCP) abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 2131. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to enhance American competitiveness through the encouragement of high-skilled immigration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 (for herself and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2132. A bill to reauthorize Federal natural hazards reduction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the work opportunity tax credit for veterans and to allow an exemption from an employer's employment taxes in an amount equivalent to the value of such credit in the case of veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2134. A bill to provide an election for funding parity for charity-sponsored pension plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to clarify liability protections regarding emergency use of automated external defibrillators; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2136. A bill to ensure small businesses in rural America have access to credit to promote economic growth and job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. REED, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 2137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for damages relating to Hurricane Sandy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2138. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to resolve the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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. CRENSHAW (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 2139. A bill to make certain luggage and travel articles eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 2140. A bill to permit insurance companies that are depository holding companies, or are subsidiaries of depository holding companies, to comply with the accounting and capital requirements applicable to the insurance company under State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Head Start teachers the same above-the-line deduction for supplies as is allowed to elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. RUNYAN):

H.R. 2142. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to set-aside community development block grant amounts in each fiscal year for grants to local chapters of veterans service organizations for rehabilitation of their facilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. TERRY, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 2143. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force; 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. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 2144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2145. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Natural Resources Conservation Service property in Riverside, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WATT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 2146. A bill to extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program of the Department of the Treasury for 10 years; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2147. A bill to provide grants to enhance the most effective freezing methods to improve access to affordable and locally produced specialty crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 to increase public awareness about the dangers of synthetic drugs through the national youth antidrug media campaign; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 2149. A bill to provide for the issuance and sale of a semipostal by the United States Postal Service to support effective programs targeted at improving permanency outcomes for youth in foster care; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2150. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize individuals who are pursuing programs of rehabilitation, education, or training under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to receive work-study allowances for certain outreach services provided through congressional offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 2152. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to establish the National Program for Arts and Technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the reporting of cases of infectious diseases at facilities of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 2154. A bill to mandate the monthly formulation and publication of a consumer price index specifically for senior citizens for the purpose of establishing an accurate Social Security COLA for such citizens; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 2155. A bill to award grants in order to establish longitudinal personal college readiness and savings online platforms for low-income students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 2156. A bill to encourage uniformity and reciprocity among States that license insurance claims adjusters and to facilitate prompt and efficient adjusting of insurance claims in the case of natural and other disasters and losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. VISCLOSKY):

H.R. 2157. A bill to authorize the ground burial at Arlington National Cemetery of members of the United States Army who served honorably in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier platoon, Third Infantry Regiment (Old Guard), United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. FLEMING:

H.R. 2158. A bill to exempt from the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 the expedited removal from the United States of certain snake species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2159. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a STEM grant program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 2160. A bill to support and encourage the health and well-being of elementary school and secondary school students by enhancing school physical education and health education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rates for Federal Direct Stafford Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, 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. GOSAR:

H.R. 2162. A bill to provide for transparency and reporting related to direct and indirect costs incurred by the Bonneville Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration related to compliance with any Federal environmental laws impacting the conservation of fish and wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2163. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to make grants to ports to enable ports to employ high school students during the summer; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2164. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2165. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide individual and group market reforms to protect health insurance consumers, to make such reforms and protections contingent on the enactment of legislation repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 2166. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. HECK of Washington (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2167. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 2168. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to promote the efficient delivery and receipt of absentee ballots and other voting materials to absent uniformed services voters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement to educational assistance under certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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. HOLT (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 2170. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a partnership program in foreign languages; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2171. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a lifetime income disclosure; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2172. A bill to improve quality and accountability for educator preparation programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2173. A bill to improve teacher quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend and reauthorize certain provisions relating to Long Island Sound restoration and stewardship; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2175. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on June 6, 1944, the morning of D-Day; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2176. A bill to require express prior statutory authorization from Congress to carry out any activities under the United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2177. A bill to eliminate the application of sequestration to unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 2178. A bill to authorize a grant program to promote physical education, activity, and fitness and nutrition, and to ensure healthy students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 2179. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Human Services of physical activity guidelines for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2180. A bill to amend the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program in title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2181. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to the qualification of the director of food services of a Medicare skilled nursing facility or a Medicaid nursing facility; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VELA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2182. A bill to establish the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Poverty which will create and carry out a national plan to cut poverty in America in half in ten years; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2183. A bill to direct the Director of the CIA to cease lethal drone operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2184. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to foster community involvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NEAL, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2185. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to encourage the nationwide observance of two minutes of silence each Veterans Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2186. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the compounding of drug products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. YODER, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2187. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize veterans' treatment courts and encourage services for veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 2188. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to ensure that footwear furnished or obtained by allowance for enlisted members of the Armed Forces upon their initial entry into the Armed Forces complies with domestic source requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 2189. A bill to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2190. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2191. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations with respect to ensuring families are able to sit together on flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2192. A bill to amend the Act popularly known as the Antiquities Act of 1906 to require certain procedures for designating national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the financing of the Superfund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care through expanded health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 2195. A bill to support Promise Neighborhoods; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2196. A bill to create and expand innovative teacher and principal preparation programs known as teacher and principal preparation academies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine (for herself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2198. A bill to require State governments to submit fiscal accounting reports as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCALISE, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 2199. A bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 2200. A bill to improve the administration of programs in the insular areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 2201. A bill to authorize voluntary grazing permit retirement on Federal lands managed by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior where livestock grazing is impractical, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the equalization of the excise tax on liquefied natural gas and per energy equivalent of diesel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 2203. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 2204. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to award grants for the employment of individuals in targeted communities to perform work for the benefit of such communities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2205. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Groundwork USA national office, to provide grants to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 2206. A bill to provide enhanced protections for prospective members and new members of the Armed Forces during entry-level processing and training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2207. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Uniform Code of Military Justice related to sex-related offenses committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 2208. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2209. A bill to establish a chain of command for Army National Military Cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 2210. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility of children of certain deceased veterans to educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BASS (for herself and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 234. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and commending its successor, the African Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. SIRES):

H. Res. 235. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 29 as Vietnam Veterans Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H. Res. 236. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on fully spending the receipts of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund on United States ports and harbors each year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 237. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to childhood stroke and recognizing May 2013 as ''National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 238. 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. PETERSON:

H. Res. 239. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the third week in October as National School Bus Safety Week and for the designation of Wednesday of that week as National School Bus Drivers Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BARR, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H. Res. 240. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to place a real time display of the United States gross national debt in the House Chamber; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 241. A resolution recognizing the importance of the United States International Boundary Water Commission (USIBWC) and its recent efforts to address trash, sediment, and water quality issues with their Mexican counterparts, Comisión Internacional de Límites y Aguas (CILA), through a proposed minute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

32. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to a Joint Resolution urging the President and the Congress to support the Clean Air Act; 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. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Sections 8 and 9 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by those sections, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''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;'' and Article III of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 2124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and

among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 2126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 2127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to enact this legislation 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. McKINLEY:

H.R. 2128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 9, giving Congress the authority to control the expenditures of the federal government.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII which states ''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;''

Most recently the Supreme Court has held that Article I, Section VIII gives Congress a plenary power to impose taxes and to spend money for the general welfare subject almost entirely to Congress's own discretion.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 2134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCARTHY OF California:

H.R. 2138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12,13,18.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 2139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, commonly referred to as the Commerce Clause. The Commerce Clause states that the Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. This bill changes U.S. trade

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 2144.

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. CALVERT:

H.R. 2145.

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 and clause 18, and Article W, section 3, clause 2.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes).

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 2151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 2152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 2153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 2154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 8.

1) The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 2155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 2156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulations of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such

part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 2158.

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 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which states the Congress shall have the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: 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 Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3 the Commerce clause.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 . . . general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution provides spending authority for Congress to issue debt and set the interest rates thereof to insure that such debt will be paid, and under the ''general welfare'' clause the authority to pass laws that provide loans to students.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate commerce and provide for the general welfare as envisioned and enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 2163.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 2165.

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;

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: . . . 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. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 2166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.1

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 2167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the General Welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce)

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 2168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 clause 12, which gives Congress the authority to ''raise and support Armies'';

Article I Section 4, which gives Congress the authority to enact legislation pertaining to the time and manner by which Representatives and Senators are elected;

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees, in part, that no State shall ''deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws,'' which the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled to be inclusive of those laws pertaining to the right to vote.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 18 and pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2176.

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 11, and Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 2181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2182.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2183.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution—the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 2190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution,

which provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce and relations between the United States and Indian Tribes, and to pass all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, as well as all other Power vested by the Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 2196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 2197.

Congress has the power to enact 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; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3. ''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 . . .''

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 2203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 2204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 2205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 2206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and

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. TURNER:

H.R. 2207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and

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. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 2210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 36: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 94: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 146: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 164: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 176: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 198: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 239: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 309: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 312: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 318: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 351: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 357: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 455: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 460: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 494: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 508: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WATT, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 531: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 533: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 567: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 594: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 628: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 640: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 664: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 685: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 686: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 712: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 713: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 714: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 724: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 736: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 755: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MOORE, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 765: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 778: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 792: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 797: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 805: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 822: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 842: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 847: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 850: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 855: Mr. POCAN and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 915: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 938: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP

of Georgia, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 940: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 942: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 952: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 961: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 984: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1012: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1014: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1015: Mr. SIRES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1020: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1024: Mr. OWENS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1074: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1077: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1083: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1098: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1129: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1136: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1146: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1148: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1151: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1155: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1175: Ms. CLARKE and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1176: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1180: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1199: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1201: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1251: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1252: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1254: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HALL, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1289: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1339: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1343: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1355: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1358: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1416: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1421: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1428: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1437: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1440: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1451: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1461: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1462: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1464: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1496: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1498: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1500: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1507: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1538: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WATT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1546: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1563: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1595: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1616: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1619: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1623: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1630: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1646: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1690: Mr. SALMON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1692: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1708: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1717: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1725: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILMER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1727: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1729: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1734: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1735: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1742: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1755: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1764: Mr. HALL, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1774: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1787: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1795: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1797: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1798: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1801: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1806: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1814: Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1823: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1825: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1829: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1830: Mr. KIND, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1837: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1851: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1861: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1877: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1891: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1900: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1910: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1915: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1918: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1919: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1920: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1926: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1933: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1940: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1941: Ms. NORTON and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1950: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1963: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1971: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1975: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1978: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NEAL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1993: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1999: Mr. ENYART, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BERA of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2000: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2009: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2014: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 2019: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 2020: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2022: Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2025: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2030: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2035: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2041: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2042: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2043: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2053: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2055: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 2056: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2059: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2066: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. POLLS.

H.R. 2070: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2083: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2092: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 2093: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2107: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 24: Mr. MARKEY.

H. Res. 30: Ms. DELBENE.

H. Res. 89: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H. Res. 102: Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Res. 109: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LATHAM, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 135: Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 136: Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 147: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H. Res. 155: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 188: Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 208: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 209: Ms. FUDGE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1773: Mr. PETERSON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

19. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Seaside, California, relative to Resolution No. 2013-31 urging Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

20. Also, a petition of the Borough of Edgewater, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 2013-114 expressing condolences and

support for the victims of gun violence and their families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

21. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 186 urging the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 712; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2013 No. 74

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Rabbi Michael Beals, rabbi at Congregation Beth Shalom in Wilmington, DE.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us join together in prayer.

Adon Olam, Master of the Universe, we send our first prayer to the residents of Moore, OK. May it be Your will that those who are missing be found alive and be cared for. Send comfort to those who have suffered loss, and with the help of those gathered here, send the resources required to rebuild.

Eternal our God, You commanded us to care for the widow, the orphan, and You commanded us to care for—so appropriate today—the stranger in our midst. Thank You for giving our Nation these esteemed Senators to help us as a nation fulfill the command to care for the most vulnerable in our midst. Into each of these honorable Senators You implanted Your divine spark. Help these Senators, Your humble servants, find a way of working together for the common good. In doing so, may they thus take their individual holy inner lights and join them together, creating one unified shaft of light so strong that it will shine clear up to the firmament above.

We pray this in Your sacred and Holy Name. And let us all say amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am going to have a few things to say, as will Senator MCCONNELL, but now I will yield to my friend from Delaware, the junior Senator from Delaware.

I ask unanimous consent that when Senator MCCONNELL and I finish our remarks, he be recognized to speak for 7 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to recognize and celebrate this morning's Chaplain. Rabbi Michael Beals has served our community in Wilmington, DE, and our country admirably and with a strength of faith and foundation that you have heard in this morning's prayer. He is joined by his wife Elissa, a caring veterinarian, his daughter Ariella, whose bat mitzvah was just celebrated, and his daughter Shira and many other family and friends. He has a wonderful and accomplished education, being ordained at the Jewish Theological Seminary and also having studied at the American University, the University of California at Berkeley, and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

In addition to his remarkable education, he is someone who is profoundly grounded in the calling, in the challenge of rebuilding. As you heard in his reflections in prayer this morning, he is someone who cares deeply for the widow, the orphan, the stranger, and is true to the Biblical calling of us to be witnesses to our communities wherever we might be found.

I am grateful for the chance to add his voice to the many who have brought this Senate into session year in and year out over the centuries, and I am grateful for his friendship and leadership in my hometown of Wilmington, DE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. With the Republican leader's consent, I ask now that the senior Senator from Delaware be allowed to say a few words regarding our guest Chaplain.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, Senator COONS and I spent a couple of lovely hours together in Michael Beals' synagogue last Saturday as his daughter was going through bat mitzvah. I will never forget that occasion. What a joy for everyone there, people from all over the country. I know it was a source of family pride for the father, the mom, and for the rabbi to be there with their daughter on that special day.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

To my colleagues I would say that one of the things I pray for every day is that we will find our way to a two-state solution in the Middle East that provides a homeland for the Palestinians, a capital for the Palestinians, and security for the people of Israel and peace for the people of Israel.

There is a great partnership in our State between Rabbi Beals' synagogue and my church and a number of other churches of different faiths. I just want to mention that here today and thank you for your commitment not just to the least of those in our society and those who need our help but also across the world to a really big trouble spot that needs our attention and our thoughts and our prayers. I thank you very much for being here today. Thank you for your prayer.

I thank the leader for letting me say a few words.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period morning business until 10:30 a.m. The time until then will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. President, if Republicans want to use extra time because of my two Democrats here, there will be no problem with that. The Chair will know how much time was taken by Senator COONS and Senator CARPER.

At 10:30 there will be two rollcall votes—first a cloture vote on the Srinivasan nomination for the DC Circuit and a second vote on the Sanders amendment to the farm bill.

The managers will continue to work through amendments to the farm bill today. Senators will be notified when additional votes are scheduled. I would note we are going to see if we can get a finite list of amendments today on the farm bill. Senators STABENOW and COCHRAN are working on that. It would be nice if we can do that.

Also, we hope we can work something out so we can finish our work today. If we do not, we will have to be here tomorrow in the afternoon to finish this circuit court business.

MAKING THE SENATE WORK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as a boy, as I grew up, what I wanted to be was a baseball player. It didn't take long until I learned I was not big enough, fast enough, or good enough to be the baseball player of my dreams, but that has not taken away my love of the game. I have followed it so closely for many years. I follow it really, really closely.

I was a cheerleader for any team Greg Maddux was on. He came from Valley High School, from Las Vegas. Almost immediately he was a star baseball player in the Major Leagues. Whatever team he was on was the team I cheered for.

I have been here in Washington now for a number of years. They have had in recent years a professional baseball team. I am reminded that when I was going to law school, working in this building, I went to Griffith Stadium and watched baseball games. I only watched two, but I watched the Washington Senators play the New York Yankees twice—Mickey Mantle, Yogi Berra, all that crowd. I remember that.

In recent years—in fact, the last 2 years—I have focused on the Nationals a lot because of another phenomenon from Las Vegas by the name of Bryce Harper. He has meant so much to that team, as we learned last night. He is recovering from running into the wall at full speed, hurting himself. But last night he was the reason they won—hit a home run and a double in the 10th inning and made a sensational catch. He is really very good.

The reason I mention that is that Davey Johnson is the manager of the Washington Nationals. He has managed five different Major League Baseball teams. He is one of the greatest managers in the history of baseball. He won pennants, won national championships. But what would the Washington Nationals be like today if he did not have the ability to have the players he wanted? Someone would say: OK, you can have your third baseman Ryan Zimmerman, but you are going to have to wait—not at the beginning of the season, you are going to have to wait until August. We are willing to have him come in August. Or their first baseman, Adam LaRoche—he is a good first baseman, Golden Glove. But you can't have him for a while. Wait for a few months and then bring him on.

That is an example of what is going on in the Senate. The President of the United States does not have the team he wants, the team he deserves.

Yesterday my friend—and he is my friend—the minority leader offered a full-throated defense of the dysfunctional status quo here on Capitol Hill. Here is what he said: ''I think we have demonstrated there is no real problem here,'' talking about the Senate. This he said yesterday on this floor.

Congress has an approval rating I don't even like to talk about. It is very low. Senator MCCONNELL stood on the Senate floor and said things here in Congress are going just fine. I think it is safe to say Americans disagree, and I am on their side. Senator MCCONNELL is free to defend this Republican-created logjam that exists in the Senate today, but I will not join him in this defense. The problem of gridlock in Washington is real, and it must be fixed. I am committed to making the Senate work again.

These remarks I am giving today are only in an effort to get this body to work well. There is nothing sinister in what I am saying. I just want the Senate to work well. I have been here a long time, and it did not work this way before.

Despite the agreement we reached in January of this year, Republican obstruction on nominees continues unabated—no different than it was the last Congress.

The minority leader used strong words yesterday accusing me of going back on my word. I take that accusation very seriously. It is true that in January Democrats and Republicans entered into an agreement. Republicans agreed to cease the endless obstruction of Presidential nominees. They agreed they would work with us ''to schedule votes on nominees in a timely manner except in extraordinary circumstances.'' This is what he said, what the minority leader said. I just quoted that. He said it this year. I repeat, ''Republicans agreed they would no longer block the President's nominees without extraordinary circumstances.''

Look at the dictionary about ''extraordinary circumstances.'' Here is how it is defined: ''going beyond what is usual, regular, or customary.'' That is not some definition I came up with, that is the definition in the dictionary. ''Extraordinary'' is defined as ''going beyond what is usual, regular, or customary.''

In return for their saying that is what they would do, we agreed that we would not consider any changes to the Senate rules outside of regular order. Democrats have kept our word. We intend to keep our word. We have not altered the rules. But since we entered into that agreement, Republicans have failed to hold up their end of the bargain. What they have done these past 5 months has not been usual, regular, or customary as defined in the dictionary. Not only have they failed to work with us to schedule votes on nominees in a timely manner, they are doing everything in their power to deny the President his team and thus undermine Obama's Presidency.

Instead of throwing about accusations, let's look at the facts. Let's stick with the facts. Republican obstruction has slowed down nearly every nominee President Obama has submitted. Even Cabinet Secretaries have faced unparalleled procedural hurdles, and Republicans are threatening to block many more of them. For example, in the some 230-plus years we have been a country, for the first time in the history of this country, while a war is going on and one is winding down, for the first time in the history of this country, Senate Republicans filibustered the nomination of Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel—who, by the way, is a Republican and, by the way, is a Vietnam hero for his combat activities there and was a Republican Senator from Nebraska.

The minority leader himself is threatening to block President Obama's nominee for Secretary of Labor, and he said so. The Secretary of Labor is a good person. He put himself through school working as a garbage man. His parents are immigrants.

What we have done here for generations of the Senate is we have had hearings on these nominees. That is the way it should be.

In recent years, after the hearings have taken place, a Senator will say: I have a few more questions. We will send them. Usually there would be two or three or four or five questions. Secretary Geithner, who recently resigned as Secretary of the Treasury, got 28 questions.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. No, I am going to finish my statement.

What happens in these committees is they ask all the questions they want, but 28 questions is not enough for them. For example, on Gina McCarthy—the President asked her to be the Director of the EPA—more than 1,100 questions were submitted to her after the hearing.

Jack Lew—who has basically had many jobs in government—had a full hearing. They gave him more than 700 questions to answer. This has gotten way out of hand. Anything they can do to slow things down, that is what they do.

Executive and judicial nominees who are ready to be confirmed by the Senate have been pending an average of 200 days—more than 6 months. Let me repeat that: Executive and judicial nominees who are ready to be confirmed by the Senate have been pending an average of 200 days. That is more than 6 months. The confirmation process has moved at a glacial pace because of extraordinary Republican obstruction.

Cloture has been filed on 58 of President Obama's nominees—58. By this point in President Bush's term, cloture had been filed on a handful of nominees. Republicans are not blocking these nominations because they object to the qualifications of the nominees.

This body passed something called Dodd-Frank. It was an answer to what was going on on Wall Street—the collapse of Wall Street. Richard Cordray, the nominee to lead the Consumer Finance Bureau—which is part of that bill that is now law—is a perfect example. He was nominated by the President of the United States almost 2 years ago—23 months ago. Republicans are not concerned about his ability to do the job. They are afraid, I guess, he would do his job too well. He is extremely well-qualified. If anything, they are concerned he might, as I said, actually do the job, protecting consumers from the kind of corporate greed that collapsed the financial markets in the first place. If he received an up-or-down vote here today, he would be approved in a minisecond, however long it takes to call the roll.

I have a couple of other examples. Yesterday we talked about the DC Circuit. By statute, the DC Circuit—some say the most important court in America, more important than the Supreme Court—has 11 spots. Justice Roberts went to the Supreme Court in 2005. His spot has not yet been filled. We have tried, but there have been two filibusters stopping that. There are four vacancies there.

President Obama is the first President in more than 50 years who has not had an appointment confirmed in the DC Circuit, but it is not because we have not tried. For example, we tried to get Caitlyn Halligan for 4 years, but her nomination has been filibustered twice. The seat she was nominated for—I repeat—was the seat vacated by Justice Roberts in 2005. Today it is 2013. Do the math.

Now Republicans have forced cloture on this nomination even though Sri Srinivasan was nominated for the DC Circuit a year ago. Even though it was reported out of the committee unanimously, they have decided to stall and not have a vote on it.

The nominee has wide bipartisan support, it appears, from both sides of the aisle. If it was reported out of the committee unanimously, I would assume that is the case. Neither stellar qualifications nor bipartisan support are enough to prevent Republican obstruction.

According to a report released this month by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, first-term judicial nominees who were reported out of committee unanimously have waited nine times longer to be confirmed than under President Bush. President Obama's first-term district court nominees have waited five times longer than those previously. The first-term circuit court nominees have waited more than seven times longer.

Yesterday the Republican leader raised the example of a Wyoming judge as proof they are willing to support some of our nominees. Wyoming—as I indicated yesterday, there may be a more Republican State in the Union, but I don't know where it is. I said, well, let's schedule a vote yesterday—Wednesday. The Republican leader said no.

It doesn't take a mathematician to figure why we have a judicial vacancy crisis in this country. We can talk about how we cleared most of the calendar. I take the Senate's charge to advise and consent very seriously, but Republicans have corrupted the Founders' intent by blocking qualified nominees for the slightest reason, if no reason.

President Obama deserves to choose his team, just as Davey Johnson deserves to choose his team. I believe any President deserves his or her team.

The Republicans have again and again delayed or obstructed the President's nominees. This Republican obstruction has created an unreasonable and unworkable standard where minor issues are raised as excuses to block major nominees or require a 60-vote supermajority for confirmation.

Before the Republican leader accuses me of going back on my word, he should take a long look in the mirror, and he should spend some time in honest reflection of Republican contributions to the gridlock threatening this storied institution before he claims ''there is no real problem here.''

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, according to the Congressional Research Service, President Obama has had his Cabinet nominees confirmed quicker than his predecessors during the same period in the second term—quicker.

I don't know what the majority leader thinks advise and consent means. Listening to him it means: Sit down, shut up, don't ask any questions, and confirm immediately. I don't think that is what the Founding Fathers had in mind.

Talk about manufacturing a problem—the Secretary of Energy, 97 to 0; the Secretary of Interior, 87 to 11; Secretary of the Treasury, 71 to 26; Office of Management and Budget, 96 to 0; Secretary of State, 94 to 3—in 7 days.

What we have just heard, I am afraid for my good friend the majority leader, in spite of the baseball analogy—and I read in the papers this morning he has been meeting with his members and trying to get 51 votes to blow the Senate up.

We have important issues coming down the pike. We want to finish the farm bill. We have been working hard to develop a broad bipartisan support for an immigration bill. We know what is going on here. What I fear is that the majority leader is working his way toward breaking his word to the Senate and to the American people, blowing up this institution, and making it extremely difficult for us to operate on the collegial basis we have operated on for over 200 years.

He wants to have no debate. Do what I say and do it now. This is the culture of intimidation we have seen at the IRS, HHS, FCC, SEC, and now here at the Senate: Do what I say when I say it. Sit down and shut up or we will change the rules. We will break the rules to change the rules.

We need to think over how we conduct ourselves in this body. The majority leader has a very important position. It is not only to lead the party of the majority, it is also to protect the institution. What I hear lacking in that speech is any interest whatsoever in protecting the traditions of this institution. What I hear is: We are going to get our way as rapidly as possible. You guys and gals, sit down and shut up. Don't ask too many questions; don't make it take a week longer. Do what we say, and if you don't, we will break the rules to change the rules. That is what this is about.

I want to make sure everybody understands where the majority leader is taking us. Make no mistake about it, the American people have given us divided government, but that doesn't mean they expect us not to accomplish things. We are on the cusp of beginning

an extremely important debate about the future of the country after the recess, but we know what is going on. What I hear is the majority leader does not want to keep his word to the Senate or to the American people. We will take that into consideration as we move forward.

With regard to this D.C. Circuit nomination—talk about a manufactured crisis. This well-qualified nominee came out of the committee unanimously. We have been operating on confirming judges on the basis of coming out of committee. So the majority leader decided that wasn't good enough and to do it now.

Yesterday I objected to that simply because—we did not have a problem here. We have been operating in a very collegial and sensible way. However, he has now manufactured something he can call a filibuster by filing cloture on a nominee we were prepared to confirm in an up-or-down vote in a week from now. So we ought to confirm him now.

Therefore, as I noted yesterday, Senate Republicans don't have a problem with an up-or-down vote on this pending nominee for the D.C. Circuit. Indeed, the day after his nomination appeared on the Executive Calendar for the first time, we offered to have an up-or-down vote on the nomination. The only thing we asked was that Members who did not serve on the Judiciary Committee have at least a reasonable amount of time to review his record. Unfortunately, the majority would not take yes for an answer.

Instead, it moved to set a 60-vote hurdle by filing cloture on the nomination the day after it first appeared on the calendar. It was heavyhanded, and, frankly, completely mystifying. As I said, the nomination had been on the Executive Calendar for barely a day, but we are not going to let the majority leader manufacture an obstruction crisis where none exists.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled for Executive Calendar No. 95 be vitiated; further, the Senate proceed to executive session at 1 p.m. today for the consideration of Calendar No. 95; there be 1 hour of debate equally divided in the usual form, and at the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate, and that the President then be notified of Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am not going to have a long conversation this morning with my friend the Republican leader, other than to say this: My speech speaks for itself. I wrote it; no one else wrote it. It is my speech, and I want everyone to look at that. I want Republicans and Democrats to look at it.

I also want the record to be clear: This man, on whom we are going to vote this afternoon at 1 p.m. or 2 p.m.—whatever time the consent agreement suggests—has been waiting 1 year. So the Republican leader can talk about how quickly it came, but this man has been waiting for a year. I went through the statistics, and I will not go over them again. I hope things work out in this Senate so we don't have to go through anymore procedural battles, but things are not working well. I went through the statistics, and they are in my speech.

I don't object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Let me make sure everybody understands where we are. Let's have no misunderstandings. What the majority leader is doing is trying to get 51 votes to break the rules of the Senate and change the rules of the Senate. We know what he is doing, and let's make no mistake what the stakes are: He is threatening this institution, which he elected, in part, to protect, by manufacturing a crisis that does not exist. As we all know, in the Senate every Senator has the ability to impact how we do business. Unanimous consent means exactly what it says, unanimous consent.

I hope the majority leader will think long and hard, and I hope my friends in the majority, who may some day be in the minority—I know there are a lot of new Democratic Senators who think that will never happen, but amazingly enough the American people do, from time to time, change their minds about who they want running the country. The shoe could be on the other foot, and we never know when. I could have the job the majority leader currently has.

I think we need to think long and hard about protecting this institution and its traditions, particularly manufacturing crises when they don't exist.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to coming to Congress, I was a trial lawyer. I tried more than 100 cases to a jury. The jury decided what was right or wrong in the particular conflict, and I have the American people on my side with this conflict. They don't like what is going on in the Senate, and I have an obligation to protect the Senate. I know that, and my friend reminds me of that, and I think of it very often. I think of it every day and when I have my weekly caucus with my 54 Democratic Senators. I represent them to represent the people they represent. I represent, because the people they represent are Republicans, Democrats and Independents, and I understand that.

So I am willing to take this case to the American people. I hope we can resolve any problems we have, but it is not right what is going on. I submit my case to the American people. I submit my case to the American people.

I don't know what he is talking about. I had a very early meeting this morning. I haven't read the newspaper. Maybe there is something in there I will have to deny. I don't know anything about the 51 votes. I look for 51 votes all the time on many different issues.

As I said, I don't want to have any animosity between me and my friend. He is a lawyer. I am a lawyer. He represents Kentucky. I represent Nevada. We both represent our respective caucuses and we both have an obligation to make this place work better.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

IRS AND OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now I wish to talk about a real scandal and not a manufactured crisis.

Nearly 2 weeks have now passed since we learned about the scandal at the IRS. The more we learn, the more troubling it becomes. It is now clear this was about much more than one or two employees going rogue at some far-flung office out in the administrative hinterlands as was first suggested.

The facts we have seen so far point to something far more systemic than that, and it shouldn't surprise anybody. This is the IRS we are talking about—the IRS. This is an agency that is basically a euphemism for mind-numbing bureaucracy—the kind of place where one would assume nobody does much of anything without signatures and countersignatures from section chiefs and subsection chiefs and deputy office heads and secondary assistant deputy subassociate directors; sort of like a Kafka novel without the laughs.

So what we first heard always stretched credulity. Employees at ground zero of the Federal bureaucracy going rogue? Come on. Think back to the testimony we heard this week—or didn't hear. Why did Lois Lerner and other senior and former IRS officials refuse to address questions they had previously misled Congress? Somehow I doubt it is because they had nothing of interest to say. We will look forward to hearing more from them and we will look forward to hearing from whomever actually made the decisions that led to these abuses, since no one we have heard from yet is able to take responsibility for what went on.

Let's not forget the administration continues to give us different timelines about who knew what and when.

So the long and short of the situation is this: The public doesn't know the full story yet. A number of my constituents have shared stories with my office about the IRS auditing their organizations and businesses during the recent Presidential campaign for the first time ever. All of a sudden they get

audited during the Presidential campaign for the first time ever.

These folks believe the audits were conducted for no other reason than the fact that their groups were conservative, and they believe the questions they have been asked have more to do with their political views than their business activities.

Without a proper investigation, frankly, we will just never know. So we owe it to our constituents to have a detailed and deliberate investigation. That is why both House and Senate committees have begun investigations into the matter.

That is why, last week, every Republican on the Finance Committee signed a letter to the Inspector General for Tax Administration requesting a probe into reports that the IRS leaked confidential information about conservative groups—actually, to their political opponents—leaked information about conservative groups to their political opponents, and that is why even the FBI is looking into the matter, because as Attorney General Holder recently testified, the IRS's targeting of conservative groups could have violated numerous criminal provisions.

I am willing to bet there is a lot more we will discover in terms of scope, in terms of timeline, in terms of who was involved and why. But we certainly can't go about fixing the problem—we can't remove all of those who need to be removed, we can't put safeguards in place if they are deemed necessary—until we find out all the details.

Here is another thing we shouldn't be doing: handing over the administration of ObamaCare to these folks—handing over the administration of ObamaCare to the IRS. Think about that, the deeply unpopular law being administered by an agency that has so betrayed the public trust. Even the IRS's staunchest defenders in this scandal describe their actions as a case of ''horrible customer service.'' That is the best they can say: ''Horrible customer service.'' Now they are going to be put in charge of a new $1 trillion program, one that will give them access to all sorts of sensitive and deeply personal information?

That is just what the administration and congressional Democrats are about to let happen. The IRS is in charge of administering some of the most important elements of ObamaCare, and for many Americans that is going to mean submitting to probing questions about their health insurance, questions such as—this is the IRS asking you, American citizens: Do you have insurance? What kind of insurance is it? Does it follow our rules? If the people at the IRS don't like the answers, Americans will be hit with new taxes. If the people over at the IRS don't like the answers to their questions about Americans' health insurance, they will be hit with new taxes.

For small businesses, the questions are going to be far more extensive and the consequences for noncompliance far worse. The agency will have broad discretion to define what constitutes noncompliance. The IRS will have broad authority to determine what is noncompliance with ObamaCare. This is nuts.

The potential for waste and abuse would have been there regardless of which agency was put in charge of administering this bloated law. ObamaCare is massive—about 20,000 pages of regulations already. That is about 7 feet tall. So waste and abuse is basically unavoidable, but now we are going to have Americans worrying they might be discriminated against too, just for having an opinion. Do my colleagues know what. We are not going to be able to tell them not to worry because we don't know the truth ourselves yet.

Guess who is heading the IRS office charged with managing ObamaCare. Get this. It is the very same person who led the division of IRS now embroiled in the scandal who oversaw the very office now under fire for the discriminatory and harassing behavior. I am not making this up.

Here is what needs to be done today: No. 1, the administration needs to work honestly and transparently with us to get to the bottom of this scandal once and for all. They can do that by working cooperatively with congressional investigators. They can do it by testifying openly and sharing key documents with House and Senate committees. They can help us conduct a thorough administrationwide review to ensure no other discrimination of this kind is occurring anywhere else—anywhere else—in the Federal Government.

No. 2, the administration needs to suspend its implementation of ObamaCare until all the things I mentioned have been taken care of. The Supreme Court declared the individual mandate, the core of ObamaCare, to be a tax—a tax—so IRS involvement is going to be absolutely unavoidable. That needs to be halted.

Better yet, the administration could work with us to repeal the law and put in place health reforms that might actually work to control costs and provide better quality of care for our constituents. I wouldn't hold my breath on that one, by the way, but here is what I do know. I know we need to get to the bottom of this IRS scandal because, at a minimum, Americans from the left, right, and center should not have to worry their government will harass or intimidate them for daring—daring—to have an opinion and express it. They shouldn't have to worry about that when partaking in the political process, and they certainly should not have to worry about it when it comes to an issue as personal and as sensitive as health care.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Kansas.

TRIBUTE TO MELVIN MINOR

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in morning business, and I wish to recognize the presence of my senior Senator from Kansas.

I am here to visit about an individual who died in Kansas recently to whom I wish to pay tribute. There are many things we admire about our folks back in our home State of Kansas, but one of the things that stands out to me is how strongly people care about their local communities and the citizens who live there. It is demonstrated by volunteering at school, serving at their church or getting involved in public service. Kansans are often looking for ways to improve the lives of those who are around them.

Former Kansas State Representative Melvin Minor was exactly one of those individuals. In Kansas, his family, his constituents lost a great man. He was a talented educator, highly regarded by his students, and a dedicated public servant.

Mel was born in 1937 in the small Central Kansas community of Arlington. As a young man, he attended Kansas State Teachers College—now known as Emporia State University—where he graduated in 1959.

Six years later, Mel married Carolyn Fuller and spent the next 46 years by her side before her passing in 2011. Together they raised two daughters, Gayle and Mary Jo.

Mel and Carolyn had a lot in common, especially their interest in education and in young people. In fact, they met while they were both serving, working as teachers. For 15 years Mel taught American Government and Carolyn taught home economics in the St. John School District.

Many of us can remember a favorite teacher who made an impact on our lives when we were growing up, someone who taught us not only facts and figures but also instilled in us a love for learning and an interest in the world around us. Mel was just that kind of teacher for many Kansas high school students. St. John is a small rural community in Central Kansas with less than 1,500 people.

Many folks who live in St. John make their living on the farm and Mel understood this way of life and could

relate to his students from the farm because he too was a farmer. For more than a decade Mel taught them about how our government works and invested in their lives. He helped broaden the horizons of those students and opened their eyes to new subjects and to new ideas. Upon learning of his passing, one of his former students said, ''There was no better social studies and government teacher than Melvin Minor.''

After teaching government for 15 years, Mel decided to try his own hand at governing and he campaigned for a seat in the Kansas State Legislature. He was elected and he served Kansans in the 114th District in the Kansas House of Representatives for the 14 years to follow.

We all know that to serve in public office takes a great commitment from your family, but especially from your spouse. For the Minor family running for office was a team effort. Mel and Carolyn made a great team—such a team that, in fact, Carolyn served as his campaign manager and treasurer.

I had the privilege of getting to know Mel when I served as a State senator and our terms overlapped for 6 years. Even though we were of different political parties, we had a lot in common because it was about our love for Kansas and interest in rural issues that brought us together.

He was such a strong advocate for rural Kansas and the special way of life we enjoy in small communities across our State. As a farmer Mel was especially interested in agriculture policy and stood up for the best interests of Kansas farmers and ranchers.

As a longtime Kansas resident, Mel was well known and respected throughout our State but especially there in Central Kansas where he was very active in the community of Stafford. He was a member of the Stafford United Methodist Church and served on the board of directors of the St. John National Bank, the Zenith COOP, and the Stafford District Hospital.

He was also dedicated to making sure all Kansans have access to a quality education and served on the Stafford Board of Education.

During his time on the school board, he met another strong advocate for education, Ruth Teichman. After getting to know Ruth and witnessing her dedication to Kansans, Mel encouraged her to run for the State senate. Here it was a Democrat encouraging a Republican to run. It took 8 years of prodding, but he finally convinced her, and she served Kansans for 12 years in the Kansas Senate.

Ruth remembers Mel as someone who was never without a smile and someone who simply enjoyed life and spending time with people. Even when things were not going his way, he was known for saying ''the sun will come out tomorrow'' and took all of life in stride.

His family and friends described him as someone to whom others went for advice and counsel. He was known for his integrity, hard-working spirit, and dedication to the work at hand—whether as a teacher, a farmer, or a legislator.

One of his former colleagues in the house, Dennis McKinney of Greensburg, eventually rose to become the minority leader in the Kansas House of Representatives and considered Mel his mentor when he began his political career. He remembers Mel as someone who always lived out the biblical command to care for those with the greatest needs. From the patients at Larned State Hospital to the youth in the juvenile justice system, Mel was always looking for ways to serve his fellow Kansans and improve their lives.

Dennis McKinney also remembers that Mel Minor had a great sense of humor. Dennis recalled one time when the two of them were the only two Democrats voting in favor of an appropriations bill in the Republican-controlled house of representatives. Dennis was sitting behind Mel at the time and leaned forward to tell him that he felt a little bit awkward. Mel looked around the chamber, and with a glint in his eye told Dennis he did not see anyone in the chamber registered to vote in his district. He said he was not concerned about the pressure from his colleagues but was more concerned about doing what was right for the people who voted him into office.

Mel lived each day to its fullest, and his commitment to his fellow man serves as an example for all of us.

I extend, on behalf of Senator ROBERTS and me, our sympathies to his two daughters Gayle and Mary Jo and to his grandchildren Abby, Katie, and Barrett. I know they loved him dearly. He loved them dearly. He will miss them and they will miss him very much.

I ask my colleagues and Kansans to remember the Minor family in your thoughts and your prayers as they face these days ahead.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kansas for his wonderful eulogy to a wonderful man, a teacher, a State legislator, and just a very nice individual. I thank the Senator for that excellent eulogy. We will miss him.

FOOD LABELING

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairperson of the sometimes powerful Senate Agriculture Committee will be on the floor to lock in amendment No. 965 by Senator SANDERS.

I rise in opposition to that amendment. The amendment would allow States to require—let me emphasize the word, ''require''—that any food, beverage, or other product be labeled if it contains a genetically engineered ingredient.

Now, that is how it is described mostly in this debate: a genetically engineered ingredient. I think it would be more accurately called modern science to feed a very troubled and hungry world.

We already have policies and procedures, I would tell my colleagues, in place at the Food and Drug Administration to address labeling of foods that are derived from modern biotechnology. The U.S. standards ensure that all labels for all foods are truthful and are not misleading to the public.

FDA has a scientifically based review process to evaluate all food products.

The Food and Drug Administration states:

> FDA has no basis for concluding that bioengineered foods are different from other foods in any meaningful or uniform way, or that, as a class, foods developed by the new techniques present any or greater safety concern than foods developed by traditional plant breeding.

The FDA reviews products and determines that they are safe. I think we need to trust the science of their review and allow this process to work.

The amendment by Senator SANDERS would result in additional costs to food producers, and that is going to come right back to consumers. The FDA has determined that approved biotech crops are not materially different than conventional crops and therefore do not require segregation from conventional crops.

The only difference—if you have a bioengineered product, and let's say you come from Africa, one of the countries over there that continually has a very difficult time trying to feed themselves—the only difference is if you use a bioengineered product that makes that crop more resistant to heat or to rain or to a particular insect that is causing a lot of problems—you have a choice: You can have a crop or you can have no crop or you can have perhaps a crop with a pesticide or you can have a bioengineered product that is perfectly safe.

Furthermore, a change in policy would place additional costs on farmers by potentially requiring them to segregate crops and change their equipment. It would also be very problematic for grain processing facilities. I know some fail to recognize—and I know many criticize—the importance of biotechnology or criticize the safety of the product. I just say, let science be the judge. Each product goes through extensive tests to ensure safety to both human health and the environment.

There are different views, of course, on farming, and some of my colleagues in the Senate believe we should focus on those that only farm a few acres—the small family farmer; somebody about 5 foot 3 inches from Vermont—and then grow organic crops and sell them to the local farmers market. There is nothing wrong with that. I encourage that. There is nothing wrong with organic farming, and there is certainly nothing wrong with regard to farmers who farm less acres. God bless them.

However, if we are going to supply enough food for this growing population around the world—9 billion more people in the next several decades—we need agriculture of all types, and that includes organic and conventional and biotech crops. The more nations we can help to feed and bring economic prosperity, the more stable the world will become. That is good for our families, our Nation, and the world, and the world's stability. We can only do that through commonsense policies based on sound science that will allow our producers to do what they need to do to get the job done.

My colleagues—and I see the distinguished chairperson. I will conclude in just about 30 seconds. I am glad she is here. I will just say to my colleagues in the Senate that we should not be putting on lab coats individually and taking action on this amendment. We have a clear scientifically based review process that works. If we pass this amendment, probably in Vermont, California, you will have a requirement; some other States may or may not; in Kansas we will not, and so our State legislature would have no need of putting on lab coats.

At any rate, the FDA has guidance for voluntary labeling, and companies can choose to voluntarily label food and products if their customers want it, if they demand it. Let the consumer decide.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, now that the circuit court nomination vote has been scheduled for later this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of S. 954, the farm bill; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to the Sanders amendment No. 965, as provided under the previous order; finally, following the confirmation vote at 2 p.m., the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of S. 954.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 954) to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

Pending:

Stabenow (for LEAHY) amendment No. 998, to establish a pilot program for gigabit Internet projects in rural areas.

Sanders/Begich amendment No. 965, to permit States to require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale have a label on indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 965 offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS. The time is equally divided.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wanted to thank Senators BEGICH, BLUMENTHAL, BENNET, and MERKLEY for cosponsoring this amendment, as well as support from many environmental and food organizations all over this country. The concept we are talking about today is a fairly commonsense and nonradical idea. All over the world, in the European Union, in many other countries, dozens and dozens of countries, people are able to look at the food they are buying and determine through labeling whether that product contains genetically modified organisms.

That is the issue. In the State of Vermont our legislature voted overwhelmingly for labeling. The State Senate in Connecticut, by an almost unanimous vote, did the same. All over this country States are considering this issue.

One of the concerns that arises when a State goes forward is large biotech companies such as Monsanto suggest that States do not have the constitutional right to go forward; that they are preempting Federal authority. This bill makes it very clear that States can go forward. I would appreciate my colleagues' support for it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. First, Mr. President, before discussing the amendment, I think it is important to note that this is not germane to the farm bill. Food labeling is properly subject to the jurisdiction of the HELP Committee; therefore, Senator HARKIN opposes the amendment.

While I appreciate very much the advocacy of Senator SANDERS on so many different issues, I do believe this particular amendment would interfere with the FDA's science-based process to determine what food labeling is necessary for consumers. It is also important to note that around the world now we are seeing genetically modified crops that have the ability to resist crop disease and improve nutritional content and survive drought conditions.

In many developing countries we see wonderful work being done by foundations such as the Gates Foundation and others that are using new techniques to be able to feed hungry people. I believe we must rely on the FDA's science-based examination before we make conclusions about food ingredients derived from genetically modified foods. They currently do not require special labeling because they have determined that food content of these ingredients does not materially differ from their conventional counterparts. I would urge a ''no'' vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 71, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Begich	King	Reid
Bennet	Leahy	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Manchin	Sanders
Boxer	Merkley	Schatz
Cantwell	Mikulski	Schumer
Cardin	Murkowski	Tester
Feinstein	Murphy	Udall (NM)
Heinrich	Murray	Whitehouse
Hirono	Reed	Wyden

NAYS—71

Alexander	Enzi	McCaskill
Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Baldwin	Franken	Menendez
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Moran
Baucus	Graham	Nelson
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hagan	Portman
Brown	Harkin	Pryor
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Carper	Heitkamp	Roberts
Casey	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shaheen
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Stabenow
Coons	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kaine	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Udall (CO)
Cowan	Klobuchar	Vitter
Crapo	Landrieu	Warner
Cruz	Lee	Warren
Donnelly	Levin	Wicker
Durbin	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	Lautenberg

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. STABENOW. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I rise to make a unanimous consent request, but I want to make a few remarks first.

At the risk of being patronizing to my colleagues about the Constitution, I wish to give a basic lesson on the Constitution this morning.

My understanding is our Founding Fathers in the Constitution devised a system where we had a House of Representatives and a Senate, and they have to agree before something becomes a law. I think this is an amazing decision our Founding Fathers made because what it does is require the Senate, where all of us represent a whole State, to reach agreement with our colleagues in the House, who have much smaller constituencies and, therefore, may be targeted more to one specific area than some of us are.

I have listened to lecture after lecture from my colleagues across the aisle about the Constitution. It is almost as if some of them think they are the only ones who have read it or that they are the only ones who understand it. Well, they are not. Here is how the Constitution works: When we pass a bill and the House passes a bill, we go to conference. Why did the Founding Fathers want that? Because they understood that compromise was the mother's milk of a democracy.

But here is the bizarre thing about this. As a candidate for office last year, I bet I heard 10,000 times: Why don't you pass a budget? I listened to the leader of the Republican Party stand on this floor—and I would love to put together a montage, because we do a lot of hyperbole around here. We exaggerate, we go too far and say too much—but it is not exaggerating that the rallying cry of the Republican Party was: Pass a budget. Regular order. Pass a budget. Regular order. Pass a budget. Regular order. So what did we do? We passed a budget in regular order.

Here is the bizarre part. Following the Constitution, which my friends like to wave around and pretend they are the only ones who love it, some people on that side now think regular order doesn't matter and, by the way, they do not want to go to conference and they do not want to compromise, blowing up the constitutional premise of compromise between the two Houses—blowing it up.

I don't know what the American people think of this, but we have to shake our head at the politics of this. We have got to shake our heads, because here is what is bizarre. They keep moving the goalpost about what it would take to get us to conference.

By the way, the people who are going to be conferring on the other side are in the Republican Party. Are my colleagues worried their counterparts in the House haven't read the Constitution and they are not answerable to their constituents who voted them into office as Republicans so that we have to have another budget bill and redo the debate or we have to make sure they can't compromise on anything and we have to put it in the law?

They had an opportunity to get their way. It is called amendments. My colleagues could have gotten their way through the amendment process. We had over 100 of them. We were here until 5:30 in the morning voting on them. We passed 70 of them. How many amendments did the Senator from Texas offer on the debt ceiling that he is now saying he has to have before we can go to conference? How many amendments did he offer on that? Zero. He offered 17 amendments, but he didn't offer 1 on the debt ceiling. In fact, there was not one Republican amendment on the debt ceiling—not one. So I have to say it is pretty obvious they didn't want a budget, they wanted a political talking point. They wanted to make it look as though we didn't care about doing our job.

They didn't care about a budget. Because if they cared about a budget they would hightail it to conference right now. They would hightail it to conference. It has been 2 months.

I hope the American people are paying attention. No wonder they think we are all losers. This is not a game. You can't love the Constitution one day and blow it up the next. You can't be a situational constitutionalist when you don't get your way. That is not the way our democracy works. I got elected fair and square, and so did my Republican colleagues, and that is why we all have to be willing to compromise with one another. We are not serving the American people by playing these games, and they are sick and tired of it. Frankly, I think it makes the body look a little silly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; that following the authorization, two motions to instruct conferees be in order from each side—motion to instruct relative to the debt limit, and motion to instruct relative to taxes and revenue; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the motions; further, that no amendments be in order to either of the motions prior to the votes; all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request so that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator so modify her request?

Mrs. McCASKILL. Could I inquire of the Senator? I am asking: Is the Senator saying the constitutional provision for a conference between the two Houses—what the Founding Fathers put in the Constitution for conferences—is, in fact, a backroom deal of the Constitution; you don't accept that part of the Constitution?

Mr. LEE. My friend and my distinguished colleague from Missouri is absolutely correct in citing the Constitution and pointing out the fact the two Houses do have to agree before something becomes law.

It is also important to point out that under article 1, section 5, clause 2 of the Constitution, each House of Congress is constitutionally charged with the task of establishing its own rules for operation. The rules of operation in this body, as they apply right here, require this kind of request receive unanimous consent. What that means is every one of us has to be willing to vote for this. What I and a few of my colleagues have said is that regardless of what you might decide to do, we respect your opinion. But if you are asking us to vote for this, meaning to give our consent, which is a vote, we are asking for one slight modification, and that slight modification includes something very simple, which says we are not going to negotiate the debt limit as part of a budget resolution.

They are two separate things. We didn't consider a single amendment that would have addressed the debt limit. Not a single part of the budget resolution passed out of this body addressed the debt limit. The debt limit not having been the subject of the budget resolution, it is not important for that to be addressed by the conference committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator so modify her request?

Mr. McCAIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will object to the modification.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. First of all, I think what is being done here, if we agree that a small number of Senators could basically change the way the Senate does business, could have serious ramifications for the future.

The Senator from Utah said he doesn't want to be deprived of his vote. We are ready to vote, I say to my colleague from Utah. We are ready to vote. We are ready to vote on a motion that would send this bill, which was the subject of an enormous amount of

debate and discussion for hours and hours—until perhaps 7 in the morning—to a conference, with motions to instruct the conferees.

I would be more than happy to vote on instructions to the conferees concerning his previous concern about a tax increase, which somehow has been removed, and/or that of increasing the debt limit—instructing those conferees. That is the way the Senate should do business.

If the Senator from Utah will allow this body to vote on whether we should move to conference with instructions to conferees, that is the regular order. It is not the regular order for a number of Senators, a small number—a minority within a minority here—to say we will not agree to go to conference because of a particular problem with an issue, which I grant is important to the Senator from Utah, and it is important to many Senators as to whether we raise the debt limit.

We are on the agriculture bill right now, I say to my colleague from Mississippi. Suppose we pass the agriculture bill and the House of Representatives passes the agriculture bill and we want to appoint conferees, but there is a burning issue that a number of my colleagues might have. Are we then going to block going to conference?

Look, this isn't just about the budget conferees, this is about whether we will ever be able to appoint conferees on a bill that has been passed by the House and also by the Senate; that we will come together and do what we have been doing since the Congress of the United States started functioning, and that is to sit down and iron out our differences.

If the Senator from Utah is worried about the result, I understand. I am worried about the result. I am worried about a bill right now that is just outrageous, porkbarrel spending on catfish and all kinds of stuff I have concerns about, subsidies for the tobacco companies and all that. But that does not mean I am going to object that we move for conferees, not when the will of the Senate and the Congress and the people is heard in open and honest debate and voting. We are here to vote. We are not here to block things. We are here to articulate our positions on the issues in the best possible and most eloquent way we can and do what we can for the good of the country and then let the process move forward.

I say to my friend from Utah, he is not going to win every fight here. He is not going to win every battle here. But if he is right, I can tell him from the experience I have had in the Senate, he will win in the end if his cause is just. But he can only win if he articulates his argument before his colleagues in the Congress and the American people.

We are about to, I hope—I hope—conclude the immigration reform bill. There will be portions of that bill I do not like. There will be portions of that bill that many of my colleagues do not like. But we are not counting on 100 votes in the Senate. But we are counting on a majority of votes in passing it, and we are hoping the House will do the same. Then we will go to conference.

Does that mean that if a group of Senators—4, 5, 10; I don't know how many colleagues the Senator has on this issue—object to us going to conference on the immigration bill that therefore it should stop?

I am very worried, if this happens, about the precedent that will be set on how the Congress of the United States does business. Just a couple or few weeks ago, after the Newtown massacre, my colleague from Utah and my colleague—I believe from Florida, I am not sure who else—said we do not want to take up the gun bill. We do not want to discuss the gun bill.

I happen to have disagreed with many of the proposals, but was it right? Would it have been right for us not even to debate in light of the Newtown massacre? But the Senator from Utah thought it was the best thing for us not to move forward. Thank God there was a group of us who said let's move forward, let's debate the gun bill, let's do what we can to prevent these further massacres. That is our obligation and our duty to the American people. So here we are again. So here we are again.

The budget that for 4 years I loved beating the daylights out of my friend from Missouri, who would not insist on a budget being brought to the Senate—now a budget has been passed. Everybody was talking about what a great moment it was. We stayed up all night—at my age that is not nearly as enjoyable as it once was—and now, after being so proud, we cannot observe at least a vote?

If the Senator from Utah wants a vote on whether we should appoint conferees and what those instructions to the conferees should be, then that is what we should be doing. I understand how important it is for the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Utah—I don't know how many there are. But I can tell you there is a majority of us who want the Congress to work the people's will.

All I would do is say I hope my colleagues will agree with motions to instruct the conferees. If it is the concern of the Senator from Utah that the conferees should not address the issue of the debt ceiling, then let's vote to instruct the conferees to do that. That is the regular process. That is regular order around here.

But I can also tell my colleague from Utah something else. If we continue to block things such as this and block what is the regular order, then the majority will be tempted to change the rules of the Senate. That would be the most disastrous outcome I could ever imagine. I do not begrudge anybody—whether they have been here 6 months or they have been here 30 years—their rights as Senators. But I hope my colleagues will look at the way the Senate has functioned in the past.

Are the American people unhappy with us? Of course they are unhappy with us. One reason is because they do not see us accomplishing anything.

What I have done for these years, and the people whom I have respected in this body on both sides of the aisle—we fight the good fight. We make our case to our colleagues and the American people, and then we accept the outcome of a regular order while preserving our rights as an individual Senator. We have maintained that balance to a large degree. I hope my colleagues will understand how important that is. I urge my colleagues to do what we have been doing; that is, to have motions to instruct the conferees—if their issue is taxes, if their issue is the debt ceiling—and we vote to instruct those conferees and those conferees carry out the will of the majority of the Senate.

[Several Senators addressed the Chair.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the modified request? The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I reserve the right to object to the request made by the Senator from Utah to amend my request. I would say within my request there is, in fact, the opportunity to vote; and he had the opportunity to offer an amendment on the debt ceiling on the budget and he did not.

I thank my colleague from Arizona and I renew my unanimous consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mrs. MCCASKILL. There is an objection to the modified request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Just for 30 seconds, this is a very important debate. I do not intend to interrupt it. But for purposes of colleagues who wish to speak next, I ask that once the debate is done, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator MCCAIN have 15 minutes to discuss a farm bill amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, for 62 days several of my colleagues and I have objected to the majority's request for unanimous consent to circumvent regular order to go to conference with the House on the budget.

They want permission to skip a few steps in the process, and jump straight to the closed-door back-room meetings.

There, senior negotiators of the House and Senate will be free to wait until a convenient, artificial deadline and ram through their compromise—

un-amended, un-debated and mostly un-read.

And with the country backed up against another economic cliff crisis, we are concerned they will exploit that opportunity to sneak a debt-limit increase into the budget.

We think that is inappropriate.

And yet, objecting to this dysfunctional, unrepublican, undemocratic process has invited anger and criticism from colleagues here on both sides of the aisle.

We just don't get it, you see.

Proceeding to a secret, closed-door, back-room, 11th-hour deal, we are told, is the way the process works. It is the way the Senate works. It is the way the House works. It is the way Washington works.

We know this. That is why we're objecting. In case nobody has noticed, the way Washington works stinks. Closed-door, back room, cliff deals are not the solution, they are the problem.

The unspoken premise of every argument we have heard in favor of going to conference on this budget without conditions is that Congress knows what it is doing.

''Trust us—to go into a back room and cut a deal.''

''Trust us—to ignore special interests and only work for the good of the country.''

''Trust us—to not wait until the 11th hour, to not hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage, to not ram through another thousand-page, trillion-dollar bill, sight unseen.''

''Trust us—We're Congress!''

As it happens, the American people don't trust Congress—or either party. And we have given them at least 17 trillion reasons not to.

I can even provide physical evidence to support my claim. If the American people had confidence in the way the Senate works I know for a fact I would not be here. I do not think my colleagues joining me in this objection would be here either.

We were not sent here to affirm ''the way the Senate worked'' as Congress racked up trillions in debt, inflated a housing bubble, doled out favors to special interests, squeezed the middle class and trapped the poor in poverty.

We were sent here to change all that. We are fully aware that ''Washington'' and the establishments of both parties do not like what we are doing—but as computer programmers say, ''that's a feature, not a bug.''

The tactics of Washington serve the interests of Washington—of Congress itself, the Federal bureaucracy, corporate cronies and special interests.

And does so at the expense of the American people, their wallets, and their freedom.

The only time I can think of when it has not worked out that way was with the recent budget sequestration and that was—literally—an accident; a mistake.

The sequestration process worked out exactly the opposite of how Washington expected and intended.

There is a reason that six of the ten wealthiest counties in the United States are suburbs of Washington, D.C.—a city that produces almost nothing of actual economic value.

And it is not because the two parties have been so effective taking on the special interests and doing the people's business.

There is a reason Tea Partiers on the right and Occupiers on the left protest their shared perception that our economy, our politics, and our society seem rigged.

That elites on Wall Street, K Street, and Pennsylvania Avenue get to play by one set of rules and people on Main Street have to play by another.

It is because they are mostly right. This is our true inequality crisis: not between rich and poor, but between Washington and everyone else.

The national debt, and its statutory limit, is a hidden part of this inequality crisis.

After all, what is new debt but a tax increase on future Americans? On those who cannot yet vote? On those who have not yet been born?

Raising the debt limit thus results in a form of taxation without representation. That is why the American people resent it. And it is why Washington desperately wants to raise the debt limit with as little public scrutiny and accountability as possible.

And that is why we're objecting.

Our critics say we should allow the process to move forward so we can have a debate. I don't know if they've noticed, but we are having the debate. We have had it several days in a row.

More than that, we are having the debate here on the floor, open to public scrutiny, and not secretly behind closed doors. This, right here, is how the process is supposed to work. The only way the American people can have any hope of supervising their Congress—not ours, their Congress—is for us to do our work above board and in the open, according to the rules.

That is all we are asking for—and only on one issue. For all our concerns, we have still said all along that we will not block a budget conference. We can go to conference right now. We are willing to give the majority permission to break from regular order and scurry off to closed door negotiations to cut their back room deal.

All we have asked is one thing, a very small and simple request: leave the debt limit out of it. Do everything else you want, spend all the money you want, use all the accounting gimmicks you want, but when you go into that back room, check the debt limit at the door. That way the American people can have that separate debate, on its own merits, here on the floor.

This should not be controversial. The House Republican budget did not include a debt limit increase or instructions to include one. The Senate Democratic budget does not include it either. House and Senate negotiators, therefore, have no procedural or democratic justification for including a debt limit hike in their talks. They have no right to do it. Yet they won't promise not to.

Once again: Trust us, we are Congress.

''This is how the Senate works,'' they say. ''This is how we do things.''

Respectfully, this is how we fail. This is how we earn our 15 percent approval rating. We know this is business as usual around here. That is why we're objecting.

If the majority wants to proceed to a budget conference through regular order, we can not stop them. But again, that is not their request. Their request is for permission to break from regular order, skip a few steps, and go straight to the secret negotiations, behind closed doors, where in the Washington-centered view of the world, the real governing can be done.

The American people do not trust secret, back-room deals, and neither do I. Unless and until the American people are assured that we will not sneak a debt limit increase into the Conference report, I will happily continue to object.

I object to the motion on the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we have been through it before. In a nutshell, what the Senator from Utah has just said is that if we pass this legislation, and if the House passes this legislation, we will not go to conference unless certain conditions are imposed on those conferees that happen to be important to a small group of Senators. Obviously, that will paralyze the process. Obviously, we can predict the outcome.

The Senator from Utah keeps talking about backroom, closed-door deals. It is the process of the Senate and the House to appoint conferees. Those conferees come to agreement and then subject their agreement to an overall vote in both bodies.

If the Senator from Utah wants to get rid of the ''backroom''—and all of the other adjectives and adverbs he used—then what is the process? What is the process? How do we reconcile legislation that is passed by one body and the other body? That is what we have been doing for a couple of hundred years.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. All I can say is, Does the Senator from Utah have another way of reconciling legislation between the House and Senate? Of course not. Of course he doesn't. Of course he doesn't. Of course he doesn't because that is the only way we can get legislation that will be passed by both bodies and signed by the President of the United States. That is the only way.

I tell the Senator from Utah again, if this condition is imposed then there is no reason why any group of Senators should impose conditions on conferees from now on, which will then mean, of course, we would not go to conference.

I would be glad to answer a question.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question through the Chair.

It is my understanding the budget resolution passed by the House and the budget resolution passed by the Senate, if conferenced and agreed upon, will result in a resolution passed by both the House and Senate but never sent to the President. It is a budget resolution that governs the way we appropriate from that point forward.

So as to the question of the debt ceiling, it could not be done in a budget resolution. If there is going to be any action on the debt ceiling, it has to be in a separate legislative vehicle that ultimately goes to the President of the United States.

Even if there were an agreement on debt limit in the budget conference, it would have no impact of law. Is that not true?

Mr. MCCAIN. Perhaps the Senator from Utah doesn't know about that, and the fact that even if they did raise the debt limit, it could not become law because it doesn't go to the President of the United States.

Again, maybe the Senator from Utah ought to learn a little bit more about how business has been done in the Congress of the United States. Budget resolutions are not signed by the President of the United States, so even if we did vote to increase the debt limit as a result of the conference—which, by the way, would be irrelevant to the work of the conference—it would not have any meaning whatsoever.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCAIN. This business of secret backroom dealmaking, that is what conferences are about, and conference results are subject to a vote of both Houses as to the conference result.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would be glad to yield for a question.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I say to the Senator, through the Chair, I have conferred with our budget chair while Senator MCCAIN was debating this with the Senator from Utah, and maybe they are not aware that conference committees are open to anyone who wants to observe them. I would like Senator MCCAIN to invite the Senator from Utah to sit in on the conference committee and listen to every word.

This notion that our democracy is a backroom deal because of bills in conference—the Founding Fathers are shaking their heads in disgust at this notion. It is not a closed-door process. It is an open process. Anybody can come and listen.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is my understanding since the conference is open to the public, it will also be broadcast on C–SPAN so all the American people can watch the deliberations.

I wonder, why would the Senator from Utah say it is a backroom, closed-door deal when, in fact—doesn't the Senator from Utah know this conference is open to the public and seen by everybody?

I mean, for the Senator from Utah to say this is a backroom, closed-door deal, he is either directly misleading or my colleague has no knowledge of how the budget conference works. I don't know which one it is, and I don't know which one is worse.

All I can say is we know, one, even if we had a restriction on allowing raising of the debt limit, it would not matter because it is not legislation that would be signed by the President of the United States—no matter what the budget conferees did. We also know the budget conferees—I will admit, unlike many—meet in open session with C–SPAN so the American people are able to observe it.

So I at least hope the Senator from Utah would withdraw his comment that this is a backroom, closed-door deal because it is not. Those are fundamental facts.

Again, it is disappointing that we are spending this time when we should be on the farm bill. The Senator from California and I have an important amendment to remove a lot of the corruption that is in that bill.

I will yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, as to the suggestion that this produces a budget resolution that at the end of day does not go to the President, and therefore it isn't law, technically, on its own face, is accurate.

What we are concerned about are the instructions which would accompany the conference report. We are concerned about instructions that would allow the normal rules of the Senate to be circumvented specifically for something like this or perhaps a piece of legislation which would itself raise the debt limit to be considered——

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEE. I would like to finish what I am saying—legislation which would itself raise the debt limit and voted on a 51-vote margin rather than a 60-vote margin. So this is different.

Regardless of how open they make that conference meeting, it is not the same kind of open debate in which every Senator and every Representative is able to participate in the same way they would be able to on the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Does the Senator admit it is not a deal that is made behind closed doors? Does the Senator admit that? Does the Senator admit he misspoke on that issue? It is not behind closed doors.

Mr. LEE. Compared to the way we do things on the floor, this is a closed-door deal. Compared to the way we do things on the floor, this is not subject to the same kind of scrutiny.

The fact is that we have rules in the Senate—rules—on something like this, which would allow us to proceed on the basis of a 60-vote threshold. That is the whole purpose of this discussion. That is the basis of our concern. We don't want legislation that can run through to raise the debt limit, incurring potentially trillions of dollars in borrowing authority on the basis of only a 51-vote threshold. That is our concern.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been listening to this debate, not just today but for 61 days as we have been working extremely hard to get the budget passed and go to conference so we can work with our House colleagues—and, by the way, the majority are Republicans. We are working to do that because the American people have been very loud about not managing by crisis. We all know that what will happen if we don't go to conference is exactly what the Senator from Utah has been saying he doesn't want.

If we go to conference we will have an open conference committee to discuss the differences between the House and the Senate budgets. They will then give those instructions to the conference committee on how to move forward on our appropriations bills that we are now looking at and how we are going to deal with sequestration. It will be an open debate that will come back here.

If we are not allowed to go to conference—we do have to pass our appropriations and spending bills or move to a continuing resolution because we can't if we don't get a budget deal—we are going to have to have a closed-door and secret discussion to figure out what we are going to do when the debt ceiling hits. It will come down on them in the middle of the night, and they will not have had an opportunity to be a part of it because of the delay that is occurring right now.

If the Senate allows us to go to conference, Members of the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, my counterpart Senator SESSIONS, and I, his committee, as well as Congressman RYAN from the Republican Party in the House and his committee members and Democrats will sit together in an open process and determine how we move our budget forward.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. In the case of the appointment of conferees, will that be open to the public on C–SPAN or any other media coverage that wishes to come in the room?

Mrs. MURRAY. Once the conference is set and we begin meeting in a conference, it is like any other committee hearing where the public will be able to come in and listen. They will able to watch on C–SPAN, and it will be an open process.

I will tell the Senator from Arizona that if we don't get to conference, we are going to have to have discussions, as a country, about how we manage our finances and our government moving

forward, and those will be behind closed doors.

So what the Senator is objecting to as to the closed-door secret meetings he is causing.

I hope our Republican colleagues would allow us to move forward. As the Senator from Missouri said, we had 50 hours of debate, we had over 100 amendments which were considered. Not one amendment was offered or considered on the debt ceiling, which is now what they are objecting to if we go to conference.

The Senator from Texas, I believe, offered 17 amendments, and he has been objecting because of this. Not one of them was about the debt ceiling.

I know the Senator wants to have a debt ceiling debate on the floor of the Senate. He is welcome to come to the floor anytime and talk about the debt ceiling. We welcome that discussion. We believe our bills should be paid, but that is separate from what we are talking about here. We are talking about a budget resolution.

Mr. MCCAIN. How many amendments were considered?

Mrs. MURRAY. There were over 100 amendments considered. There was 50 hours of debate equally divided. Every Senator participated.

Mr. MCCAIN. How many were voted on?

Mrs. MURRAY. Over 70 were agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. But there was not one amendment on the debt ceiling?

Mrs. MURRAY. Not one amendment was offered or considered on the debt ceiling.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. MURRAY. I would add that what the Senator from Missouri has offered, after talking with the Senator from Arizona, is the ability now to have a vote, despite there wasn't any during that time. There was an offer, with our consent, that, yes, OK, fine. If you have to have that now, we want to get to conference so we will allow a vote on that and proceed to the conference.

So I do not understand this argument that we are going into some secret meeting. I assure the Senator that we have seen secret meetings here when it comes to the budget in the past that have gotten us all to a very frustrating point.

Let's move to conference so we do not have those secret meetings. The Senator is arguing for something—I say to the Senator from Utah—that the Senator from Utah is going to cause.

I hope we can come to an agreement. We have offered a consent which offers two motions to be considered. We hope to have those, and we hope to go to conference.

I assure the Senator that we will be as open and as transparent as possible. That budget resolution will come back to the Senate, everyone will have a chance to have their say if they want that, and then that budget resolution will give us our instructions so we can continue to move forward on regular order to fund the Defense Department, Agriculture, Education, and to fund the different aspects of government such as transportation and housing. That is our obligation as the United States Congress in order for the American public to be able to manage what they are required to do once we pass our budget.

I urge our Republican colleagues to back off on their insistence on this matter. I am ready to go to conference. Am I going to like what comes out of conference as chair of the Budget Committee that worked very hard to get a budget passed in the Senate? Probably not.

I know my responsibility as a Senator is to work with my House Republican colleagues and those on our conference committee to come to the best judgment we can mutually so we can move our country forward and get us out of this management by crisis that has been forced on us time and time again over the last several years.

The American people deserve certainty. That certainty will come when we can move to conference with an open, transparent committee process which allows us to get the budget in order.

Again, I urge my colleagues to reconsider their objections.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I too want the Senate to move to negotiate with the House on the budget. I think it is critically important.

I have tremendous respect for the legislative process and our Republic at the State level, local level, and the Federal level. In fact, my colleagues are correct. Oftentimes in this place we have to vote for issues we don't like because it is a product of compromise. It may not have everything we want, but it gives us the things we need.

I have certainly been on the losing end during multiple votes in this place during the time I have been here because I am in the minority both in party and sometimes in view. So I certainly understand that part of it.

That is why I voted against the budget. I am glad we finally produced a budget after 1,000 days, but that budget is one that I believe is deficient. That is why I voted against the budget.

Nevertheless, I believe this institution should move forward in negotiating the differences between our budget and the budget that the House has so we can finally have a budget in this country and so this country can move forward.

The only thing me and my colleagues are asking for is that as part of that negotiation the issue of the debt limit not be included.

I have heard here today statements made that there were X number of amendments filed and they didn't include the debt limit. I think the reason is because most of us agree that is an issue which needs to be dealt with on its own. This is not just some issue. It is an extremely consequential issue—one that needs to be debated in and of itself because it is a function not just of an annual budget. The massive debt our country faces is a function of a structural problem we have. We basically have these massive government programs that are going bankrupt, and if we don't deal with it, it will keep getting worse.

I have also heard statements made here today that we can't raise the debt limit even if we wanted to because of the way it is structured. That is why I am puzzled. Why, then, the objection? Why the objection to a very simple notion?

We could be in conference with the House today. We could be negotiating with the House at this very moment if all we would do is just say: Go ahead and negotiate the differences with the budget. Negotiate taxes. If there is a tax increase, I am voting against it, but negotiate that. Negotiate all of these sorts of things. But the debt limit cannot be part of it; it has to be dealt with separately.

I don't understand the objection to that being in there.

I would say one more thing about the amendment process, and this is a cautionary tale. The next time someone comes up to you and says, ''Don't file any more amendments; you are slowing the place down,'' maybe you should file them because if you don't file them, you will have to hold your peace forever.

With that being the case, I think we need to move to negotiation with the House with the very simple language in it that it should not have a debt limit increase.

I am going to move and ask for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate; further, that a conference report in relation to H. Con. Res. 25 not be in order in the Senate that includes reconciliation instructions to increase the debt ceiling.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. RUBIO. Well, then, we are in the same place we were before. Basically, this is senatese, but what I basically said is that I want the Senate to go into negotiations with the House. The only thing we ask is that when they come back, there not be reconciliation

instructions in there that the debt limit be dealt with or increased because the debt limit is so consequential for our country that it needs to be dealt with on its own.

Let me remind everybody of what we are dealing with. Let me tell my colleagues that this is a bipartisan debt. I said it yesterday, and I will repeat it today. This is a debt that grew over the last 20 or 30 years with the cooperation of both parties, unfortunately, although we have never seen anything like the last 5 years. It is a function of a structural problem in our spending programs. If we don't deal with those programs, it is going to collapse our economy within our lifetime and certainly that of our children. It is time to deal with it now. That issue should be debated on its own, not as part of a budget negotiation that deals with a 1-year spending agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we have been through this quite a bit, but, again, I wish to respond by saying that if it were part of the budget resolution, it would have no effect in law. So one has to then question what the knowledge of those who are advocating this is about fundamental procedures.

Second of all, if this is a prerequisite, then for every conference we send, Senators will be allowed, according to this precedent, to set certain parameters of those conferences, which is a procedure we use now—instructions to conferees. We are willing to have votes on instructions to conferees on any issue any Senator feels necessary for the conferees to do their job.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be glad to.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. The Senate is a wondrous creation by our Founding Fathers in that a great deal of power was given to the minority in the Senate.

Mr. MCCAIN. Thank God.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. And I know the Senator from Arizona has enjoyed having that power from time to time, and I am sure when my party has been in the minority it has been important, and we have respected that in this body, although there have been some really dicey times, and I am sure the Senator from Arizona has been involved when we have been on the brink of blowing up the rights of the minority.

I want to make sure I understand. The way I really see what is going on is we now have a superminority. If this were allowed to pass, what we would be doing is changing what the Founding Fathers had in mind in terms of the power of the minority and actually saying: Let's go back in history and say there were one or two or three Senators or four Senators who decided, by gosh, they weren't going to do voting rights legislation or they weren't going to do the vote for women or they weren't going to do some of the changes that have occurred in our country.

Does the Senator from Arizona see a problem that if we allow a superminority—a minority of the minority—to hijack a process laid out in our Constitution, that what would happen is the majority would have no choice at that point other than to begin to circumscribe the rules for the minority?

Mr. MCCAIN. Well, I think that is a danger and I think it is a significant danger if a number of Senators, either large or small, should insist that certain conditions be imposed unilaterally without motions to instruct. That is what we have the motions to instruct for. It is not that we don't want the conferees to do certain things, but we have motions to instruct. That is the regular order of how we do business.

The Senators who are here who say the debt ceiling should not be part of any negotiations, fine. Let's have a vote, motions to instruct the conferees. It has been my experience that the conferees have stuck with the instructions that were voted on by the majority of the Senate.

So this is kind of a sad time because here we are debating as to whether we should allow the debt limit to be part of negotiations, which would have no meaning in law whatsoever because it is not signed by the President. We have pressing issues. The Senator from California and I have an issue that has to do with tobacco and the health of our kids that we would like to have considered before the Senate. We could be debating on the instructions to the conferees. We could be doing so many things, and we are not. We are not doing those things.

Finally, I would again share my experience with my colleagues. I have lost a lot more times than I have won, but I have come to the floor of the Senate using the rules of the Senate and made the argument on those things I believe in and stand for. I have been passionate on those issues, and sometimes I have irritated my colleagues, but at least I have had my say.

But then after I have had my say, there have been votes, and the body has decided, and the body has decided whether I was right or wrong. When I have been voted down, I have gone back on those issues and I have tried to convince my colleagues of the rightness of my position, rather than, as with the gun bill, after people were slaughtered in Newtown, CT, my colleagues didn't even want to debate the issue of gun control and what we should do about that. That is not how the Senate should function. The Senate is supposed to debate and discuss and give our passionate appeals and beliefs and then put it to the will of the body. That is the protection of the individual Senator, not to just say we are not going to do anything. That is not the way the American people want us to act. And to throw in all this stuff about the debt and the deficit—I will match my record on opposing the debt and the deficit against certainly my colleagues here.

But that is not the point. The point is, will this deliberative body, whether it is the greatest in the world or the worst in the world, go ahead and decide on this issue so we can have a budget so we can at least tell the American people we are going to do what we haven't done for 4 years and what every family in America sooner or later has to do, and that is to have a budget.

So, as I say, we have gone on too long. The farm bill is of the utmost importance, and the Senator from California and I have amendments on it. I hope my colleagues will realize the best way to get their point of view over and sway the opinion of our colleagues and the American people is to engage in honest and open debate, as the Senate does, instruct the conferees, let them go to conference in an open—not closed-door, not behind closed doors, not backroom—process that is the procedure employed by the Budget Committee in conference.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, in ''Gulliver's Travels,'' Swift told us of two fictional lands—Lilliput and Blefuscu—that had been at war for years over which end of the egg to open first. In Lilliput they opened the big end of the egg, and in Blefuscu they opened the small end of the egg, and the big-enders and little-enders battled endlessly. I am sorry to say that satirical depiction often reflects what occurs in this august body. We spend a great deal of time arguing about procedural niceties, about motions to commit or not commit that do not matter to the American people, and all the meantime we are bankrupting our children and our grandchildren.

If I could, I wish to cut through all of the arguments back and forth because in my view most of the arguments are by design missing the point of this disagreement. This disagreement is over one issue and one issue only: Can the Senate raise our debt limit with only 50 votes or does it take 60? Everything else that is being talked about is smoke, is a side issue. The central fight is, Should the Senate be able to raise the debt limit with 50 votes or 60?

I will note that my friend from Arizona questioned the knowledge of those who are objecting, and he suggested that perhaps our knowledge was lacking because this could not be done. Well, I know my friend from Arizona is a long veteran of this body, and he surely knows it was done in 1987 and 1990. This is not a hypothetical. In 1995 and in 2004 it was attempted. It didn't quite get accomplished, but it was attempted.

What occurs under the Budget Act of 1974 is that when a conference report is adopted and reconciliation instructions are sent, that raises the debt ceiling, and that can then be passed by this body with merely 50 votes. This is all an avenue to allow a debt ceiling increase to be raised with 50 votes. And I

know my friend from Arizona is well aware of that because he is such an esteemed historian of this body, he knows not only that it can be done but that it has been done.

We don't need to hypothesize over whether that is what this is about because for 62 days we have asked the majority leader: Simply say we won't use this as a procedural trick to raise the debt ceiling with 50 votes and then we can go to conference. For 62 days the majority leader has said: No, no, I will not do that; I will not do that. And those protestations make absolutely clear what this is about.

I think that on both sides of the Chamber there are different things at work. On the Democratic side of the Chamber—President Obama has been very explicit. He wants to raise the debt limit, and he has said he wants no debate about it. He is unwilling to debate. He wants to shut down the discussion. He simply wants a blank check. He simply wants an unlimited credit card to keep digging the debt hole this Nation is in deeper and deeper and deeper. He said this publicly, repeatedly from the White House.

What our friends the Democrats are doing is standing shoulder to shoulder with the Democratic President in fighting to enable the Senate to raise the debt limit with just 50 votes, which means, if that happens, that would then allow the 55-Member Democratic majority to vote to do so without listening to a word from the minority. That is what this fight is about, and there is no other issue being contested here.

What is happening on the Republican side? Well, some have suggested we ought to just have a motion to instruct. The problem with the motion to instruct is that a motion to instruct is nonbinding, so it is a purely symbolic gesture. But even a motion to instruct not to raise the debt ceiling would lose. Why? Because there are 55 Democrats, and the 55 Democrats would vote against it.

Here is the dirty little secret about some of those on the right side of the aisle: There are some who would very much like to cast a symbolic vote against raising the debt ceiling and nonetheless allow our friends on the left side of the aisle to raise the debt ceiling. That, to some Republicans, is the ideal outcome because they can go to their constituents and say: See, I voted no, and yet at the same time, wonderfully, they lost, and they did not actually have to stand up and stop what was happening. That is an outcome I believe some on this side of the aisle desire.

I do feel obliged to rise in defense of my colleagues, the Republicans, because the senior Senator from Arizona has impugned the Republicans by claiming repeatedly it is only a minority of Republicans who are opposed to raising the debt ceiling on 50 votes. He has repeatedly suggested on the floor of the Senate that, in fact, it may be a small minority, that the overwhelming majority of Republicans, the senior Senator from Arizona said, stand with HARRY REID in wanting to be able to raise the debt ceiling on 50 votes.

Let me suggest to the senior Senator from Arizona that, No. 1, in saying that, he is impugning all 45 Republicans in this body, but, No. 2, it has been suggested that those of us who are fighting to defend liberty, fighting to turn around the out-of-control spending and out-of-control debt in this country, fighting to defend the Constitution—it has been suggested we are wacko birds. Well, if that is the case, I will suggest to my friend from Arizona there may be more wacko birds in the Senate than are suspected. Indeed, I would encourage my friend, the senior Senator from Arizona, that if he were to circulate to Republicans a simple statement that said: We, the undersigned Republican Senators, hereby state we support giving HARRY REID and the Democrats the ability to raise the debt ceiling with 50 votes instead of 60, I believe he will find his representation to this body that it is only a minority of Republicans who oppose that is not accurate.

This issue gets obscured by the procedural complexities, and that is not by accident. Washington is very good at speaking doublespeak that makes the citizens' eyes glaze over. But as its heart it is very simple. Majority Leader REID and the Democrats want to raise the debt ceiling. They have stated they want to raise the debt ceiling, and they want to do so consistent with President Obama's instructions to do so without debate because he does not want to debate this issue, without conditions, without anything to fix our out-of-control spending, our out-of-control debt—simply give him an additional blank credit card because going from $10 trillion to $17 trillion has not been enough. That is the desire of the Democrats, and it is candid.

We could go to conference right now, today, if the Democrats would simply say: We will not raise the debt ceiling with just using 50 votes. We will debate it on the floor with a 60-vote threshold and actually be forced to find some bipartisan agreement. But that is not what the majority wants to do.

Those who are arguing that Republicans should accede to that demand are arguing that all of us who have told our constituents we are going to fight to solve this economic problem, we are going to fight to stop out-of-control spending, we are going to fight to stop bankrupting our kids—that those promises are hollow, those are just what we tell constituents at home, that is not actually what we do when we are on the floor of the Senate.

I would note, indeed, when the senior Senator from Arizona said it is only a small minority that believes this on the Republican side, if my friend, the senior Senator, is able to produce a written letter with the signature of a majority of Republicans, I will offer here and now to go to a home game of my Houston Astros wearing an Arizona Diamondback hat. And I can guarantee you, in Houston that will not be well received. But yet I stand in complete comfort that I will not find myself in that situation because I do not believe it is right that a majority of the Republicans in this body have given up the fight on spending, have given up the fight on reining in out-of-control Washington bipartisan spending, deficits, and debt. I believe we are seeing leadership in this body stand together to fix the problem. That is what the American people want.

Let me say this in closing: It is easy to get confused by all of the procedural discussions back and forth. This issue is about one issue alone: Should Majority Leader HARRY REID be able to raise the debt limit an unlimited amount with just 50 votes or should it require 60? If it requires 60, there will have to be some positive steps made to fix the problem. If it is just 50, the majority leader has the votes right now, today, to write a blank check for the Federal debt.

That is the issue, and I think the American people are not conflicted in the answer to that issue. The American people want us to fix the problem and stop digging the debt hole deeper and deeper, stop putting our kids and grandkids on the path to Greece.

I am proud so many Senators are standing here working very hard to honor our commitments to our constituents because that is exactly what our job is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I thank my friend and my colleague, the Senator from Texas, for his remarks and I speak briefly to respond to a couple of points that have come up today.

First of all, it is important for us to remember that although the rules of our body might allow for a conference committee to meet in public, and although that may have happened in the past from time to time, it is not the norm. In asking around to some senior staff members who have been here longer than I have, it typically has not happened in recent years. In fact, it has become relatively rare in recent years. So to suggest it necessarily is an open process because it has the capacity to be made into an open process, those are not the same things. Typically, we can legitimately expect for this to be a backroom, closed-door process.

That is not the end of the world; we, of course, need conference committees. They do valuable, important work. We are not disputing that. We are not disputing the fact that sometimes it is important for conference committees to meet in order to reconcile competing versions of the same legislation—one passed in the House and one passed in the Senate. But what we are talking about here is a very limited request: to limit the scope of their work

so as to exclude the possibility of a debt limit increase without the 60-vote threshold.

It is also important to remember that although this is the procedure the majority has chosen to use in order to try to get to a conference committee, it is not the only way. In fact, it is possible to do this without unanimous consent. It is possible to do this without, in other words, all of us being willing to do it—all of us—by withholding our objection as effectively voting to do that.

If, as has been suggested, the other body does, in fact, want to go to conference, the other body could take the budget we passed, could slap their amendments on top of it, could even replace most or even all of our budget with theirs, send it back over, and at that point it is my understanding we could go to conference without the need for a unanimous consent.

So there are other ways. This is just the way the majority has chosen to go. The majority has every right to do that, and we have every right to object. That we do and that we will continue to do until such time as it either becomes unnecessary or until such time as the majority agrees to modify the request along the lines we have specified so as to permit and ensure that any debt limit discussions and votes will take place subsequent to the normal order and subject to a 60-vote threshold.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I believe pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement propounded by the chairwoman of the Agriculture Committee that I am next up to be able to speak on an amendment. But for a brief moment I want to reflect on what I have heard and the lens through which I see it.

I have been here for 20 years. When I came to the Senate, it was not this way. The rules of the Senate were observed. A small minority never tried to subvert the will of a majority. I think Senator MCCAIN said it well. We stand on the floor. We advocate for our views. We either win or lose. The dye is cast. But we have an opportunity for full deliberation.

It is one thing to have a minority have their rights. It is another thing to have a minority of the minority absolutely try and handcuff a committee of the Senate. I believe that is wrong. Because what is happening here sets a precedent for future answers. And there is no reason not to have a conference committee.

I think the Senator from Utah knows full well these conference committees are open to the public. They are open to the press. They are often long. They can be laborious. But it is a way of reconciling the differences between the House and the Senate.

So to handcuff this Budget Committee and say it can do this but it cannot do that is not the right thing to do. I hope the credibility of the minority of the minority running this body diminishes with this debate.

AMENDMENT NO. 923

Let me now go to an amendment Senator MCCAIN and I are offering to eliminate taxpayer subsidies for tobacco production in the farm bill of America. It is No. 923. I will not call it up because I understand an agreement is—I am just told by the chairwoman of the committee that I can call up the amendment, and to this end I call up amendment No. 923.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask reading of the amendment be vitiated, and I will proceed with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will simply report the amendment first.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Fine.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN, for herself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 923.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the payment by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation of any portion of the premium for a policy or plan of insurance for tobacco)

On page 1101, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 11_____. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION FOR TOBACCO.

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) (as amended by section 11030(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION FOR TOBACCO.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning with the 2015 reinsurance year, notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Corporation shall not pay any portion of the premium for a policy or plan of insurance for tobacco under this subtitle.

''(B) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings realized as a result of subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction.''.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I thank the chairwoman. She made a commitment to hold a vote on this amendment on Monday evening, and she has sought mightily to keep her word, and I very much appreciate that.

This amendment is, to my view, about common sense. Tobacco is not just another crop; it causes 443,000 deaths each year. It is the leading cause of preventable death in America. The CDC estimates that tobacco costs the American economy more than $200 billion each year in health care expenses and lost productivity.

A recent study estimates that annual smoking-attributable expenditures add $22 billion each year to Medicaid's bottom line. In other words, Medicaid costs $22 billion more because of tobacco.

In 2004, Congress approved nearly $10 billion—$9.6 billion, to be exact—in payments over the next 10 years to tobacco farmers and quota holders in exchange for ending the tobacco program.

In addition to this $10 billion, tobacco farmers also received more than $276 million in taxpayer-funded crop insurance subsidies since 2004. That is what we are trying to change. Unlike crop insurance indemnities, the tobacco insurance subsidy is not based on losses. The government pays premium support subsidies year in and year out regardless of losses.

In 2012, farmers received $37.4 million in subsidies; in 2011, $33 million; in 2010, $37.1 million; in 2009, $40.1 million. If you add this up, there is $147 million in subsidies given, despite the big tobacco buyout of $10 billion, in subsidies to crop insurance.

If you look at our $642 billion deficit, why would the government continue to subsidize crop insurance for tobacco?

Now that is not to say tobacco farmers should not have access to crop insurance. Insurance is an important risk management tool for any business, and our amendment allows tobacco farmers to continue to purchase crop insurance.

The amendment is specific. It eliminates the government's contribution to the annual cost of tobacco insurance premiums. But it does not impact the ability for crop insurance companies to sell these products. Farmers can manage weather and market risk without the mandatory taxpayer premium support.

Some may say: Well, market rate insurance is not feasible for farmers. I challenge that notion. Carrot farmers do not have access to any crop insurance—federally subsidized or otherwise—neither do spinach farmers, broccoli farmers, or artichoke farmers.

The list of crops with no insurance support goes on: cauliflower, celery, eggplant, cut flowers, Kiwi, kumquats, melons, garlic, raspberries, and pomegranates, to name a few.

Farming without government-subsidized crop insurance is possible, contrary to what some would have you believe.

I also want to remind my colleagues that tobacco farmers have done quite well by the government. In 2014, North Carolina tobacco farmers and quota owners will have received $3.9 billion in buyout payments. In other words, they have taken this money to be bought out. Kentucky quota owners and farmers will have received $2.4 billion from the government. Quota holders and farmers in Tennessee, South Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia will each have received more than $600 million in buyout payments by the end of next year.

Evenly divided among the thousands of tobacco quota holders and farmers nationwide, the nearly $10 billion buyout has provided very generous support. We need to remember this is not a struggling industry. Contrary to what some would have you believe, a 2012 University of Illinois study found that productivity on Kentucky tobacco farms increased by 44 percent in the last 10 years.

At the same time, tobacco farmers are seeing some of their best paydays since the 2004 buyouts began. Tobacco is fetching nearly $2 a pound for some farmers. The 2012 crop was valued at $1.579 billion.

To return to the question at hand, should taxpayers continue to subsidize tobacco productions, I believe the answer is no. Tobacco is the leading cause of preventable death in the United States. As I said, it kills 443,000 people each year. It costs $200 billion in health care and reduced productivity.

I am not alone. This amendment is supported by the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, the American Public Health Association, the Environmental Working Group, Doctors for America, Physicians for Responsible Medicine, and Taxpayers for Common Sense.

Some would have you believe this is going to affect the small tobacco farmer. Let's take a look at it. There are 16,228 farms that grow tobacco nationwide. Well, I will not get into that. The industry is concentrated. A small number of large farms produces the vast majority of the crop. Two percent of the farms produce 50 percent of the annual tobacco crop; 10 percent, 75 percent of the annual tobacco crop. Twenty percent of farms that grow tobacco are smaller than 50 acres. Eighty percent of farms that grow tobacco are larger than 50 acres.

The bottom line is most tobacco farmers are not relying on tobacco as their primary crop. Thus, it is not surprising that only 4,495—that is 72 percent of farms—have tobacco sales of more than $50,000 a year. A fair assessment shows that about 5 percent of tobacco farmers, 908, do fall into the category of small farmers who rely on tobacco as their primary farm income.

The buyout expires, I believe, at the end of 2014. My point is nearly $10 billion of taxpayer funds is in the process of being expended to buy out tobacco farmers. Why should we then subsidize crop insurance? I very much hope my colleagues will join me in supporting what I think is commonsense reform. We have to say no to tobacco in America. Most of us think we have made great progress. Young people smoke less; older people smoke less; you do not smoke in public places. All of these have had a big impact. I think by eliminating this subsidy on crop insurance, it also can have a constructive impact.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I thank the Senator from California for her excellent work on the amendment she is offering which takes to another level the fight against tobacco addiction that has so plagued this country. She has been such a champion of the victims of nicotine and tobacco addiction. Her work certainly has been a model for many of us who have been involved in this fight.

(The remarks of Mr. BLUMENTHAL pertaining to the introduction of S. 1041 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 1 p.m. be equally divided between proponents and opponents of the Feinstein-McCain amendment No. 923; that following the confirmation vote this afternoon and the resumption of legislative session, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendment; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote and that the amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. One more comment, as I see my colleague is waiting to speak on the Senate floor. I want to thank everyone. As we are working through the farm bill, we are making progress, moving forward, and looking forward to continuing to put in place the final path for passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 133

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise to make a unanimous consent request.

We have been following an extraordinary horror story in the news, and it is the story of Kermit Gosnell's truly unspeakable crimes that were committed over a long period of time—maybe as long as two decades—at the Women's Medical Society in Philadelphia, PA.

We suspect there were literally hundreds of late-term and very late-term abortions that were conducted there, and we now know from his conviction in a criminal trial that there were babies born alive—probably many—who were then murdered when scissors were used to sever their spinal cords after they were born alive in a failed abortion attempt. Further, we know that Kermit Gosnell and some of his colleagues kept aborted fetuses in bags and bottles, discarded them, left them on shelves.

It is unbelievable what was happening at that place for years and years. In fact, the crimes were discovered by accident. Police raided offices to seize evidence of illegal sales of prescription drugs. It was only during that raid for illegal prescription drug sales that they discovered the evidence of these atrocities.

It is my view and the view of many of my colleagues that we need to do a lot more to make sure that the laws, which were blatantly being violated by Kermit Gosnell, are better enforced. We need to do that through proper due diligence and discover where they are being violated.

About 2 weeks ago Kermit Gosnell was convicted. He was convicted of three counts of first-degree murder for killing three infants. He was convicted of one count of third-degree murder in the overdose death of a woman. There were 21 counts of abortion of an unborn child of 24 weeks or more, and he was convicted of 208 counts of violation of informed consent.

We have a resolution, S. Res. 133. It points to these atrocities that were committed. It simply calls on Congress and the States to investigate and correct the abusive, unsanitary, and the blatantly illegal abortion practices that certainly were conducted here at the Women's Medical Society in Philadelphia and similar such practices that may be occurring in other places.

I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 133, that the Senate proceed to its consideration, and that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will, in fact, but I want to first discuss the resolution that now for the third time essentially has been brought to this body, and I am here to speak and object for a third time but not out of disagreement with the basic goal that has been well articulated by my friend from Pennsylvania.

I think I am quoting him directly from his remarks just now in saying that the goal is to do a lot more to ensure that the laws violated by Kermit Gosnell are vigorously enforced. I am here to say, yes, let's condemn the kinds of practices that resulted in the conviction of Kermit Gosnell and his sentence, in effect, to life in prison. Let's do more to ensure that laws are vigorously enforced that protect innocent patients in any setting, whether it is a doctor's office, a hospital, or a nursing home; whether it is by a nurse, a doctor, or another kind of caregiver, or by a vicious, conscienceless practitioner like Kermit Gosnell.

Let's stop this kind of despicable medical conduct even if it may be only a tiny fraction of all the caregiving that occurs in the United States by an even tinier fraction of a great and noble profession, by extraordinarily experienced and expert members of our medical profession.

We need to talk about all of the kinds of malpractice and criminal misconduct that can cause death or injury or the threat of death or injury.

We ought to be equally outraged by the doctors and the nurses in States such as, for example, hospitals and nursing homes in both New Jersey and Pennsylvania—in 2006, a nurse was sentenced to multiple life sentences for

killing at least 29 patients by intentionally overdosing them with medication. There was simply no justification for those actions, and they are equally as heinous and unforgivable as the crimes that resulted in the conviction of Kermit Gosnell.

We need to talk about the nurse who was charged with killing 10 patients in a hospital in Texas by injecting them with a medication to stop their breathing. She pleaded no contest and is now serving life in prison.

I want this body to adopt a resolution that addresses those kinds of lapses in basic decency, ethics, and morality, as well as law.

We ought to be talking about the doctor who worked in hospitals in seven States—New Hampshire, Kansas, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Georgia—and exposed almost 8,000 patients to hepatitis C. He knowingly injected patients with his own infected blood and exposed them to a life-threatening disease.

The resolution I am going to ask this body to adopt speaks to those violations of trust, decency, and law.

In this place, I have talked about other similar violations—the Oklahoma dentist who exposed as many as 7,000 patients to HIV and hepatitis B and C through unsanitary practices. In Nevada, practitioners at an endoscopy center exposed 40,000 patients to hepatitis C through their unsanitary practices, and it went on for years.

My resolution speaks to those basic violations of trust and morality.

Kermit Gosnell's case has run its course. Our criminal justice system has done its work.

I have a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it be adopted.

I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 134 and that the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the resolution be agreed to, the Blumenthal amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

I object to the resolution offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania and ask him and my colleagues to join me in support of this alternative resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Reserving the right to object, I think the Senator from Connecticut makes a number of important observations and raises a number of very important issues. I think there is an opportunity for the two of us to work together to address some of these. However, my reading of the actual resolution for which he is requesting unanimous consent, in my view, equates outcomes—including deaths but outcomes resulting from malpractice and unsanitary conditions and other completely indefensible practices—equates those with the serial, premeditated, intentional murder of babies. I don't think those things ought to be equated because I think they are of a very different nature.

Furthermore, the resolution of the Senator from Connecticut, it is my understanding, does not call for the investigations that I think are necessary to determine how widespread these practices are, under what circumstances they are occurring, and what more could be done to prevent them.

For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, being a majority leader is not an easy job whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. Some good things have been happening in the Senate recently, and I think we should credit both the majority leader and the Republican leader with helping to make that happen.

Over the last few weeks we have seen the water resources bill come to the floor. The majority leader allowed Senator BOXER and Senator VITTER to manage the amendment process, to handle the necessary arguments that always occur about what they will be. They came to a conclusion and passed a bill. The bill went through committee, went through the floor. It is a very important bill because it deals with locks, dams, and ports in the United States. We want to make sure that as the Panama Canal is widened and deepened, that ports in the United States are deep enough to receive the bigger ships and that the locks and the dams are in good enough shape so that commerce can move through the company and the jobs can be created. That is an important piece of legislation.

And now we are on the farm bill and we see the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Michigan managing a bill. There is plenty of opportunity for amendments, as far as I have been able to tell, and that has been very helpful.

At the same time, we have coming out of the Judiciary Committee, after several days of intense work, a bill on immigration. Probably the four most important words that can be said about the immigration debate is that we are all Americans, and Americans know we must have a legal immigration system if we want to be able to say we are all Americans. And we want one. We don't have an enforceable legal system today. All of us know that. None of us like the status quo, I don't think, and all of us know the President and the Congress are the only ones who can fix it. This is not something we can dump on the mayors or the State legislatures.

Many of us haven't formed a final opinion about this legislation that is coming forward, but I, for one, respect the fact that it has moved; that it has four principal Republican sponsors and four principal Democratic sponsors. It has moved through the committee, voices have been heard, it is coming to the floor, and, again, the majority leader has indicated, and the Republican leader has agreed, there will be a full and open debate so the American people can see it and watch us come to a result.

All those are good things. In addition, so that we might do that, there are a number of nominations about which we are likely to disagree. They will come after that so as not to interfere with the immigration debate.

That brings me to my final point. I would note the fact that with occasional interruptions for debate over whether we are going to go to a budget, which I hope gets resolved, we are on a pretty good path right now. I hope the majority and the minority leaders can see that.

We are moving this afternoon to a vote on a Federal appellate judge for the DC Circuit. A major objective of the Democratic side has been to get another judge on that circuit, and the President has nominated a person, Mr. Srinivasan, who, by every account, is an exceptional attorney. He came out of the committee with an 18-to-0 vote and has widespread respect and support.

The only glitch in the process is the majority leader believed it was necessary to file a cloture motion this week, even though the Republican leader had agreed we would have an up-or-down vote on the Tuesday we get back, and every indication is that almost everyone would vote for that judge. That has now been resolved, and we are going to vote this afternoon at 2 p.m. I know better than to predict how the Senate will vote, but I will vote for Mr. Srinivasan, and I suspect he will be easily confirmed.

In all of this the majority leader has believed it was necessary to suggest that somehow there is a problem with the President's nominations being considered by the Senate, so I think it is important that someone other than the Republican leader—because it is his job, really, to defend our side—lay out the facts, and I hope I can do that with some credibility because I worked with my Democratic colleagues at the beginning of the last Congress and at the beginning of this Congress to make it easier for this President and future Presidents to have their nominations considered. We have changed the rules to make it easier.

Just a few months ago, in a long discussion that involved Senators on both sides in a debate on the floor, we made a number of changes to make it easier for a President to have his nominations considered. And 2 years ago we adopted the expedited nominations, where nominations simply come to the desk. If no single Senator wants it sent to committee, it just sits there until all the paper is in, then the majority leader will just move it on. Within the next few days there will be a number of

those that come out of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. So that speeds things up.

We removed from the list of nominations about 160 low-level executive nominations. They are not subject anymore to Senate advise and consent. The President may just go ahead and appoint those persons.

We have gotten rid of the secret hold, which was used for a long time to hold up nominees, and even to block them, because no one knew who was doing that. Earlier this year we changed the rules so that when a district judge comes up, there can't be a long debate after the district judge comes to the floor. As a result, things are moving along very well.

So I would like to say there is not a problem with the President's nominations being considered in a timely fashion by the Senate. There is no problem. There is, however, the responsibility for advice and consent. Most of our Founders did not want a king. They created a Congress and they said: Here is an advice and consent. So we now have about 1,000 people the President will nominate whom we are supposed to consider, and we should do that well. That is our job to do, and it is our check on a runaway Executive.

When I first came here, Senator Byrd made wonderful speeches about that. I remember the speeches Senator Kennedy gave from the back row, with that big booming voice of his, about President George W. Bush's recess appointments and how offended he was by those because they offended the Constitution. Senator Byrd, as I mentioned, was very eloquent, going all the way back to President Reagan's days.

So we have always jealously defended the people's right to have an elected group of representatives to check the Executive, and we need to use that in a responsible way. Therefore, it is important to have an accurate report on just how well President Obama is being treated by the Senate in terms of his nominations.

I have just noted that we have changed the rules to make it easier. I did not even say we have even made it easier for the nominees; we set up a working process to make it easier. I like to call it a response to the ''innocent until nominated'' syndrome.

The President picks some well-respecting person from the Midwest and sends his or her nomination to the Senate, and all of a sudden it is as if they were a criminal of some kind. That is because there were so many conflicting forms to fill out it was easy to make a mistake and look as though you were misleading the Senate. We have tried to simplify that, and this President is the first beneficiary of that change.

So this President is the first beneficiary of consecutive Congresses that have changed the rules to reduce the number of potential nominees subjected to advice and consent. We have expedited a number of others, and we have made it easier—easier and quicker—for the President to have his nominations considered. This President is the first to benefit from that.

So what are the results? The majority leader suggested there was delay and obstruction. Those words just come out automatically sometimes when people wake up in the morning on that side of the aisle. But let's look at the facts.

I asked the Congressional Research Service to take a look at the Washington Post article written earlier this year—now, these are not Republican people I am asking, this is the Congressional Research Service—about how President Obama is being treated in terms of his Senate nominees.

According to the Congressional Research Service, as of May 16, 2013—that is last week—President Obama's Cabinet nominees were still, on average, moving from announcement to confirmation faster than those of President George W. Bush or President Clinton. President Obama's nominees were moving from announcement to confirmation, at that time last week, in 50.5 days, George W. Bush averaged 52 days, and President Clinton averaged 55 days.

So let me say that again: President Obama's Cabinet nominees are moving ahead in the Senate more rapidly than those of his two predecessors: one of them President George W. Bush and one of them President Clinton. So there is no delay there that is unusual.

It is not unprecedented, Madam President, for some second-term nominations to take much longer to move from announcement to confirmation than the average. President Clinton's nominee for Secretary of Labor, Alexis Herman, took 135 days; President George W. Bush's nominee for Attorney General, Alberto Gonzalez, took 85 days. I remember the case of one especially distinguished nominee for Secretary of Education by President George H.W. Bush, a former Governor of Tennessee whose name was Alexander. His nomination took 88 days from announcement to confirmation, and President Reagan's nominee for Attorney General, Ed Meese, took nearly 1 year.

Now that is an unusual case, but it is not so unusual for second-term nominees to take a little while—for the Senate to perform advice and consent. And as the Congressional Research Service and the Washington Post have reported in their own analysis, President Obama's Cabinet nominees are being better treated than either President Bush's or President Clinton's in terms of the time it takes to confirm them from announcement to confirmation.

Now, one last thing. What about judges? Sometimes I have heard Senators on that side and Senators on this side get up and give conflicting information about whether judges are being considered rapidly. Here is what the data says about the judicial nomination process.

If Mr. Srinivasan is confirmed today, as I expect he will be, President Obama will have had 20 judges confirmed at this point in his second term, including 6 circuit judges and 14 district court judges. At this point in his second term, President George W. Bush had 4. So that is 20 for President Obama, 4 for President George W. Bush. No unusual delay there.

Apparently, President Obama's nominations are being considered more rapidly than those of President Bush. To be specific, let's go to the district court nominations. We know, with all the talk of a filibuster, in the history of the Senate there has never been a nominee for a Federal district court judge who has ever been denied his seat by a filibuster after that nomination came to the floor. So that needs to be said, too. But right now there are five pending district judge nominations that have been reported from committee that haven't been confirmed.

There have been 33 nominations this year. Fourteen are already confirmed, five are reported from committee, as I said, and await floor action. They were reported in May and April and three of them in March. So there is no big backlog. There are five. They were reported in the last few weeks. So no excessive delay there.

Finally, on circuit court nominations. I mentioned we are likely to confirm one of the three that are today pending, Mr. Srinivasan. Twelve nominations of Federal circuit court judges have been received this year. Six will have been confirmed after this afternoon. That leaves two—two—circuit court judges who have been nominated by the President and await floor action. They were reported by the committee in April and February.

So I can't find any evidence of any delay on Cabinet nominations. In fact, President Obama is being treated better than his predecessors. I don't see any evidence of any delay on judicial nominations. After the vote on Mr. Srinivasan, President Obama will have 20 confirmed in his second term, President Bush had 4. And there are only five pending district court nominations, all reported within the last few weeks. There are only three circuit nominations, one of which is likely to be confirmed this afternoon. On that one, the majority leader indicated Mr. Srinivasan, who has such widespread support on both sides of the aisle, had been waiting forever. Well, he has been waiting a while. President Obama nominated him on June 11, 2012. But why did he wait? Madam President, he had no hearing. Who is in charge of setting hearings? The Democratic majority is in charge of setting hearings. The Republicans can't call a hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

So their nominee, Mr. Srinivasan, sat there all of last year, after June 11, without a hearing. There may have been delay, but that was a self-inflicted delay.

What about this year for Mr. Srinivasan? Here is the timeline. He was nominated again on January 4 by

the President. His hearing was April 10. I don't know why they had to go from January to April to have a hearing, but, again, that is solely within the control of the Democratic majority. He returned his questions—which we all have to do if we are nominated for an executive position—on May 6. That is this month. The committee considered his nomination May 16, which is just last week. They approved it 18 to 0. That is all Democrats and all Republicans voting yes. He came to the calendar of the Senate on May 20. That was on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SRIKANTH SRINIVASAN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 60 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I will conclude for those who are expecting to do that, but these are timely remarks.

So, Mr. Srinivasan, nominated on June 11, 2012—no hearing by the Democratic majority and the executive committee, I wonder why; nominated January 4 by President Obama this year again, no hearing until April 10. If there is any delay there, it has no fault anywhere on the Republican side. May 6, questions returned; no nominee is considered by the committee until his questions come back; marked up May 16 last week, 18 to 0, unanimous; came to the floor on Monday and the Republican leader moved yesterday to ask unanimous consent that we consider an up-or-down vote for Mr. Srinivasan when we return after a week, which means he would have been fully considered then, to which the majority leader put down a cloture motion.

Now he has removed the cloture motion but there was no need for the cloture motion. The only suggestion may be he did it, he made it so it would look as though there was some delay over here, but there is no delay. Mr. Srinivasan has broad support. We are ready to vote for him up or down. I think it is time we got away from this idea of manufacturing a crisis about nominations when in fact we have made it easier for any President to offer his nominations, and the majority leader and Republican leader agreed at the beginning of this year when we did that, that that was the end of the rule changes for the Congress in this Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the Feinstein amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, let me first say about the comments of Senator ALEXANDER, you see why he is a former university president, a Governor, a Secretary of Education, a candidate for President, and now some would call him a Senator. I think you would call him a statesman, because he tries to lay it out in a way we can all understand it, with facts and not hyperbole, and this is an opportunity for us on both sides to step back from the brink and actually do the people's business, to get something done, to solve big problems.

I came to the floor to talk on the Feinstein amendment, knowing it is not up for an hour—and I will be very brief, to my colleague from Virginia, because I know he wants to talk about judges—primarily because there is some misinformation that has been stated. Let me recap the tobacco industry in a very brief summary.

Tobacco, like many agricultural products, for years received a price support system that the Federal Government, the Congress of the United States, put in place. A number of years ago, Members of Congress said, for obvious reasons, the Federal Government probably should not have a price support on something we consider not to be best for people's health. At that time farmers reluctantly listened to Members of Congress who said the international market should be open to you and we should do our best to make it unlimited, and we did. At that time we eliminated the price support system.

Senator FEINSTEIN came to the floor—I do not think she did this intentionally—and she said it costs the American taxpayer $10 billion. In fact, there was not one dime of American taxpayer money that went to the tobacco buyer; 100 percent of the cost of the elimination of that program was absorbed by the tobacco companies. So, yes, if the purchase of a pack of cigarettes and the profit that goes to a tobacco company and the $1.01 in Federal taxes they pay per pack of cigarettes is the American taxpayer paying the price of the buyout, she is right. I am not sure you can make that connection.

But I want to state for my colleagues: The Federal Treasury did not pay $10 billion to buy out tobacco farmers. It was the companies, the ones that understand they have to have a viable, abundant source of product. Sixty percent of what we grow in the United States is shipped for export. It does not go to the domestic market.

Let me say to my colleague, if the intention of this is to be punitive to this product, for gosh sakes, come to the floor; change your amendment; let's vote up or down as to whether tobacco is going to be legal. If the purpose here is to suggest we are going to save taxpayer money, let me suggest if you put every tobacco farmer out of business—and this is the commodity that achieves, actually, our best balance of trade in agricultural products—you would make a real long-term mistake. The only thing this commodity, this agricultural commodity, asks is let us participate in the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Without that protection it is impossible for my neighbor, your neighbor, the backbone of the community—a farmer—to go to a bank and say: Can you lend me enough money to plant my crop this year? And if Mother Nature is good and I work hard I am going to be able to sell this product, I am going to be able to pay you back, and I am going to be able to make a profit to feed my family. Without that assurance of a safety net they would never get the bank to loan the money.

This is about availability of capital, this one cost. Why in the world we would pick one commodity out of the entire agricultural industry and say everybody else can participate in the crop insurance program but you can't is insane.

Let me say to my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, I don't think this was intentional. I think she either got bad staff information or she made a gaffe.

To my colleagues, let me encourage you, vote against this amendment. Don't do this to a piece of the agricultural community that is profitable, that works hard, but, more importantly, contributes a lot to the backbone of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to support the nomination of Srikanth Srinivasan to be judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. This matter will be before us for a vote later today. I want to talk for a bit about Sri's significant qualifications. I am going to discount the fact that he was born in Kansas and raised in Kansas, as I was. I will not take that into account. I will discount the fact he lives in Virginia as I do, and focus on other qualifications because he has them by the boatload.

Sri has a wonderful background that equips him for this most important judicial position, and this has been a position that has been vacant since June of 2008. He was an undergraduate and then law degree and then business degree, MBA at Stanford after he grew up in Lawrence, KS. Like many law graduates, his next step was to work in a clerkship with appellate judges. He

worked first for a wonderful Virginia jurist, Judge J. Harvie Wilkinson, who was the chief judge of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals headquartered in Richmond. Judge Wilkinson is well known as a superb legal scholar and judge.

After he completed that clerkship, he had the honor of being selected to work as a clerk for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, also a tremendous honor for a young lawyer. I talked at length with Mr. Srinivasan and heard about the fact that he learned a great deal from both of these judges about judicial temperament and the importance of so many aspects to be a good judge.

Sri had the expertise developed in private practice at one of America's major firms, O'Melveny and Myers. O'Melveny and Myers has had a very significant pro bono practice for years, headed by Bill Coleman, who was a long-time official—one of the lawyers who worked on the Brown v. Board of Education case in the 1950s. Sri eventually became the leader of the appellate practice in O'Melveny and Myers, in that capacity doing good work. He has been a teacher at Harvard Law School.

Probably most specific to the needs of the DC Circuit, Sri has had a long career working in the Solicitor General's Office, the key legal office of the United States, charged with representing the United States on important matters before the Supreme Court and the Federal appellate courts. He has worked two stints in the Solicitor General's Office, having worked both under the Solicitor General's Office during President Bush 43's tenure, and then again returning to work as the principal deputy solicitor general under President Obama. In that capacity he has had extensive arguments, more than 20 arguments before the U.S. Supreme Court and numerous appellate court arguments in the Federal appellate courts, including the DC Circuit Court for which he is nominated.

Srikanth Srinivasan enjoys broad support. Numerous officials in the Solicitor General's Office under both Democratic and Republican administrations have weighed in on behalf of his candidacy. The ABA, American Bar Association, which looks at candidates and scrutinizes their qualifications, has given him the ''most qualified'' award, their highest recommendation. He comes with significant support in this body and others with whom he has practiced.

The area I probably spent most time with him on as I was interviewing him was the whole notion of judicial temperament. These are important positions, and under the Constitution we grant them to people for life. You can have all the intellectual qualifications, but if you do not have the life experience to enable you to understand situations and pass judgment on matters important to people, and if you do not have the temperament to work in a collegial body—circuit courts, as you know, hear cases generally in panels of three and then occasionally hear cases en banc, the entire list of the circuit court judges for the DC Circuit would sit together—it is not enough to be a scholar; you have to be a good listener, you have to be a good colleague. Srikanth Srinivasan's career is a track record of his dedication and ambition, but his temperament is a real tribute to his humility, to his ability to listen not only to litigants but to other judges.

I think these credentials, both his formal credentials—his work experience and temperament—would make him an excellent choice. For that reason I am proud to stand up as one of his home State Senators. I am proud to acknowledge the Judiciary Committee's unanimous vote on his behalf and urge my colleagues today as we move to the vote to support his nomination. None of us will be disappointed in his work as a DC Circuit judge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I voted for this nominee out of committee. I will vote for this nominee on the floor of the Senate. He is well qualified for this position.

I come to the floor not to repeat what a lot of other people have said about this nominee, but the process that was connected with arranging the vote for today's vote. Basically I want to speak about the needless shenanigans that have gone on before we get to this point where we vote at 2 o'clock.

Today's nominee for the DC Circuit was voted out of committee 1 week ago, on May 16, a unanimous vote of 18 to 0. He was placed on the Executive Calendar 3 days ago, on Monday, May 20. One day later, on May 21, the Republicans cleared this nominee to have an up-or-down vote when we returned from the Memorial Day recess, but the majority leader was not content to take yes for an answer. One day after this nominee was placed on the Executive Calendar and after Republicans agreed to an up-or-down vote, the majority leader chose to file cloture.

Why file cloture? Why would the majority leader do that on a nominee whom the minority party, the Republicans, were ready and willing to vote on, backed up by the fact that every Republican on the committee voted for this nominee?

There is only one plausible answer: That is part of the majority's attempt to create the appearance of obstruction where no obstruction ever existed. It is pure nonsense. It is a transparent attempt to manufacture a crisis, a crisis that does not exist. The fact of the matter is there is no obstruction and particularly no obstruction on this nominee, and the other side knew it before they filed cloture.

This morning in his opening remarks the majority leader tried to argue he has had to file cloture 58 times. But what the majority leader did this week illustrates precisely why that claim is completely without merit.

What the Majority Leader did fits neatly into the Democratic Majority's playbook.

First, file cloture for no apparent reason, none whatsoever. And then immediately turn around and claim: See, look everybody, we had to file cloture.

The fact is, we are confirming the President's nominee—all nominees—at a near-record pace. After today, the Senate will have confirmed 193 lower court nominees. We have defeated only two. That is 193 to 2, which in baseball terms is a .990 batting average. Anybody would agree that is an outstanding record. Who could complain about 99 percent?

After today—this year alone, the first year of the President's second term—the Senate will have confirmed 22 judicial nominees. Let's compare that to the previous President's first year of his second term—President Bush—when there was a Democratic Congress. In that same period of time in 2005, the Senate had only confirmed four nominees. So that is a record of 22—the first year of this President's second term—compared to only 4 for the first year of President Bush's second term.

If we were treating this President in the same way the Senate Democrats treated President Bush in 2005, we would not be confirming the 22nd nominee, we would be confirming only the 4th. So it should be clear to everyone that these are needless shenanigans.

Anyway, based on that record, what can the Senate Democrats possibly complain about? The bottom line is they can't complain—or they shouldn't complain. That is not based upon rhetoric but based on the record of 22 so far this year and 193 total confirmations for this President versus 2 disapprovals.

Of course, because the record is so good, the other side needs to manufacture a crisis, and that is why the other side filed cloture on this nomination just 1 day after it appeared on the Executive Calendar.

Yesterday, when the majority leader was pressed on why he chose to file cloture 1 single day after his nomination appeared on the Executive Calendar, he pointed to the fact that the nominee was first nominated in the year 2012. But apparently the majority leader was unaware that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee made no effort to schedule a hearing on this nominee until late last year.

Apparently, the majority leader was unaware that by January of this year, we learned the nominee was potentially involved in the quid pro quo that Mr. Perez—the President's nominee for Labor Secretary—orchestrated between the Department of Justice and the city of St. Paul.

I spoke on this issue last week regarding the deal Mr. Perez struck, where he agreed the Department would decline two False Claims Act cases in exchange for the city of St. Paul withdrawing a case from the Supreme

Court. I am not going to go into those details again, but that is a very serious issue. The Department—and as it turns out Mr. Perez in particular—bartered away a case worth about $200 million of taxpayers' money to come back into the Federal Treasury under the False Claims Act. To have that case withdrawn is a pretty serious matter.

As it turns out, the nominee before us today happened to be the lawyer in the Solicitor General's Office who handled the case Mr. Perez desperately wanted withdrawn from the Supreme Court.

So, as would be expected, any Member of the Senate—particularly those who have the responsibility in the minority—needed to know what the nominee knew about the quid pro quo and what Mr. Perez told the committee about that deal.

We needed the documents about this issue, and we needed to speak with the witnesses involved, but the Department was desperate to keep those documents from Congress. They were desperate to keep the witnesses from being involved and interviewed.

The bottom line is that the Department of Justice dragged its feet for months. If the Department of Justice had turned over those documents and made witnesses available way back when we asked for them, the hearing for this nominee could have been one of the first we had this year. Instead, the Department of Justice chose to try their best to keep Congress from getting to the bottom of that quid pro quo, and, frankly, Mr. Perez's involvement in that matter.

If the majority wishes to complain about the nominee having his hearing in April rather than February, they should pick up the phone and call those in charge at the Department of Justice and ask: Why didn't you give Congress the information they needed?

It wasn't the Senate Republicans who withheld the documents, it was the Department of Justice. It wasn't Senate Republicans who held up the nominee's hearing, it was the Department of Justice.

The bottom line is that the Senate is processing the President's nominees exceptionally fairly. I will not repeat those statistics because I have already gone through them in this speech and in previous speeches.

This President is being treated much more fairly than Senate Democrats treated President Bush in 2005.

The fact is this: Filing cloture on this nominee—who will probably pass unanimously—was nothing but a transparent attempt to create the appearance of obstruction.

As I said, I intend to support this nominee, just as I did in committee, and I encourage my colleagues to support the nomination as well.

But as we move forward on these nominees, I wish we could stop these needless shenanigans. I wish the other side would stop shedding those crocodile tears. The statistics of approval by this Senate of judicial nominees, which is 193 to 2, is no justification for any crocodile tears whatsoever.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, today this body will have the chance to vote on the nomination of the highly qualified Sri Srinivasan for the DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

I am a member of the Judiciary Committee and have had the honor and privilege of chairing Mr. Srinivasan's confirmation hearing. I can say, without question, he has the background, skills and, perhaps most importantly, the temperament to serve as a circuit court judge.

He is one of the single most qualified judicial nominees I have seen in my years in this body, and he deserves better than the games which have been played with his confirmation. He already has bipartisan support. Now let's work together and give him a strong bipartisan vote.

The Constitution of the United States gives the Senate the responsibility to advise and consent to the President's nominations for important posts, such as the bench of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. It is certainly our responsibility to review and vet candidates—nominees—who come over from the President. We should not simply serve as a rubberstamp but neither should we be a firewall, unreasonably blocking qualified nominees from service at the highest levels of our government.

Our Nation's courts should be above politics. When the President submits a highly qualified candidate of good character and sound legal mind, as that of Mr. Srinivasan, then absent exceptional circumstances that candidate should be entitled to a rollcall vote.

Up to this point in President Obama's administration—nearly 1,600 days—the Senate has failed to live up to its responsibility and to confirm any nominee to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. The DC Circuit Court of Appeals is often called the second most important court in the Nation.

Similar to the Supreme Court, the DC Court of Appeals handles cases that impact Americans all over the country and from all walks of life. It regularly hears cases that range very broadly from terrorism and detention to the scope of Federal agency power. Yet today it is critically understaffed. The DC Circuit Court of Appeals has not seen a nominee confirmed since President George W. Bush's fourth nominee to that court was confirmed in 2006—7 years ago.

Republicans in this Chamber filibustered President Obama's nominee, Caitlin Halligan, until she ultimately—after hundreds and hundreds of days of waiting across several Congresses—gave up and withdrew. Her opponents said the caseload at the DC Circuit was too low and that it did not deserve another judge.

Such concerns about caseload did not prevent the Republican-led Senate from confirming two nominees to the 10th seat on the DC Circuit and one to the 11th. Mr. Srinivasan is not nominated for the 10th or 11th seat on the DC Circuit but for the 8th.

We need to confirm Mr. Srinivasan and we need to act quickly on the President's next nominee for that court and the one after that.

I believe we have a chance to start fresh with Mr. Srinivasan, who would serve equally well and ably on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, as might Ms. Halligan.

Mr. Srinivasan has a razor-sharp legal mind. He served in the Solicitor General's Office for both Republican and Democratic administrations and has earned the bipartisan support of his colleagues. Twelve former Solicitors General and Principal Deputy Solicitors General wrote a letter supporting his nomination—6 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The letter, which is signed by conservative legal luminaries such as Paul Clement and Ted Olson, notes that Mr. Srinivasan is ''one of the best appellate lawyers in the country.'' They commented further in the letter and said that he has an ''unsurpassed'' work ethic and is ''extremely well prepared to take on the intellectual rigors of serving as a judge on the D.C. Circuit.''

My point is a simple one: Sri is a capable and, in fact, highly accomplished attorney, with the character and demeanor to serve admirably on this bench, which has sat without a nominee from the Obama administration for the entire time our current President has served.

Sri Srinivasan has earned bipartisan support. Today, let's give him a bipartisan vote.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that any time during quorum calls leading up to the vote be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. 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. MORAN. Mr. President, I certainly recognize that providing advice and consent of Presidential nominees is one of our most important responsibilities as Members of the Senate, and it is a responsibility that I expect and believe all of us take very seriously.

On a number of occasions, I have had the opportunity to meet Sri Srinivasan, whom President Obama has now nominated to fill a vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. I have found Sri to be a highly qualified candidate who has a distinguished career in the private sector and in the Department of Justice of both Republican and Democratic administrations, for President Bush and President Obama. I announced my support for his confirmation in advance of the Judiciary Committee realizing the same circumstance I realized, which is that we have a very highly qualified individual of integrity who has been nominated by the President. Of course, the Judiciary Committee unanimously supported that nomination to confirm him.

Sri is a fellow Kansan and is one of our State's most accomplished legal minds. He was born in India and moved with his parents to Lawrence, KS, where he graduated valedictorian from Lawrence High School in 1985. As do most Kansans, he enjoyed basketball and at one point in time was a guard on the high school basketball team playing alongside one of our State's most famous athletes, Danny Manning.

After high school, he went to Stanford University, earning a bachelor's degree, an MBA, and a law degree.

Sri served as a clerk for the U.S. Supreme Court and served with Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and later worked in the Solicitor General's Office under President George W. Bush. He became the Principal Deputy Solicitor General in 2011.

Sri has argued more than two dozen cases before the U.S. Supreme Court, and his nomination is supported by 12 former Solicitors General and Principal Deputy Solicitors General evenly split among political parties.

If confirmed today, Sri would become the first South Asian to serve on a Federal circuit court.

I wish to indicate to my colleagues how proud Kansans are of Sri and his success, his accomplishments, and I am pleased to support his nomination. He is one of our Nation's leading appellate lawyers, and I believe he will serve our Nation well on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit has primary responsibility to review administrative actions taken by countless Federal departments and agencies. The court's decisions—including its recent invalidation of President Obama's unconstitutional ''recess'' appointments—often have significant political implications. As a result, this body—the Senate—has a longstanding practice and tradition of scrutinizing nominees to the DC Circuit very carefully. When evaluating those nominees, we have also carefully considered the need for additional judges on that court.

In July 2006 President Bush nominated an eminently qualified individual, Peter Keisler, to fill a seat on the DC Circuit. I know Peter Keisler. Peter Keisler is among the very finest attorneys I have ever worked with. In fact, most who know him would agree he is among the very finest attorneys in the entire country. He is one who happened to have enjoyed bipartisan support throughout the legal profession at the time of his nomination. Nevertheless, Democratic Senators blocked Mr. Keisler's nomination, and his nomination simply languished in the Judiciary Committee.

At the time a number of my Democratic colleagues signed a letter arguing that a nominee to the DC Circuit ''should under no circumstances be considered—much less confirmed—before we first address the very need for that judgeship.'' Those Senators argued that the DC Circuit's modest caseload simply did not justify the confirmation of any additional judge to that court.

More than 6 years have elapsed from that moment, but the DC Circuit's caseload remains just as minimal as it was back then. The court's caseload has actually decreased since the time Democrats blocked Mr. Keisler. The total number of appeals filed is down over 13 percent, and the total number of appeals pending is down over 10 percent. With just 359 pending appeals per panel, the DC Circuit's average workload is less than half of other Federal appellate courts.

Some have sought to make much of the fact that since 2006 two of the court's judges have taken senior status, leaving only seven active judges on the DC Circuit. But the court's caseload has declined so much in recent years that even filings per active, nonsenior, sitting judge are roughly the same as they were back then.

Of course, this doesn't account for the six senior judges on the DC Circuit who continue to hear appeals and author opinions. Their contributions are such that the actual work for each active, nonsenior judge has declined and the caseload burden for the DC Circuit judges is less than it was when the Democrats blocked Mr. Keisler on the basis of declining caseload in the DC Circuit. Indeed, the average filings per panel—perhaps the truest measure of actual workload per judge—is down almost 6 percent since the time Democrats blocked Mr. Keisler. And those who work at the court suggest that in reality, the workload isn't any different today than it was back at the time the Democrats blocked Mr. Keisler's nomination to that court.

Much like Mr. Keisler, the DC Circuit nominee before us today, Mr. Srinivasan, is exceptionally qualified, and I am pleased to say he enjoys broad bipartisan support from throughout the legal profession.

Unlike what the Democrats did to Mr. Keisler, I will vote to confirm Mr. Srinivasan. I do not believe in partisan retribution and hope that, moving forward, the Senate—whether controlled by Democrats or Republicans at any moment in the future—will rise above such past differences and disputes.

The DC Circuit is one area in which we share common ground. Both Democrats and Republicans have argued repeatedly that the DC Circuit has too many authorized judgeships. Indeed, while other Federal circuit courts throughout the country struggle to keep up with rising caseloads, in each of the last several years the DC Circuit has canceled regularly scheduled argument dates due to a lack of pending cases.

For these reasons I am an original cosponsor of S. 699, the Court Efficiency Act, which was introduced last month. The bill does not directly impact today's nominee, but it will reallocate unneeded judgeships from the DC Circuit to other Federal appellate courts where caseloads are many times higher than that of the DC Circuit.

Especially after we have confirmed Mr. Srinivasan, I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will join me in ensuring that these unnecessary DC Circuit judgeships are reallocated to courts that need those judge slots.

I certainly hope neither the White House nor my Democratic colleagues will instead decide to play politics and seek—without any legitimate justification—to pack the DC Circuit with unneeded judges simply in order to advance a partisan agenda.

Now, importantly, it was stated earlier in debate that we should stop ''playing games'' with this nomination. We agree. In fact, we could not agree more. Unfortunately, the only game played was by the majority leader in manufacturing a false impression by filing cloture one day after the nominee was listed on the Executive Calendar and after Senate Republicans agreed to a vote.

It has also been suggested that Senate Republicans have somehow refused to fill this seat or any other on the DC Circuit since 2006. Apparently, this is representative of a memory lapse or perhaps they want to rewrite history.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination of Srikanth Srinivasan to the DC Circuit Court.

Mr. LEAHY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am glad to hear what my friend from Utah said about voting for this nominee because this is the second time this year the majority leader had to file cloture on one of President Obama's well-qualified nominees to the DC Circuit. Sri Srinivasan is not a nominee who should require cloture, and I am glad he is not going to now that cooler heads have prevailed, but neither was Caitlin Halligan. Caitlin Halligan is a woman who is extraordinarily well qualified and amongst the most qualified judicial nominees I have seen from any administration. It was shameful that Senate Republicans blocked an up or down vote on her nomination with multiple filibusters and procedural objections that required her to be nominated five times over the last three years.

Had she received an up or down vote, I am certain she would have been confirmed and been an outstanding judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Instead, all Senate Republicans but one supported the filibuster and refused to vote up or down on this woman, who is highly-qualified and would have filled a needed judgeship on the DC Circuit. Senate Republicans attacked her for legal advocacy on behalf of her client, the State of New York. It is wrong to attribute the legal positions a lawyer takes when advocating for a client with what that person would do as an impartial judge. That is not the American tradition. That is not what Republicans insisted was the standard for nominees of Republican Presidents but that is what they did to derail the nomination of Caitlin Halligan.

Also disconcerting were the comments by Republicans after their filibuster in which they gloated about payback. That, too, is wrong. It does our Nation and our Federal Judiciary no good when they place their desire to engage in tit-for-tat over the needs of the American people. I rejected that approach while moving to confirm 100 of President Bush's judicial nominees in just 17 months in 2001 and 2002.

Like Caitlin Halligan, Sri Srinivasan has had an exemplary legal career and has the support of legal professionals from across the political spectrum. Born in Chandigarh, India, he grew up in Lawrence, KS, and earned his B.A., with honors and distinction, from Stanford University. He also earned his M.B.A. from the Stanford Graduate School of Business along with his J.D., with distinction, from Stanford Law School, where he was inducted to the Order of the Coif. At Stanford Law School, Sri Srinivasan served as the Note Editor of the Stanford Law Review. After completing law school, he clerked for Judge J. Harvie Wilkinson III on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Sri Srinivasan has experience in private practice, where he served as a partner and chaired the Appellate Practice at O'Melveny & Myers LLP. He has also served in the Office of the Solicitor General during both the Bush and Obama administrations, where he is currently the Principal Deputy Solicitor General. He has argued more than 25 cases before the U.S. Supreme Court and several cases before the U.S. Courts of Appeal. The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously rated him ''well qualified'' to serve on the DC Circuit, its highest rating. The Judiciary Committee reported him a week ago by a unanimous 18-to-0 vote. That means every single Republican on the committee who had a chance to review the nominee's record and to ask him questions supported him.

He was first nominated almost 1 year ago—a longer wait than any other current judicial nomination. His Committee hearing was delayed by 4 months from when I first planned on holding it, at the request of the Republicans. Sri Srinivasan has waited long enough, and, given his unanimous support in Committee, there was no reason to delay his confirmation. The Senate confirmed 18 of President Bush's circuit nominees within a week of being reported by the Judiciary Committee, while not a single one of President Obama's circuit nominees has received a floor vote within a week of being reported. Senate Democrats even allowed a vote on a controversial Fourth Circuit nominee within just 5 days of being reported. By that standard, there is no reason not to vote now on Sri Srinivasan. When confirmed, he will be the first Asian American in history to serve on the DC Circuit, and the first South Asian American to serve as a Federal circuit judge.

But, regrettably, even after their unwarranted filibuster of Caitlin Halligan, and even after their efforts to delay Sri Srinivasan's confirmation, Senate Republicans are expanding their efforts through a ''wholesale filibuster'' of nominations to the DC Circuit by introducing a legislative proposal to strip three judgeships from the DC Circuit.

I am almost tempted to suggest they amend their bill to make it effective whenever the next Republican President is elected. I say that to point out they had no concerns with supporting President Bush's four Senate-confirmed nominees to the DC Circuit. They did this even though for the previous President—a Democrat—they said we had too many judges there. But as soon as a Republican came in they suddenly found the need and did confirm four judges to the DC Circuit. Those nominees filled the very vacancies for the 9th, 10th, and even the 11th judgeship on the court that Senate Republicans are demanding be eliminated now that President Obama has been reelected by the American people. In other words, filling those seats was okay with a Republican President but not okay with a Democratic President. The target of this legislation seems apparent when its sponsors emphasize that it is designed to take effect immediately and acknowledge that ''[h]istorically, legislation introduced in the Senate altering the number of judgeships has most often postponed enactment until the beginning of the next President's term'' but that their legislation ''does not do this.'' It is just another one of their concerted efforts to block this President from appointing judges to the DC Circuit.

In support of this effort, Senate Republicans are citing a subcommittee hearing they held back in 1995 on the DC Circuit's caseload in an attempt to eliminate the 12th seat during President Clinton's tenure. They are fond of citing the testimony of Judge Laurence Silberman, a Reagan appointee, that he felt the 12th seat was not necessary. What Senate Republicans do not mention is that Judge Silberman believed that 11 judgeships was the proper number on that Circuit, and that the notion that the DC Circuit should have only nine judges was ''quite farfetched.'' I would echo those comments, and note that it is beyond farfetched that the same Senate Republicans who cite Judge Silberman's view on the 12th seat are ignoring the rest of his statement and seeking to reduce the court to eight seats. In fact, we have already acted to eliminate the 12th seat from the DC Circuit. What Senate Republicans are now proposing during this President's tenure is the elimination of the 11th, 10th, and 9th seats, as well.

In its April 5, 2013 letter, the Judicial Conference of the United States, chaired by Chief Justice John Roberts, sent us recommendations ''based on our current caseload needs.'' They did not recommend stripping judgeships from the DC Circuit but state that they should continue at 11. Four are currently vacant. According to the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, the caseload per active judge for the DC Circuit has actually increased by 50 percent since 2005, when the Senate confirmed President Bush's nominee to fill the 11th seat on the DC Circuit. When the Senate confirmed Thomas Griffith—President Bush's nominee to the 11th seat in 2005—the confirmation resulted in there being approximately 119 pending cases per active DC Circuit judge. There are currently 188 pending cases for each active judge on the DC Circuit, more than 50 percent higher.

This falls into a larger pattern that we have seen from Senate Republicans over the past 20 years. While they had no problem adding a 12th seat to the DC Circuit in 1984, and voting for President Reagan and President George H.W. Bush's nominees for that seat, they suddenly ''realized'' in 1995, when a Democrat served as President, that the court did not need that judge. When Judge Merrick Garland was finally confirmed in 1997, many Senate

Republicans voted against him, because they had decided that the 11th seat was also unnecessary. Senate Republicans then refused to act on President Clinton's final two nominees to the DC Circuit, one of whom now serves on the Supreme Court.

In 2002, during the George W. Bush administration, the DC Circuit's caseload had dropped to its lowest level in the last 20 years. During that Republican administration, Senate Republicans had no problem voting to confirm President Bush's nominees to the 9th, 10th, and 11th seats. These are the same seats they wish to eliminate now that Barack Obama is President, even though the court's current caseload is consistent with the average over the past 10 years. Maybe they are suggesting people work harder and more effectively if there is a Democrat in the White House than a Republican, but I suspect they may have a different motive. Even on its own terms, it is apparent this has nothing to do with caseload; it has everything to do with who is President.

Contrary to what Senate Republicans are arguing, the DC Circuit does not even have the lowest caseload in the country. The circuit with the lowest number of pending appeals per active judge is currently the Eighth Circuit, to which the Senate recently confirmed a nominee from Iowa, supported by the ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee. I do not recall seeing any bills from Senate Republicans to eliminate that seat.

So I think it depends more on politics than on judicial independence, and that is not a path to follow. The Federal courts have been too politicized as it is. There have been more filibusters and more blocking of judicial nominations by President Obama, than of nominations by any President of either party in the past. It makes me wonder, what is different about this President from all these other Presidents that he is given such a more difficult time—even the blocking, the filibustering of judges supported by home State Republican Senators.

This kind of political falderal with our Federal judiciary has come at a price. The Federal judiciary is losing the perception of independence it had before because it is being seen as being politically manipulated, even though virtually every Federal judge I have met—almost every Federal judge I have met—nominated by either a Republican or a Democratic President has shown independence.

The public gets a view otherwise, especially when they see a number of judicial vacancies where nominations have been made and even nominees who get through the Judiciary Committee unanimously or virtually unanimously then have to wait for months and months, even a year, to finally get a vote, and then only after we have either had a cloture vote or a threat of a cloture vote.

As I have said, I was Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee for 17 months at the beginning of President George Bush's term, and we put through 100 of his nominees. Now, in the other 30 months of his first term, with Republicans in charge, they did better. They put through 105. My point being, of course, that we actually moved his judges faster even than Republicans did when they were in the majority. But now the willingness to cooperate demonstrated there has broken down. Now the rules that worked for a Republican President, we are told, cannot apply for a Democratic President—especially this President.

Moreover, the unique character of the DC Circuit's caseload means that it is misleading to compare its caseload to that of the other Circuits as part of this effort to eliminate its judgeships. The DC Circuit Court of Appeals is often considered ''the second most important court in the land'' because of its special jurisdiction and because of the important and complex cases that it decides. The Court reviews complicated decisions and rulemaking of many Federal agencies, and in recent years has handled some of the most important terrorism and enemy combatant and detention cases since the attacks of September 11. These cases make incredible demands on the time of the judges serving on this Court. It is misleading to cite statistics or contend that hardworking judges have a light or easy workload. All cases are not the same and many of the hardest, most complex and most time-consuming cases in the Nation end up at the DC Circuit.

Former Chief Judge Harry Edwards has said:

> [R]eview of large, multi-party, difficult administrative appeals is the staple of judicial work in the D.C. Circuit. This alone distinguishes the work of the D.C. Circuit from the work of other Circuits; it also explains why it is impossible to compare the work of the D.C. Circuit with other Circuits by simply referring to raw data on case filings.

Former Chief Judge Patricia Wald has written:

> The D.C. Circuit hears the most complex, time-consuming, labyrinthine disputes over regulations with the greatest impact on ordinary Americans' lives: clean air and water regulations, nuclear plant safety, health-care reform issues, insider trading and more. These cases can require thousands of hours of preparation by the judges, often consuming days of argument, involving hundreds of parties and interveners, and necessitating dozens of briefs and thousands of pages of record—all of which culminates in lengthy, technically intricate legal opinions . . . The nature of the D.C. Circuit's caseload is what sets it apart from other courts.

Judge Laurence Silberman has said: ''I very much agree . . . as to the unique nature of the DC Circuit's caseload, and therefore do not believe a direct comparison to the other circuits is called for.''

And Chief Justice Roberts, who formerly served on the DC Circuit, has noted that ''about two-thirds of the cases before the DC Circuit involve the federal government in some civil capacity, while that figure is less than twenty-five percent nationwide,'' and that less time-consuming ''prisoner petitions which make up a notable portion of the docket nation-wide on other courts of appeals—are a less significant part of its work.'' He also described the ''D.C. Circuit's unique character, as a court with special responsibility to review legal challenges to the conduct of the national government.''

The arguments now being made by Senate Republicans to eliminate three seats on the DC Circuit are not based on the reality of that court's caseload. Even if we do make these misleading comparisons to other circuits, the arguments ultimately do not withstand scrutiny since other circuits have caseloads that are lower than the DC Circuit's. And most do not have the complexity of the cases that come to the DC Circuit. So the DC Circuit's need for judges will not be met by Sri Srinivasan alone. We must work hard to fill the three additional vacancies currently on that court so the DC Circuit can have its full complement of judges to decide some of the most important cases to the American people.

Some have called the DC Circuit a court second only to the Supreme Court in its importance. Let's not politicize it. Let's not say here is this rule that applies to a Republican President, and we want an entirely different one with a Democratic President. That does not do the court any good, it does not do the country any good, and it actually is beneath this great body, the U.S. Senate.

Sri Srinivasan is a superbly-qualified, consensus nominee. I am glad the Republican filibuster has come to an end and the Senate is being permitted to vote on this nomination. I will, again, vote in favor of confirmation.

Mr. President, I understand we have a vote scheduled for 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today in support of the nomination of Sri Srinivasan to the D.C. Circuit Court.

Mr. Srinivasan is an exemplary nominee to the Federal bench, and I am here to encourage my colleagues to confirm him without delay.

Sri Srinivasan is currently the Principal Deputy Solicitor General at the Department of Justice and was previously a partner at the law firm of O'Melveny & Myers LLP.

Born in India, Mr. Srinivasan grew up in Lawrence, KS, and earned his B.A., with honors and distinction, his M.B.A, and his J.D., Order of the Coif, all from Stanford University. After completing law school, Mr. Srinivasan served as a clerk on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and then for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Srinivasan has extensive Federal appellate court experience representing pro bono clients, private sector clients, and, in his current post, the U.S. government.

Over the course of his 17-year legal career, Mr. Srinivasan has argued an impressive 24 cases before the U.S. Supreme Court and 9 cases in the Federal courts of appeal. His arguments before the Supreme Court include a wide range of subject matters ranging from the First Amendment, criminal procedure, and foreign sovereign immunity to banking, immigration, and Native American law.

If confirmed, Mr. Srinivasan will be the first Asian American in history to serve on the D.C. Circuit, and the first South Asian American to serve as a Federal circuit judge, which is a very significant milestone.

The non-partisan American Bar Association committee that reviews every Federal judicial nominee gave Mr. Srinivasan its highest possible rating. And a group of solicitors general and principal deputy solicitors general of the United States wrote a letter saying that ''Sri has first-rate intellect, an open-minded approach to the law, a strong work ethic, and an unimpeachable character.''

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Mr. Srinivasan has dedicated substantial time to teaching, mentoring and pro bono representation.

His achievements as a public servant and a private attorney are outstanding, and if confirmed, I have no doubt that he will serve as a committed and distinguished member of the Federal bench.

Mr. Srinivasan has received considerable praise from all parts of the legal community including former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

In an interview with The New Yorker last year, Ms. O'Connor said she remembers Sri, ''as a very skilled, intellectually gifted clerk.'' She went on to say that Mr. Srinivasan deserves a smooth ride to confirmation. She said, ''he's not anybody who's been politically active, he's been very serious in his work habit, and people have had an ample opportunity to see his work.''

With a strong vote of confidence from Sandra Day O'Connor, an esteemed former Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Srinivasan has garnered the one of greatest endorsements any nominee to the Federal bench can receive in my view.

Not only is Mr. Srinivasan remarkably credentialed and widely supported, he is nominated to serve on one of the most important courts in the Nation, a court that currently has four of its eleven judgeships vacant.

The D.C. Circuit is widely regarded as the second-most important court in the United States, behind only the U.S. Supreme Court, because of the complexity and significance of the cases it decides.

The court has significant responsibility in deciding cases regarding the balance of powers of the branches of government and actions by Federal agencies that affect our health, safety, and industry.

With the court's current vacancies, the D.C. Circuit caseload per active judge has increased 50 percent from 2005, when the Senate confirmed a nominee to fill the eleventh seat on the D.C. Circuit bench.

Vacancies on this court should only be filled by the best and the brightest legal minds in the country—those who have demonstrated the most sophisticated legal and analytical skills, those who have committed their careers to justice, and those who personify professional excellence and impeccable character.

Based on his impressive qualifications and stature in the legal community, it is clear that Mr. Srinivasan embodies those ideals. I strongly support his nomination to the D.C. Circuit Court.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Sri Srinivasan to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

There is no question that Mr. Srinivasan has the qualifications and experience to be an outstanding Federal judge. He earned undergraduate, business and law degrees from Stanford. He clerked for Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. He worked at the prestigious law firm O'Melveny & Myers where he chaired the firm's appellate practice group. He has worked for nearly a decade in the United States' Solicitor General's office, where he currently serves as the Principal Deputy Solicitor General. He has argued 20 cases before the United States Supreme Court and worked on many more briefs before that court.

Mr. Srinivasan has also been praised for his independence and his integrity. He has worked for the Solicitor General's office under both Democratic and Republican administrations. His nomination has been strongly endorsed by former Democratic Solicitors General such as Walter Dellinger, Seth Waxman and Neal Katyal, and by former Republican Solicitors General such as Paul Clement, Ted Olson and Ken Starr.

Mr. Srinivasan was reported out of the Judiciary Committee in a unanimous vote. Democrats and Republicans from across the ideological spectrum came together to support his nomination.

I would also note that Mr. Srinivasan's nomination is a historic one. Upon confirmation he will be the first Indian-American to serve on a Federal circuit court. I am glad that the Senate is soon going to vote on Mr. Srinivasan's nomination. This vote is coming not a moment too soon.

The D.C. Circuit urgently needs the Senate to confirm judges to serve on that court. Right now, there are only 7 active status judges on the D.C. Circuit. There are supposed to be 11.

This vacancy situation is untenable. Retired D.C. Circuit Judge Patricia Wald, who served as the chief judge of the Circuit for 5 years, recently wrote in the Washington Post that ''There is cause for extreme concern that Congress is systematically denying the court the human resources it needs to carry out its weighty mandates.''

In 2010 the President nominated another well-qualified attorney, former New York solicitor general Caitlin Halligan, to serve on the D.C. Circuit, but she was filibustered twice by Senate Republicans.

There were no legitimate questions about Ms. Halligan's qualifications, her judgment, her temperament, or her ideology. She was filibustered simply because some lobbying interests—mainly the gun lobby—did not agree with positions she argued on behalf of her client. She eventually withdrew her nomination.

It is truly unfortunate that Ms. Halligan's nomination was filibustered to death. She deserved better. She would have served with distinction on the Federal bench.

The Senate urgently needs to address the vacancy situation on the D.C. Circuit. We can start by confirming Mr. Srinivasan. We should then work to confirm other qualified nominees to fill vacancies in the D.C. Circuit and across the Federal judiciary.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of Mr. Srinivasan's nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I do not see anyone else seeking recognition.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Barrasso	Bennet
Ayotte	Baucus	Blumenthal
Baldwin	Begich	Blunt

Boozman
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Collins
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cowan
Crapo
Cruz
Donnelly
Durbin
Enzi
Feinstein
Fischer
Franken
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hagan
Harkin
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (WI)
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Landrieu
Leahy
Lee
Levin
Manchin
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Paul
Portman
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Risch
Roberts
Rockefeller
Rubio
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Scott
Sessions
Shaheen
Shelby
Stabenow
Tester
Thune
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Vitter
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Boxer
Flake
Lautenberg

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

AGRICULTURAL REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I have spoken to the managers of the bill, and they have one vote scheduled right now. They expect—they hope—they can have a couple more today, maybe even three today, but they are not sure. It will have to be done by consent. They are confident they can get that done. We will have to wait and see.

When this vote is over, we should have in the near future an idea of what we are going to finish today. If we are here and we have a few more votes, it should not be past 5:00. We will see. We are going to finish today sometime—hopefully soon.

A decision is being made as to what we are going to do when we get back. The managers of this bill are trying to come up with a finite list of amendments. They hope to be able to do that today.

Then we will make a decision on whether we are going to move to immigration when we get back or wait a week. I have spoken to the Gang of 8 today, and they are going to give me some indication of what they want to do. I have also spoken to the chairman of the committee, and that decision should be made very soon. We will have a vote on the Monday we get back.

AMENDMENT NO. 923

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 923, offered by the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, this amendment is offered on behalf of Senator MCCAIN and myself.

Ladies and gentlemen, tobacco is not just another crop. It is the largest preventable cause of cancer deaths in this country. Exactly 443,000 people die every year. It costs Medicaid an additional $22 billion.

In 2004 a special assessment of $9.6 billion was authorized to buy out tobacco farms in the United States. That has 1 more year to run.

We subsidize tobacco crop insurance. We should not. This country should become tobacco-free. It will save lives.

I urge you to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. I speak in opposition to the amendment.

Let me say to my dear friend from California, whom I really respect, the tobacco buyout was not paid by taxpayers, it was paid by the tobacco companies. It happened several years ago. The only program tobacco farmers participate in today is crop insurance, like every other agricultural product in America. Without that safety net, those farmers can't go to the bank and get capital to plant their crops.

Although I think we can all agree that tobacco is not healthy for you, some Americans make the decision to do it because it is legal. Eliminate the American tobacco farmer and you will replace them with tobacco grown in Zimbabwe and Brazil—around the world. If we want to outlaw tobacco, let's have that vote, but don't walk away and believe that a vote eliminating crop insurance is going to change the health care of the American people as it relates to this product.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I request 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I request 1 minute to respond to Senator BURR, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request, as modified?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I too rise to express strong opposition to the amendment. This amendment would prevent our tobacco growers from being eligible for Federal crop insurance. This amendment would do significant harm to the small tobacco farmers in North Carolina and in other parts of the country. There are 2,000 farmers in North Carolina who would be affected, and it would be devastating to them and their families. Without access to crop insurance, they wouldn't be able to borrow money from the banks to receive financing.

It does nothing to alter the amount of tobacco used in our country. Demand will be filled by foreign imports, probably from Brazil and other countries. It would put our American farmers out of work.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, we are not talking about eliminating crop insurance. There are plenty of crops that don't have crop insurance, but this crop does. We are talking about eliminating the Federal subsidy, which amounts to $30 million-plus a year for crop insurance.

With respect to my distinguished friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle, I misspoke once today. This is an assessment from the tobacco industry. I thought I straightened that out. But the assessment that paid for the buyout of $9.6 billion is what I am speaking of.

But this is a Federal subsidy on crop insurance. You can still get crop insurance, but it won't be federally subsidized.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Ayotte
Baldwin
Blumenthal
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coats
Collins
Crapo
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Hatch
Heinrich
Heller
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (WI)
Kirk
Klobuchar
Lee
Manchin
McCain
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murkowski
Murray
Reed
Risch
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Nelson
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Baucus	Grassley	Portman
Begich	Hagan	Pryor
Bennet	Harkin	Reid
Blunt	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Scott
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Stabenow
Coons	Kaine	Tester
Corker	King	Thune
Cornyn	Landrieu	Vitter
Cowan	Leahy	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	
Enzi	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—4

Boxer	Lautenberg
Flake	Levin

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, through no one's fault but my own, I got here a couple of minutes late for the last amendment, the vote on the Feinstein amendment. I would have voted aye had I gotten here in time.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following first-degree amendments be in order to be called up: Hagan No. 1031, and Durbin-Coburn No. 953; that we have 5 minutes of debate on the Hagan amendment, that there be 10 minutes allotted to Senators Durbin and Coburn for their amendment, and I reserve 5 minutes I would control on their amendment; that we have a vote then at 3:15, and that when we vote in relation to the amendments we proceed to the votes in the order listed; that no second-degree amendments be in order to either amendment prior to the votes; that there will be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes; and then finally, upon disposition, Senator MERKLEY will be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1031

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 1031.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mrs. HAGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 1031.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize the use of the insurance fund to reduce fraud and maintain program integrity in the crop insurance program)

On page 1076, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 110___. CROP INSURANCE FRAUD.

Section 516(b)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1516(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) REVIEWS, COMPLIANCE, AND PROGRAM INTEGRITY.—For each of the 2014 and subsequent reinsurance years, the Corporation may use the insurance fund established under subsection (c), but not to exceed $5,000,000 for each fiscal year, to pay the following:

''(i) Costs to reimburse expenses incurred for the review of policies, plans of insurance, and related materials and to assist the Corporation in maintaining program integrity.

''(ii) In addition to other available funds, costs incurred by the Risk Management Agency for compliance operations associated with activities authorized under this title.''.

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I rise today to offer an amendment to make sure we are doing all we can to prevent fraud and abuse in the Federal Crop Insurance Program. The issue of fraud in this program hit home for me in March of this year when the Justice Department announced a $100 million crop insurance fraud case in eastern North Carolina, the largest ever of its kind. Forty-one defendants were found guilty and many are serving prison time for profiting from false claims for losses of soybeans, tobacco, wheat, and corn.

Following this incident I regularly have farmers coming up to me, telling me they are nervous, nervous that the actions of a few bad actors will lead the Federal Government to cease providing crop insurance assistance. In these difficult budget times, these are valid concerns. For Federal assistance to continue, the integrity of these programs must be rock solid. Crop insurance fraud not only harms the integrity of Federal safety net programs and increases the cost to taxpayers, it also drives up the cost of the insurance program for our honest, law-abiding farmers.

The amendment I am offering would provide additional tools to the Risk Management Agency to analyze and combat fraud, waste, and abuse. The Risk Management Agency can expand the sampling requirements to test for and address the concerns with these improper program payments. This is in accordance with the Federal Improper Payments Information Act and the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act, as recommended by the office of the inspector general. The Risk Management Agency can increase the number of reviews of the approved insurance providers conducted each year. Currently we are able to review only about one-third of these providers due to our resource constraints. It also will provide additional support for data-mining activities to detect the fraud and abuse in the program and develop proactive underwriting and loss adjustment applications to minimize the scope for such activities to occur.

The farm bill before us now includes extensive reforms to create a host of new safety net programs. As the complexity of these programs grows, the resources needed to oversee these programs are actually shrinking. This amendment will provide the resources necessary to proactively detect and combat fraud and abuse. Funding for this amendment will come out of the general savings contained in the underlying bill. The cost of this amendment is minimal and I believe this investment will generate substantial savings for taxpayers, expanding our efforts to tackle the fraud and abuse in the crop insurance program. Protecting the integrity of these programs is critical to ensuring the safety net programs are available for the vast majority of our farmers who are honest, and to avoid undermining public confidence in these programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina. This amendment would provide additional support for data-mining activities to detect fraud. It would develop proactive underwriting and loss adjustment applications to minimize the scope for such activities to occur. It would help reduce improper payments through better controls and reviews of policies. All of these will result in saving taxpayer money and ensuring program integrity in the long run.

I urge approval of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Who yields time?

The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 953

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how much time remains for the Durbin-Coburn amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Please notify me when I have used 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the Chair will.

Mr. DURBIN. The Durbin-Coburn amendment says this: We have the Crop Insurance Program in America. Farmers buy crop insurance because they could have a drought, flood, lose their crop, or the market price could fall down to nothing, so they buy insurance to cover the loss. However, it isn't really insurance as we understand insurance. It is not like fire or auto insurance because farmers don't pay enough in premiums to cover the actual losses paid out by crop insurance.

In fact, the farmer's contribution to crop insurance is only 38 percent of the actual premium cost. Who pays the rest? Hold up your hand, America. All the taxpayers in this country subsidize crop insurance—62 percent. What did it cost us last year? Over $7 billion, and then an additional $1 billion to administer the program.

Here is what this amendment says: We stand behind crop insurance. We believe in crop insurance, but for that

tiny 1 percent of farmers across America making over $750,000 a year, their Federal subsidy will be cut from 62 percent, on average, to 47 percent. They can afford it, and over the span of 10 years we will save over $1 billion. That is money we can better spend either to reduce our debt or on critical programs for this country.

I want farmers to have crop insurance, but I want those who are doing so well in this system and getting hundreds of thousands of dollars of Federal subsidy to show a little bit of sacrifice on their part. Keep this program sound and keep it fair. The Durbin-Coburn amendment moves in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield the floor to my friend from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, 4 percent of the farmers in this country receive 33 percent of the benefits from crop insurance. I don't think it could be said any better than Senator DURBIN has said it. The point is, what we ought do is make sure there is a safety net, and crop insurance is the way to do that. But like every other program, we eventually are going to ask those who have more to participate more.

I have the location and how much the top five farmers in this country actually get. The No. 1 farmer in the country gets $1.9 million worth of subsidies a year. All we are going to do is cut his subsidy to $1.6 million. His income is far in excess of $750,000.

The No. 2 farmer is from Washington State. We will cut his subsidy from $1.7 million to $1.4 million, and, of course, he made far more than that in the last year and in the previous years.

No. 3, located in Minnesota, we are going to cut from $1.6 million to $1.4 million. We are still going to subsidize $1.4 million a year for this one individual who is going to make in excess of $2 million this year.

All we are asking is to appropriately limit the benefits that are coming from borrowed money against our children's future for the very wealthy in this country.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, while I very much appreciate the amendment of Senator DURBIN and Senator COBURN, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Crop insurance is insurance, and the farmer gets a bill not a check. They get a bill. The question is whether we are going to provide a discount so it is an affordable policy.

We ended subsidies through direct payments. We want them to move to a voluntary system of crop insurance. The bill they get has to be a bill they can afford to be able to provide the coverage, and then there is no payout unless they have a loss, such as a flood, drought, or whatever has happened. It is insurance.

There are several reasons this is not the same vote the Senate took last year on this amendment. With the historic agreement to attach conservation compliance to crop insurance—potentially reducing the acres and numbers of producers covered by crop insurance—will only reduce the environmental benefits and could lead to draining wetlands and plowing highly erodable land.

Let me say this another way: Of course most of the crop insurance goes to the largest farmers because they have the most land to insure. Just by definition, the larger the insurance policy, the more they are trying to cover. The question is—and the reason conservationists and environmentalists have come together—is because they want the large tracts to become conservation compliant.

There is even more environmental impact on the large tracts than on the small tracts, which is why we saw this historic agreement between 30-some different farm, environmental, and conservation groups to say: We will support crop insurance, but you have to do conservation compliance on all of the land.

Limiting crop insurance support to producers will cause producers with large pieces of land to leave the insurance system, losing the conservation benefits and possibly increasing the costs, again, to smaller providers. If everybody is not in, then the cost goes up for who is in.

In fact, we know if we take the largest purchasers out, it is estimated we could see premiums go up nearly 40 percent for those who are currently in the system, and we are more likely to go back to ad hoc disaster assistance.

In the drought of 2012, one of the worst on record for U.S. farmers, there were no calls for our crops to receive ad hoc disaster assistance. The corn, wheat, soybean growers, and others across the country were able to survive. Why? Because of crop insurance, and it worked.

I urge colleagues to take a second look at this. We are talking about preserving a historic agreement that came together around conservation compliance. We want to make sure all of the land that is in crop insurance is covered, and we are protecting our soil and water.

I ask for a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The No. 1 person who cares about the environmental quality of their land is the farmer. The bigger the farmer, the more they care.

The No. 4 farmer, as far as crop insurance in the country, farms 105,000 acres. The average farmer in Oklahoma has 160 acres. They will make an economic decision, and if a 15-percent bump in their premium will cause them to go out, they will go out. But they will not go out because it is too much of a sweetheart deal. We are still going to pay almost half of their crop insurance—50 percent.

Does anybody else have that kind of deal going? Nobody else has that kind of deal going.

What we are saying is, let's save some money and ask those who are more well endowed with benefits and profits to pay a fairer share of what they should be paying based on the benefits they get.

The one thing the chairwoman didn't say is these are the guys who collect the big bucks when there is one. They do pay a portion of it, but their payouts are hundreds of times higher than the average farmer.

They will make an economic decision, and they are not going to walk away from this because it is still—even at 48 percent—too sweet of a deal for any of them to walk away. There is no study that says they will walk away.

Wait and see. If they walk away, Senator DURBIN and I will walk down and offer mea culpas on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I appreciate the confidence my friend from Oklahoma has about what business decisions will be made. Let's assume they don't walk away from crop insurance; they will be walking away from conservation compliance if they are not required to do that.

If this agreement falls apart—and it is an agreement that was delicately put together with over 30 different farm organizations, as well as conservation and environmental folks, to work together to support crop insurance. But to require environmental compliance—they may or may not make decisions about crop insurance. I do know if they do leave, the folks in the program, which are small- and medium-sized programs—as a matter of economics, like any other kind of insurance—will see their costs go up. We do know that.

We also have this broader question that relates to the large farmers the Senators are talking about where the benefit to having comprehensive conservation compliance for our country is a benefit we want to make sure we keep intact. It would be undermined with the passage of this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators DURBIN and COBURN have 5 minutes remaining, Senator HAGAN has 1 minute remaining, and Senator STABENOW has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. COBURN. Let me just make the point. The large farmers I know in Oklahoma really don't want the government telling them what kind of agreement they are going to have with their crop insurance and environmental things. We already have a ton of rules.

What I do know is there is nobody in Oklahoma who cares more about the environment than our farmers. I disagree there is a disconnect if we limit

the crop insurance subsidy to the very large farmers in Oklahoma and that they are not going to do what is in the best interests of the environment since it is a benefit to their own economic well-being.

We understand a deal was cut to get us to where we are on the bill, and we are not trying to disturb that. We don't want to disturb that, but we cannot continue to subsidize the very well heeled in this country to the same level that we try to protect those who are marginal. We just cannot do it.

We could have made this a whole lot different. We could have lowered it even lower. We didn't do that. The average median family income in this country is less than $60,000. We are talking about almost 15 times more than the average family in this country makes, and saying: If you make more than that, maybe you could take a little trim off the subsidy of your crop insurance. That is not an unfair question.

I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Let's get it straight: Every farmer buying crop insurance gets a subsidy. The question is, How big is the subsidy? Is it 62 percent of the actual premium cost—that is what they are all receiving now—or will it be 47 or 48 percent, which is what we are suggesting, for 1 percent of the farmers, of the wealthiest farmers.

How many farmers are we talking about? There are roughly 2 million farmers in America. The people we are talking about number 20,000. There are 20,000 farmers who would be affected by our amendment. One would think we are about to destroy agriculture in America. There are 2 million farmers, and all of them get a subsidy.

Senator COBURN and I are saying: Let's nix the subsidy for the wealthiest. What we hear is that is too much to ask—it is too much sacrifice. I don't think so.

One example in Illinois—and I will not read the examples from other Midwestern States—a corn and soybean grower received $740,000 in premium subsidies to cover the crops he planted in my State in 18 counties. There are 102 counties in Illinois. We would cut his subsidy from $740,000 to $639,000. Does anyone think he will notice? Does anyone think he will stop buying crop insurance on what he has planted in 18 counties? I don't think so.

At a time when we are asking people in the Head Start Program to make a sacrifice across America, can we at least ask for a little bit of a sacrifice from the 20,000 of the wealthiest farmers out of 2 million? I don't think it is asking too much.

Madam President, I ask that the amendment be called up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois, [Mr. DURBIN], for himself and Mr. COBURN, proposes an amendment numbered 953.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the amount of premium subsidy provided by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on behalf of any person or legal entity with an average adjusted gross income in excess of $750,000, with a delayed application of the limitation until completion of a study on the effects of the limitation)

On page 1101, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 11_____. LIMITATION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY BASED ON AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) (as amended by section 11030(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) LIMITATION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY BASED ON AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—In this paragraph, the term 'average adjusted gross income' has the meaning given the term in section 1001D(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(a)).

''(B) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle and beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, in the case of any producer that is a person or legal entity that has an average adjusted gross income in excess of $750,000 based on the most recent data available from the Farm Service Agency as of the beginning of the reinsurance year, the total amount of premium subsidy provided with respect to additional coverage under subsection (c), section 508B, or section 508C issued on behalf of the producer for a reinsurance year shall be 15 percentage points less than the premium subsidy provided in accordance with this subsection that would otherwise be available for the applicable policy, plan of insurance, and coverage level selected by the producer.

''(C) APPLICATION.—

''(i) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Government Accountability Office, shall carry out a study to determine the effects of the limitation described in subparagraph (B) on—

''(I) the overall operations of the Federal crop insurance program;

''(II) the number of producers participating in the Federal crop insurance program;

''(III) the level of coverage purchased by participating producers;

''(IV) the amount of premiums paid by participating producers and the Federal Government;

''(V) any potential liability for participating producers, approved insurance providers, and the Federal Government;

''(VI) different crops or growing regions;

''(VII) program rating structures;

''(VIII) creation of schemes or devices to evade the impact of the limitation; and

''(IX) administrative and operating expenses paid to approved insurance providers and underwriting gains and loss for the Federal government and approved insurance providers.

''(ii) EFFECTIVENESS.—The limitation described in subparagraph (B) shall not take effect unless the Secretary determines, through the study described in clause (i), that the limitation would not—

''(I) significantly increase the premium amount paid by producers with an average adjusted gross income of less than $750,000;

''(II) result in a decline in the crop insurance coverage available to producers; and

''(III) increase the total cost of the Federal crop insurance program.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, it was my understanding that the consent was for the Hagan amendment and then the Durbin-Coburn amendment. So if we could proceed in that order—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the order in which they will be voted.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on our amendment and yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1031

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Hagan amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. We yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If all time is yielded back, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1031.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Baucus	Hagan	Portman
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Risch
Blunt	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boozman	Hirono	Rockefeller
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cowan	McCain	Vitter
Crapo	McCaskill	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Enzi	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Heller	Lautenberg
Flake	Inhofe	Reid

The amendment (No. 1031) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 953

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 953, offered by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am cosponsoring this amendment that says the wealthiest 20,000 farmers in America will pay slightly more for their crop insurance so the program will be a sound program for all farmers.

I urge my colleagues, in the name of deficit reduction and making this a good program, to vote yes on the Durbin-Coburn amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I would urge a ''no'' vote for a number of reasons, but let me simply say the problem with increasing crop insurance premiums by about 40 percent, which is what this does, is we are going to reduce participation in crop insurance, reduce coverage, and drive up premiums. Most important for me, we have a historic agreement to tie crop insurance to conservation compliance, and this would undermine that effort.

I would urge a ''no'' vote.

Before proceeding, I wish to thank everyone for their good work up to this point and announce there will be no further votes. The next vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on the Monday we return, and we will proceed and complete the bill.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 953.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 139 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Begich	Grassley	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Kirk	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Scott
Casey	Lee	Sessions
Coats	Levin	Shaheen
Coburn	Manchin	Tester
Collins	McCain	Toomey
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Corker	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Merkley	Warren
Cruz	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Gillibrand	McConnell
Baucus	Hagan	Moran
Blunt	Harkin	Pryor
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Chambliss	Hirono	Roberts
Cochran	Hoeven	Sanders
Cowan	Isakson	Shelby
Crapo	Johanns	Stabenow
Donnelly	Kaine	Thune
Enzi	Landrieu	Warner
Fischer	Leahy	Wicker

NOT VOTING—8

Alexander	Heller	Rockefeller
Boxer	Inhofe	Vitter
Flake	Lautenberg	

The amendment (No. 953) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 978

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that my amendment No. 978 be called up.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I regret that we have heard an objection to pulling up this amendment. Many may not understand that to pull up an amendment and to have it considered in the Senate takes unanimous consent. All 100 have to agree.

My colleague has objected, making it impossible to consider an amendment that should be debated here on the floor of the Senate because this amendment is about good policy and good process.

Not so long ago, in the continuing resolution, a provision was slipped in by the House of Representatives. Because this was a must-pass bill under tight time constraints, it also slipped through the Senate with no debate. And what did this legislation do, the Monsanto protection act? This legislation does something that I think most would find astounding. It allows the unrestricted sale and planting of new variants of genetically modified seeds that a court has ruled have not been properly examined for their effect on other farmers, the environment, and human health.

Obviously, this raises a lot of concerns about the impact on farmers and the impact on human health, but there is even more. The fact that the act instructs the seed producers to ignore a ruling of the court is equally troubling. It raises profound questions about the constitutional separation of powers and the ability of our courts to hold agencies accountable to the law and their responsibilities.

I can tell my colleagues that this process and this policy has provoked outrage across the country. When I held townhalls in Oregon after this happened, at every townhall it was raised by farmers concerned that this would endanger the crops they were growing and hoped to export overseas. I have received over 2,200 letters on this topic.

I am very hopeful that when we come back next week, we can have a full debate on this amendment, that it won't be objected to, and that certainly there will be no opportunity of any kind for this policy to be extended because it hurts a process of holding our departments accountable for enforcing the law, and it provides a policy of overriding the court order designed to protect other farmers, to protect the environment, and to protect human health, and that is absolutely unacceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I would like to respond to my friend Mr. MERKLEY.

This act, which I would think would more properly be called the farmer assurance act, was passed by both the House and the Senate and signed into law by President Obama in March of 2013, March of this year.

Many have claimed it was never publicly debated and it was slipped into the bill by the House of Representatives, as my good friend said on the floor a minute ago, and passed the Senate without debate. Now, this was a big bill, I will admit that, and there was a lot of debate.

While that would certainly be, I am sure, what Mr. MERKLEY believes happened, I don't think the facts would bear that out. In fact, this language originated, as he said, and was passed by the House after it was debated in committee, and it was posted for several months. This was not mystery language.

In fact, on June 6, 2012, the House publicly posted their resolution that included this in the Agriculture appropriations bill. It was available on the House Web site from that point on. Section 733 of the House bill is identical to the farmer assurance language included in the final fiscal year 2013 appropriations bill that was passed by the Congress.

On June 19, 2012, the House Agriculture appropriations bill was passed out of committee. That bill included this exact language. That was June 19, 2012.

The continuing resolution, actually, on the AG/FDA—the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration—bill included a coming together of these two bills.

The CR—the continuing resolution—included items in the Senate bill that dealt principally with agricultural research that the House didn't have, and there were provisions in the House version like this one that the Senate accepted.

The language was publicly available and posted as part of the agreed-to appropriations bill for 9 days before the vote.

A week before the vote, Senator TESTER filed an amendment which is exactly like the amendment we just heard about today because it would have struck this provision. On that same day, Senator TESTER spoke at length on the floor about his amendment. This was a week before the continuing resolution was passed.

I don't mind having a debate about the provisions. I do mind the idea that somehow nobody knew about this. Now, I can't watch the debate for every Member of the Senate and say: Here is what you should have been paying attention to that one of our colleagues said, but it was fairly substantial and took some time, and it was a week before we voted.

By the way, nobody in the Senate proposed this provision. Nobody put it in the House bill, as some have contended. But I do think this provision, as it turns out, this policy, protects farm families. That is why it was supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the American Soybean Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Congressional Hunger Center, the National Corn Growers Association, and others.

Many have incorrectly claimed that this language gives priority to the needs of a small number of businesses over the rights and needs of the American consumers. I don't think that is true either. This provision doesn't protect any seed company—Monsanto or Pioneer Seed—or even the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It would help the family who planted a crop that was legal to plant.

My mom and dad were dairy farmers. The one thing I do know about the farming cycle is that once you have made a decision to plant a crop, it is usually too late to plant another one, and there are times when it is absolutely too late to plant another crop. So what does your family do that year when the crop the government told you you could plant, some Federal judge decides you can't plant it, only to have maybe another—in the few cases where this has happened—other Federal judges later say that the first Federal judge was wrong and that those crops were legal to be planted and legal to be harvested.

Both challenges, by the way, were about what environmental impact this might have if something happened from one property to another. There was never a question in those two cases about the safety of the food.

This provision allows the Secretary of Agriculture to create a way for those farm families to sell that crop, but it doesn't require the Secretary do that.

Remember, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has already said: This is a crop that we have deregulated. It has heavily regulated these kinds of crops until the Secretary of Agriculture says it is not, and when the Secretary of Agriculture says it is not, then anybody who wants to can plant these crops. This gives the farmers and their families the assurance that a legally planted crop is likely to be able to be harvested.

In addition, the authority granted to the USDA in this language was only temporary. It was in the House bill, and it lasts until September 30 of this year. The Secretary of Agriculture said he already had the authority. It didn't seem to me that the return for ag research and other things we had in our bill—that repeating the authority the Secretary of Agriculture said he had and had used was a bad thing.

It basically tells the Secretary of Agriculture: If you agree with the court, by the way, and don't think you did your job and you don't intend to appeal the case, you don't have to do anything that allows a crop to be harvested. But if you still think you were right and you are going to appeal that case, you have the authority, if you want to use it, to figure out how to let that crop be harvested for that year and that time.

USDA can determine at any time that a biocrop should not be approved, and USDA can pull its approval on a crop that it has approved. FDA also has to approve the food value of these things before they can go into food.

This language doesn't require USDA to approve biotech crops. It doesn't prevent individuals from suing the government over a biotech crop approval. Ultimately, this language simply codifies the authority the Secretary believes he had.

As recently as May 9 of this year, Secretary Vilsack testified before the Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee and said this language "doesn't necessarily do anything I can't already do. We're going to make these decisions based on the science and based on the law, which is the way they ought to be made."

Unfortunately, if you took a quick search of the Internet, you wouldn't find out these facts. But we have the advantage that we can search actually what the law said, not what somebody else said it might have said.

These provisions protect farm families and their livelihoods, and that is why they are supported by some groups I have already mentioned and some I haven't: the American Farm Bureau Federation, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Soybean Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, the Congressional Hunger Center, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, the Agriculture Retailers Association, the Biotechnology Industry Organization, the American Seed Trade Association, and many other groups.

Facts are stubborn, and the law here is easy to find and read, and it doesn't say anything about protecting anybody because, frankly, you can't sue these companies anyway. They sold you a legal product. The only people protected here are the people who have put the seeds in the ground. A farmer can't put those seeds in the ground in August or September and expect to harvest a crop that year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to thank colleagues for their work this week, to thank my partner Senator COCHRAN and both of our staffs, who have been working very hard to complete the process of this very important jobs bill called the farm bill.

Let me take a moment to remind everyone that we are talking about 16 million jobs in America that come because of agriculture, because of what we do in the food industry altogether. It is incredibly important we complete this work. I am very confident when we come back into session in another week that we will complete our process.

I thank our majority leader and the Republican leader for their support in our moving through this process, and certainly our majority leader, Senator REID, who has been incredibly supportive in working with us and giving us the time to come directly from committee to the floor of the Senate and to work with colleagues through amendments on both sides of the aisle to get this done. We are doing this the way we have always done it, which is in a bipartisan fashion, working through both Democratic and Republican amendments. At the end we will have produced what I believe is the most reform-minded farm bill in decades.

Let me also remind my colleagues we have before us a bill that is different than anything I can think of actually in terms of deficit reduction. We have a bill that has over $24 billion in spending cuts put forward by our committee and supported by the communities that are affected—$24 billion in deficit reduction, which is much more than we would be required to do if we went with the across-the-board cuts that have been so debated with the sequester. The Agriculture Department and the farm bill are responsible for $6 billion in deficit reduction through the sequester. We have added four times to that amount in deficit reduction, but we are doing it in a smart, focused way, making tough decisions, setting priorities, eliminating subsidies that don't make sense anymore, and strengthening risk management, market-oriented programs.

We have debated, and will debate more, something called crop insurance, which I will remind my colleagues does

not allow for someone getting a check. They get a bill. They pay for crop insurance. We do it in a partnership between the Federal Government and farmers to help them have affordable risk management. That is what we strengthen in this bill. We have been told by farmers all across the country that the most important risk management tool for them is insurance—crop insurance that is affordable.

We have also in this legislation done something that is historic, which is as we have moved from subsidies to insurance, we are tying conservation compliance to the purchase of insurance. This is a very important policy, and we have many groups—over 30 groups—that have come together, and I want to commend all the commodity groups and the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union and all those that came together, along with environmentalists and conservation organizations, to put a real priority on both a strong risk management system called crop insurance and a strong conservation policy called conservation compliance. This is a very important part of our bill as we look to savings.

Frankly, we have looked at savings in every single part of this bill. We have 12 different bills all put together called titles in this thing we call a farm bill, and we have looked at savings in each area of the bill. We have, for instance, taken a hard look at our conservation programs and decided that instead of 23 different kinds of programs, we actually could consolidate and streamline down to 13. We put them in four different buckets of activities, with a lot of flexibility, working with community groups and grassroots groups on conservation, and saw that we could save money, which we have done.

We listened to mayors and rural communities around Michigan and around the country—those who represent townships and counties—who said make sure you continue to have a strong rural economic development presence. Because once you get outside the cities in Michigan or around the country every community is partnering with rural development for business loans, water and sewer projects, transportation, firetrucks, police cars, housing, and all those efforts working through rural development. But we heard from our local officials that it was complicated. We currently, in law, have 11 different definitions of ''rural.'' That made no sense. They said: Could you please give us one? We looked through all the different programs and streamlined it and now we have one definition, so it is easier to work with, less paperwork, and it makes much more sense.

We have continued to strengthen the part of our agricultural economy called ''specialty crops.'' This is near and dear to me in Michigan—fresh fruits and vegetables and other areas that are very important to many States, including mine. The organic community is a fast-growing part of agriculture, and so we strengthen that as well.

We have looked from Mississippi to Michigan, California to Delaware, and everything in between, to make sure this is a bill that works for all parts of agriculture, and I am pleased to say we have been able to do that.

We have also made sure the energy title is strong, both in supporting farmers and ranchers who want to be focused on energy efficiency on the farm or the ranch, and also in expanding efforts beyond our traditional biofuel efforts to something that is near and dear to my heart which is called bio-based manufacturing.

We have very exciting opportunities in America. I know our Presiding Officer is as passionate about manufacturing as I am, and we now have the opportunity, working with our agricultural groups, to create ways to replace petroleum in plastics and other types of materials that we have today—synthetic fibers and so on—with agricultural by-products.

If you buy many of our great American automobiles today, you might find you are sitting on foam that is actually made from soybean oil instead of petroleum oil. So you might be sitting on soybeans in the seats. Many parts of the interior of the automobiles that folks are now buying actually have some kind of agricultural by-product, whether it is wheat chaff or corn husks or soybean oil. So we know we can use these new opportunities to not only create markets but create situations that are much better for our environment and that create jobs. This is a new and exciting part of what we are doing to expand opportunities through the energy title as well.

We also are very pleased and proud of the efforts around nutrition for folks in this country who, through no fault of their own, have found themselves hit hard by the economy. We want to make sure they continue to have the support they need around food assistance. That is absolutely critical, and I am pleased we have stood together in opposing very damaging amendments to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Because just as crop insurance is important for our farmers when they have a disaster, food assistance is important for our families when they have a disaster. I think it reflects the best about us as Americans that we want to make sure we are providing that assistance.

We also are making sure we are doing more around farmers markets, and fresh fruits and vegetables in schools, making local food hubs a possibility so we have local farmers being able to come together to market their products as well.

There are many pieces in this farm bill that all relate back to jobs, all relate back to reforms we have put in place, and relate to making sure we have a continuation of the safest, most affordable food supply in the world here in America. When you go home tonight, if you sit down to have supper, thank a farmer. We all understand this is the riskiest business in the world, and the job of the farm bill is to provide support and risk management tools for our growers when they need them, but also to be great stewards of taxpayer dollars and to do what is right for rural communities across America and for families that need some temporary help as well.

There are many pieces, and I haven't even mentioned all of them. But I did want to remind people why we take the time on the floor to work through these issues and these amendments. We have more work to do, but we see the light at the end of the tunnel. We will be putting together a list for final votes on amendments when we come back into session, and we are looking forward to doing that and to completing this effort.

Again, I would remind colleagues, we did this last year. The House did not do their job. They did in committee, on a bipartisan basis, but not on the floor. We did our job. Last time around I remember doing 73 different votes on this particular bill. We wrapped in almost every single one of those amendments that were passed into the bill we presented to the Senate this time, and we are continuing to work together on other amendments as well. But it will be time, when we get back, to bring this to closure and to once again demonstrate the Senate can work together on a bipartisan basis to do the right thing for the families and the businesses and the farmers and the ranchers we represent. Sixteen million people in this country are counting on us to get our job done, and I am sure we will.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Michigan in predicting that we are moving in the right direction. We have covered a lot of important issues during the debate over the last couple of days and taken up a good many amendments. We have had recorded votes and free and full discussion of a lot of issues that are affected by this legislation, and I must say it has been a remarkable performance in terms of the subjects that have been covered and amendments disposed of. True progress has been made in developing what I think can be a very important contribution toward a legal framework and support structure to help enable American farmers to compete in the international marketplace and to sustain the jobs that flow from these important activities throughout the United States.

At a time when, in some places, jobs are hard to find, this is a job creator and it is a step toward strengthening our economy not just in rural America but throughout the country—in municipalities as well.

I hope everybody recognizes what a strong leader our committee chairman

has become, as she has demonstrated in her performance as chairman of our committee. She has done an excellent job. I commend her and all of our colleagues on the committee for helping shape this product so it can be adopted by the Senate and signed into law by the President. I look forward to that day and to celebrating and helping salute those who have been responsible for this good work.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in condemning the Internal Revenue Service for intentionally singling out dozens of nonprofit organizations for no cause other than their political leanings. This is not an issue of Democrat versus Republican. Indeed, the actions of the IRS have brought rare bipartisan accord. There are lessons for us all in this scandal.

One is that a government that is too big, too powerful, and too all-encompassing is prone to overstep its bounds. It becomes unwieldy and inefficient. And sometimes, it tramples upon the rights of the people it is supposed to serve. We have seen those maxims in action over these last few weeks.

We have an IRS that targeted groups of American citizens, threatening them with the force of law and imprisonment, for no other reason than they had certain political affiliations. We know now the IRS selected these groups by zeroing in on certain words and phrases.

And what were these words and phrases that elicited such concern in the halls of the Internal Revenue Service? Words like ''patriot'' and ''we the people.''

It seems to me that we can draw only one of two conclusions from the actions of the IRS. Either some in the administration intentionally attempted to use the power of the Federal Government to target and cripple their political enemies, or they lack the competence to oversee a bureaucracy that has grown too big not to fail.

One thing is for sure, though. The reputation of the IRS has been tarnished in ways that will take years to repair, and it is imperative that we restore the trust that has been lost between the American people and our government. That work begins with getting to the bottom of this scandal.

We have many questions that need answers. Did these IRS officials act on their own, or did they have direction from their superiors? How high up does this scandal go? What did the White House know, and when did they know it?

This scandal comes as Washington is preparing to hand over even more power and authority to the IRS. It will be the IRS that enforces the mandates of the new health care law. It will be the IRS that will have control over some of our most private, personal decisions.

It is not too late to change course. But if we insist on placing the blame for the IRS's actions on a few low-level staffers without looking at the root cause of the abuse—corruption, or a government that, as the President's former Senior Advisor David Axelrod recently admitted, has become too vast to manage and oversee—then we will continue to witness scandals like this.

Big government comes with bigger problems, bigger scandals, and bigger dangers for our liberties. The Tea Party and organizations like it have been arguing that position since they were founded. And while I know there are some in this chamber that will hate to hear this, it turns out the Tea Party's fears were justified.

We need more than just an audit of what happened at the IRS. We have given the IRS every opportunity to deal with this issue internally. More than a year ago, Senator HATCH and I sent a letter to the IRS expressing our concerns about the targeting of conservative groups. We received a response assuring us that our concerns were unfounded.

We now know that this response was false, and perhaps intentionally misleading. Tuesday, former-Commissioner Steven Miller appeared before the Homeland Security and Government Affairs committee on which I serve. During that hearing, Mr. Miller claimed that while he had dispatched a team to investigate our concerns a month before he responded to our letter, the response was sent without input from that team. He claims he did learn that targeting had occurred, but not until a week after misinforming the Senate that all was fine. He said he was ''outraged.'' And yet he never corrected the record, choosing instead to allow his false response to stand. At the very least we have a situation where the IRS, knowing what had happened a week after they sent a response saying everything was fine, refused to correct the Record. I believed them at the time. Unfortunately, we were misinformed. And yesterday, Lois Lerner, the head of the IRS's tax-exempt organizations division, declined to answer questions regarding this scandal, deciding instead to invoke her Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination.

Despite all this, the IRS asks us to trust them when they tell us that this scandal was simply the result of a few misguided, low-level employees, and that no senior officials were involved. With all due respect, I am done taking the IRS's word for it. We need an in-depth investigation, one that fully documents the what, when, and who of this scandal. Only when we get to the bottom of this incident can we begin to rebuild the bridge of trust between us as citizens and our Federal Government here in Washington, DC.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk a little bit about the farm bill which is before the Senate. Notwithstanding all the rhetoric we have had around the budget over the last 4 years or so around here, last year the Senate Agriculture Committee was the only committee, to my knowledge in either House, the Senate or the House, that passed a bipartisan deficit reduction plan. We did it together, Democrats and Republicans, working together on the committee with the various constituencies around the United States of America. That bill ultimately passed the Senate in a broad bipartisan vote right here on this floor.

The House of Representatives was unable, for whatever reason, to enact a version of the farm bill over there, which was an incredible disservice to rural America. Farmers in my State, ranchers in my State, the State of Colorado, faced an unprecedented drought throughout this entire period. Throughout the summer of 2012, when I was traveling the State, no one was talking about the Presidential election—particularly in these rural areas, which was on the mind of everybody in Washington. What they wanted to know was why a farm bill had not been passed and for good reason—because the Senate had passed a bill that was supported by both Republicans and Democrats, by producers of all types across the country, and it was a good piece of legislation.

Fast forward to this week, when the Senate Agriculture Committee has once again passed a bipartisan bill with meaningful deficit reduction. I thank Chairwoman STABENOW from Michigan and the ranking member Senator THAD COCHRAN for their leadership on this bill. This bill now has gone through two different ranking members on the Republican side and has been supported in a bipartisan way, as I said earlier. This farm bill, similar to the last version we passed, reflects the values and the process we want to see in other areas of our budget. We identify priorities in this bill. We streamline duplication in this bill. We break away from old, inefficient ways of doing business in this farm bill.

We eliminate direct payments in one of the most significant reforms we have seen in a farm bill in a very long time. These payments are issued to farmers regardless of economic need or market signals. We do away with that abuse. This bill prioritizes what is working for producers and it strengthens crop insurance as a result, which is what my farmers have said is most important to them.

I have spoken on this floor before about Colorado's battle against historic drought conditions. Some farmers

lost over half their corn yields in 2012 alone. It is hard to imagine, when you think about it, any business losing half of its production in 1 year, but that is what happened to Colorado's corn growers. Crop insurance is what is keeping farmers and rural economies in business and that is why this should be a priority. That is why this bill should have been passed 2 years ago when it first came to the floor of the Senate. It is why we should pass it next month.

Beyond crop insurance, another key highlight of this bill for those of us from Colorado is conservation. The title carries over the reforms from last year's bill, and this year's bill includes a provision to ensure that recipients of government-supported crop insurance comply with basic conservation requirements. This measure is the result of a historic agreement between the commodity groups and the conservation groups in this country. It is supported by a wide variety of stakeholders—from the Farm Bureau to the National Wildlife Federation.

This revamped conservation title is huge for rural America and for my State. It is critical for farming and ranching families looking to keep their land in agriculture generation to generation. It is incredibly important for our hunters and sportsmen. It is important for anybody—which is most of us—who cares about the long-term health of our soil, our air, and our water. These conservation measures help us improve the efficiency of production agriculture and improve the quality of the environment in farm country. We recognize that keeping these landscapes in their historical, undeveloped state is an economic driver for our entire State and for our entire region—for tourism, for wildlife habitat.

As I have traveled Colorado over the last several years, farmers and ranchers constantly were talking to me about the importance of conservation. They highlighted, in particular, conservation easements which provide Department of Agriculture assistance to help landowners who are interested in voluntarily conserving the farming and ranching heritage of their land.

I wish to spend a few minutes sharing stories that Coloradans have shared with me. This is a photo—you don't have this as much in Delaware. I know you have other things. Here is a photo of a ranch in Colorado, the Music Meadows Ranch. It is outside of Westcliffe, CO, elevation 9,000 feet.

I have a version of this picture in my office here in Washington. It is 4,000 acres. The rancher's name is Elin Ganschow. It is some of the finest grass-fed beef in the country, raised by Elin and her family at this ranch. Thanks to the Grassland Reserve Program, Elin's ranch now has a permanent conservation easement. It provides wildlife habitat for elk, mule deer, pronghorn antelope, black bear, and mountain lions, species prized by Colorado sportsmen. They contribute millions of dollars to our State's economy, and she has been able to continue having her family ranch.

Thanks to an amendment adopted by the Agriculture Committee this year, we will see even more of these easements happen on high-priority landscapes such as the Music Meadows Ranch. I thank Chairwoman STABENOW and Senator COCHRAN for working so hard with me to get that amendment approved.

Private lands conservation such as this, the type aided by the farm bill, is absolutely critical for so many reasons. It is poorly understood in the East, but it is an incredibly important tool for those of us in the West to keep our family farms and ranches family farms and ranches and provide the habitat needed for our sportsmen and for tourism.

Here is another example of why this bill is so crucial for our sportsmen and outdoor recreation economy. This is a photo taken of a friend, John Gale, hunting pheasants in Yuma County, CO. The Conservation Reserve Program, CRP, provides important habitat for pheasants and other upland birds all across the country. The land surrounding this is all CRP land—everything you can see and far beyond that—and it has enabled this pheasant hunting to happen in our State.

The CRP program protects habitats in addition to holding in place highly erodable soil—something we have a lot of history with in Colorado. For instance, the soil in Baca County, CO, has over 250,000 acres enrolled in CRP. Baca County was absolutely devastated by the Dust Bowl of the 1930s, as chronicled in Tim Egan's ''The Worst Hard Time,'' and other books. Thanks to CRP, Baca County has weathered recent droughts much better than it otherwise would have.

Healthy grasslands, open landscapes, and abundant wildlife are a fundamental part of what it is to be in the West. We need to preserve those grasslands, those open spaces, and those species, and that is what the conservation title of the farm bill does.

I strongly support this new conservation title as reported out of the committee in a bipartisan vote. I know some are going to try to amend this bipartisan consensus.

One of the great things about serving on the Agriculture Committee is there is so little partisanship. The differences we have are not Republican versus Democrat. We have some differences, but they tend to be regional and understandable. We have a way, a process, and the leadership to actually work through issues together. It would be nice if we did more of that around here.

I am worried there will be some amendments that will come forward, among other things, in the name of deficit reduction, which, as I mentioned earlier, is already reflected by this committee's work, unlike every other committee in the Congress.

As far as Lee amendment No. 1017 and No. 1018, I appreciate my neighbor's effort on deficit reduction. These programs repeal the important programs I talked about here on which our farmers and ranchers rely, and they keep our soil on the ground, not in our wind and air.

Lee amendment No. 1017 repeals the CRP program I spoke about earlier. I have been on this floor many times to talk about cutting our deficit. I am glad we have been part of a process which has actually led to deficit reduction. We need to put the entire budget under a microscope, including agriculture, to cut waste and eliminate redundancies.

Let me say again, including agriculture, the bill we have on this floor makes those cuts—$24 billion in all. Some $6 billion of these cuts come from conservation. Not all of those cuts are cuts I like, but I agreed to them in the package we were moving forward. We made difficult compromises at the committee level, and now we have a more efficient conservation title as a result that won support from both sides of the aisle. Over 650 conservation groups support the conservation title before us, and I urge my colleagues to support it and oppose amendments which would weaken the title and undermine the good work of Republicans and Democrats on the committee.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss some of the amendments I offered to the 2013 farm bill. First of all, let me start by thanking the chairwoman and the ranking member for their leadership and listening to the voices of the members of the Agriculture Committee when it comes to reauthorizing the farm bill which is set to expire at the end of September. We have not been able to agree on all aspects of the farm bill, but our chairwoman and ranking member should, however, be recognized for their tireless work in getting a farm bill done this year.

One way or another, we need to move this process forward. We came close when the Senate passed a farm bill, but we were unable to get the House to move it. I hope this year we can complete the process and get a bill we can put on the President's desk so we are able to give the producers around this country the certainty they need when it comes to planting and making decisions about the future of their farming operations.

While this bill is commonly called the farm bill, the majority of spending is not for the agricultural producers. The nutrition title of this bill, which is primarily food stamps, or what we refer to as SNAP, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, accounts for 77 percent of the spending in the farm bill programs over the next 10 years. Let me repeat that: Seventy-seven percent of all spending in this farm bill

doesn't have anything to do with production agriculture, but is in what we refer to as the nutrition title of the farm bill.

It is important we subject all areas of Federal spending to close examination, and that includes the nutrition title of the farm bill. There should be no exceptions.

I recently introduced legislation that will reform several components of the nutrition title and save more than $30 billion from the $760 billion nutrition title, and that is a 10-year number.

These commonsense reforms to SNAP generate significant savings without altering benefits to needy families. The SNAP is exceedingly complex. We should be vigilant to ensure that taxpayers' money is indeed going to help lift those in need out of poverty instead of going to ineffective programs that are mired in bureaucracy.

I have offered several parts of the amendments of this reform package to the farm bill currently on the floor. My amendment No. 991, which I hope to have an opportunity to get voted on after we return following next week, reforms the nutrition, education, and obesity prevention grant program. While well-intended, the current structure of this program funnels 52 percent of the funding to only four States. This is an inequitable use of funds which should be spent more equitably among program participants.

My amendment restructure of these grants will allow the States to receive up to $5 per SNAP enrollee indexed for inflation. Five dollars is the median value of what is currently spent on this education program per capita across all the States.

This amendment in no way limits the capacity of the States to leverage those dollars with their own funding to deliver more nutrition education services. By reforming these grants, all recipients of SNAP benefits will have more equal access to nutrition education and obesity prevention resources that will help them make healthy choices when shopping on a budget.

This amendment will save $2 billion over the next 10 years without impacting SNAP's benefits for those in need. Again, I want to stress this: Reforming this program does not affect the true mission of SNAP, which is providing food assistance to needy families. There is nothing in this amendment that changes eligibility requirements for SNAP benefits. Even after this nutrition education program is reformed, approximately $250 million a year will still be available to the States for these education programs.

The priority of the SNAP should be providing food assistance to needy families while they work to get back on their feet. Unfortunately, the nutrition, education and obesity grant program has become so partial to just a few large States that these States are expanding the use of these grants to fund lobbying campaigns instead of reaching out to educate SNAP families on making healthy choices while shopping on a budget.

Clearly, this program is in need of reform. Making commonsense changes to the SNAP shows the American people we are holding each Federal program up to the light and making sure the taxpayers' money is being spent for the public good.

Again, these are largely administrative changes to the SNAP that do not impact SNAP benefits for those who are truly in need of food assistance. A $2 billion cut represents less than ½ of 1 percent of what the Federal Government will spend on SNAP over the next 10 years.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me today in telling the American people we are committed to program integrity and quality among SNAP beneficiaries.

In the course of the next few weeks when we get back on this bill, I look forward to engaging my colleagues in a fair and open debate about how we can improve all farm bill programs that strengthen the stability and safety of our Nation's food supply for the next 5 years and beyond.

This is a commonsense amendment that saves us a couple of billion dollars which we can add to the savings in this bill in a time when we have rising deficits and debt and budgetary constraints we are operating with.

I hope we will be able to come together in the interest of reform—reform that actually targets the administrative costs of a program and does not impact benefits that are so needed for people who truly do need food assistance. I hope to get that amendment voted on when we return to the bill.

The second amendment I want to mention today is another one I have filed, and that deals with the commodity title of the farm bill.

Last year this body passed a farm bill by a vote of 64 to 35. This was a farm bill that most of us believed offered a level of reform we could support and defend to the American taxpayer.

Several of my colleagues and I pointed out in the Agriculture Committee debate that we have deep concerns regarding what we believe is a step backward in the commodity title of this bill with the creation of the Adverse Market Payments, or what we now call the AMP Program.

This program takes us a step backward from last year's farm bill by recreating a program with countercyclical payments and fixed target prices which the Senate farm bill completely eliminated last year.

Our concerns are not crop specific, but they are policy specific. Most Agriculture Committee members were told by our producers that they don't need an additional commodity title program, and that a sound crop insurance program is a much higher priority.

My amendment No. 1092 is a response to the wishes of most of the farmers in the United States. It simply strikes the newly created and unneeded Adverse Market Payments or AMP Program and places peanuts and rice back into the ARC Program. To put it simply, this amendment restores the reform-minded, market-oriented commodity title included in the farm bill we passed in the Senate last year.

This amendment also saves taxpayers more than $3 billion relative to the bill that is on the floor today.

High target prices are an outdated concept from past farm bills. They distort planning decisions, raise trade compliance issues, and they are not an effective use of limited taxpayer dollars.

While I appreciate the work our chairwoman and ranking member have put into this farm bill, I believe the inclusion of target prices is a step backward from a market-oriented farm policy that is anchored by a strong crop insurance program.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that recaptures the level of reform we achieved in last year's farm bill, and at the same time saves more than $3 billion over the bill that is on the floor today.

Both of these amendments have been filed. I hope as the debate moves forward we can get these amendments up and voted on.

If we are serious about moving farm policy in this country in a direction of reform that is market oriented and is about the future and not the past, then this commodity title amendment makes all the sense in the world and, again, saves $3 billion over the bill that is on the floor today.

I simply say with regard to the nutrition title amendment that too saves a couple of billion dollars. It makes reforms that I think create greater efficiency in the food stamp program and helps to address what I think is a very serious need which I think we all need to be aware and conscious of in the times we are in, and that is the out-of-control spending and out-of-control debt we are passing on to our children, grandchildren, and future generations. Passing a farm bill to achieve the highest level possible of additional savings, to me, seems to be a very high priority, and both of these amendments address those particular objectives.

I look forward to getting these amendments hopefully voted on when we return.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COWAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be in order: Moran No. 987 and

Coons-Johanns No. 1079; that at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 3, the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the two amendments in the order listed; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to either amendment prior to the votes, and that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in recent years the farm bill has changed and become more about welfare than providing a safety net for America's agriculture producers. Because this is so frustrating to me, I offered an amendment that would have restored the integrity of the farm bill. It would have cut the food stamp program by about $250 billion over ten years and converted it into a discretionary block grant. I am disappointed the Senate rejected my amendment by a vote of 36–60.

But the crop insurance program remains the heart of the farm bill. Many of my colleagues believe it is appropriate to reduce the program's effectiveness by imposing means testing and other limitations on participation. These restrictions are counterproductive and result in crop insurance becoming more expensive for family farmers. I agree there are many issues that should be addressed to make the farm bill more about farming, but I am opposed to efforts to limit the effectiveness of the crop insurance program.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was unable to attend four roll call votes that occurred on May 23, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the confirmation of Srikanth Srinivasan to be U.S. Circuit Judge, yea on Feinstein amendment No. 923 to end the Federal crop insurance subsidy for tobacco, yea on Hagan amendment No. 1031 to reduce fraud in the crop insurance program, and yea on Durbin amendment No. 953 to reduce crop insurance premium subsidies for those earning over $750,000 annually in adjusted gross income.•

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wish to start by thanking Senator WHITEHOUSE who has shown such strong leadership on the issue we are going to be discussing this afternoon, which is how do we get out of the sequestration box we are now in. I also wish to thank him for joining with me in sponsoring the Cut Unjustified Tax Loopholes Act, which could do so much to address the problems we will be discussing today, including the need to move forward on solutions to our budget deficit and to ending sequestration.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from Rhode Island be recognized for his remarks on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, at the beginning of March, when Congress's failure to reach a compromise on deficit reduction triggered sequestration, some in Congress were ready to declare victory. ''Sequestration will take place . . . [and] I am excited,'' said one Member of the House of Representatives. ''It's going to be a home run,'' said another Member of the House of Representatives. ''This will be the first significant tea party victory,'' said a third Member of the House of Representatives.

Well, sequestration may be a victory for the tea party, but it isn't a victory for the American people. It is not a victory for the men and women of our military and their families.

Over the past 2 months, the Senate Armed Services Committee has heard testimony from our highest ranking military leaders, including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Army Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Air Force Chief of Staff, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Combatant Commanders who are responsible for our forces in Afghanistan and Korea and around the world. Each of these military leaders told us that continued sequestration will damage our security and harm the troops they lead.

General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff, warned us:

> If sequestration occurs, it will severely limit our ability to implement our defense strategy. It will put the Nation at greater risk of coercion, and it will break faith with men and women in uniform.

He warned us that continued sequestration would ''destroy'' military readiness. General Amos, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, told us: ''Sequestration will leave ships in ports, aircraft grounded for want of necessary maintenance and flying hours, units only partially trained and reset after 12 years of continuous combat, and modernization programs canceled.'' The result, he stated, would be ''a lapse in American leadership.''

General Odierno, the Chief of Staff of the Army, told us:

> Sequestration will result in delays to every one of our 10 major modernization programs, the inability to re-set our equipment after 12 years of war, and unacceptable reductions in unit and individual training. . . . It will place an unreasonable burden on the shoulders of our soldiers and civilians. . . . If we do not have the resources to train and equip the force, our soldiers, our young men and women, are the ones who will pay the price, potentially with their lives.

The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force warned:

> Lost flight hours will cause unit stand-downs which will result in severe, rapid, and long-term unit combat readiness degradation. We have already ceased operations for one-third of our fighter and bomber force. Within 60 days of a stand down, the affected units will be unable to meet emergent or operations plans requirements.

The Vice Chief of Naval Operations told us:

> In FY13, we will reduce intermediate-level ship maintenance, defer an additional 84 aircraft and 184 engines for depot maintenance, and defer eight of 33 planned depot-level surface ship maintenance availabilities. At our shore bases, we have deferred about 16% of our planned FY13 shore facility sustainment and upgrades, about $1 billion worth of work. . . . By the end of FY13 . . . nearly two thirds of the fleet . . . will be less than fully mission capable and not certified for Major Combat Operations.

We rely on the men and women of our military to keep us safe and to help us meet the U.S. national security objectives around the world. We expect our men and women in uniform to put their lives on the line every day, but in return what we tell them is that we will stand by them, we will stand by their families, we will provide them the best training, the best equipment, and the best support available to any military anywhere in the world. Sequestration in fiscal year 2013 is already undermining that commitment to the men and women in the military and their families.

There may be a few people who, hearing all of this, might still consider sequestration a ''victory.'' But members of the Armed Services Committee who have heard the testimony—Democrats and Republicans—believe the continued sequestration is a grave mistake.

These cuts will damage our military readiness, restrict our ability to respond when crisis erupts, and restrict our flexibility in confronting national security threats from Iran to North Korea to international terrorism. These cuts will cost taxpayers in the long run because maintaining our military readiness today is far less expensive than rebuilding our military readiness tomorrow after it has been squandered.

The devastating effects of sequestration are also felt in other of our agencies and departments. These effects are going to harm students and seniors and farmers and families across this Nation. Continued sequestration will set back our slow climb out of recession, as well as education and medical research and health care and public safety.

As former Defense Secretary Panetta told our committee in February:

> It's not just defense, it's education, loss of teachers, it's childcare. . . . It's about food safety, it's about law enforcement, it's about airport safety.

The desire to avoid this outcome is, I believe, bipartisan. That is why it is so baffling to me that some of our Republican colleagues still refuse to allow us to take the necessary next step to avert this continued damage. By refusing to allow a House-Senate conference

committee to meet—a meeting in which Members of both Chambers and both parties would work to resolve differences between the Senate- and House-passed budgets—a few Senate Republicans are objecting to the search for a solution to sequestration. For reasons I do not understand, they are objecting now to the normal budget process they previously urged us on with such energy to follow.

It is truly baffling because 2 months ago we heard from some Republicans that it was a travesty that we had failed to pass a budget. They called failure to pass a budget an outrage. Now that we have passed a budget, a few of our colleagues across the aisle are preventing us from going to conference so we can work out our differences with the House and finalize a budget.

Those colleagues want a guarantee in advance of a conference in which they will get their way on a number of issues or else, they say, they are going to prevent the conference from even occurring. They want the rules of the game to guarantee they are going to win even before they agree to play. The budget resolution is no game, but the analogy is apt.

I cannot understand the reasoning—I simply cannot understand that reasoning—but at a time when our national security is challenged on so many fronts and we face the effects of sequestration that I have outlined, this is not just illogical, it makes responsible governing impossible. It is harmful to our Nation. Getting to conference and working out our differences is simply essential.

I am very much encouraged that some of our Republican colleagues have come to the floor to point this out. They have spoken forcefully, admirably, courageously about the need for the Senate to move forward. They give me hope. Those Senate Republicans who have come to the floor and urged us to go to conference and urged those who are blocking our move to conference to remove the blockage have a mission which I hope succeeds.

I have spoken on this floor on a number of occasions about what I see as the proper path to sensible deficit reduction, and that is the reverse of sequestration. A significant majority of Americans believes we need a balanced deficit reduction plan to dig us out of the hole we are in. Such an approach would include some additional discretionary budget cuts, but prudent, prioritized cuts, replacing the hatchet which is sequestration with a scalpel instead.

Such an approach would include reforms to entitlement programs, and it would include revenue. Budget experts of all ideological stripes know additional revenue must be part of our deficit solution. By closing unjustifiable tax loopholes, such as those my Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has outlined in detail on a bipartisan basis, we can provide tens of billions of dollars for deficit reduction—deficit reduction that does not require us to raise the burden on working families or on the men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line to keep us safe. That kind of revenue will help us reverse sequestration—part of a solution to this budget crisis we are in.

A balanced approach to deficit reduction is the approach to the budget which this body passed on March 24. I hope this position prevails in conference when we get to conference with the House. I would hope the Senate position prevails. But I cannot even believe that Members of this body would consider obstructing the budget process until they were given a guarantee they could get their way. It is the wrong way to govern. Most of us know it. You cannot guarantee in advance of a conference that the conference is going to have your outcome. If you want to instruct conferees, fair enough, and that is what the effort has been here on the part of the Democratic majority leader. But for some Members of this body to insist that unless they are guaranteed they will get their way in conference or else they are going to block us going to conference is not the way we are able to get anything done here. If we all took that position, we would never get anything done.

This obstruction does a disservice to the men and women who serve in our military and to the people of this great Nation whom they protect. Their position is as damaging as it is illogical. I hope they will soon relent to logic, to the needs of the Nation, and end the objection to proceeding to conference with the House of Representatives, because that is the way we can try to work out our differences, finalize a budget, and take the necessary steps toward deficit reduction and the end of sequestration.

I thank our Presiding Officer.

Again, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE. It is his initiative that brings us to the floor today. It is his initiative which has cast a light in so many ways on the budget dilemmas we face, but also the solution to these challenges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me first thank Chairman LEVIN for the immense amount of work and passion and good thought he has put into trying to accelerate the day when we can say good riddance to the sequester. He sees firsthand, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, how much damage the sequester is doing to the military, to the soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines who honor us by their service, to the talented and loyal civilians who support their efforts. But families all across the country also are feeling the painful consequences of this sequester.

Just in my small State, Rhode Island, 8,100 folks have already seen their weekly unemployment checks reduced by $50. For a family struggling to get by, losing $50 can hurt. Federal rental assistance has been eliminated for 500 low-income Rhode Island families, which may cause some even to lose their homes.

Economy-wide, our nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $85 billion in sequester cuts this year will cost us 750,000 jobs nationwide. We have 12 million Americans out of work already. Why on Earth would we want to cut 750,000 more jobs?

As Chairman LEVIN said, it does not have to be this way. In fact, Leader REID tried twice to bring up measures that would get rid of the sequester, but twice Republicans filibustered. Now they refuse even to allow the process to go forward that would negotiate a solution through the regular legislative process. They will not even let us appoint Senators to negotiate a compromise between the Senate and the House budgets.

It has been 61 days since we passed our budget, and each time we try to move the process along, Republicans object. If their rule is: I have to have it my way before I am willing to enter into negotiations and I need a guarantee, I would like some of that deal too. I have some things I feel pretty passionately about, and if they want to play by those rules, then we should all be playing by those rules. If not, then let's follow the regular order and let the process of democracy work.

From government shutdowns to Federal default, the other party has a strategy: to manufacture one crisis after another, each time holding our economy hostage to demands for radical policies that the vast majority of the American people reject.

They demand the end to Medicare as we know it. The American people want no part of that. They demand cuts to Social Security. The American people want no part of that. They refuse to close a single—not one, not a single—corporate tax loophole. Well, huge majorities of Americans want that to happen. But our friends do not care. They are extremists.

It is not just the American public, by the way, that rejects the extremist tea party agenda. So do economists. What economists say has been confirmed in practice by the experiences of other nations that followed the Republican austerity strategy.

Republicans say budget cuts are necessary to reduce the deficit, but their fervor ignores the established economic effect that has during a recovery. Right now, for every $1 we cut, the economy shrinks by more than $1. Their theory is when you cut $1 in government spending, that releases the economy to grow more rapidly. Well, the fact is, during a recovery the exact opposite is true. The way this is measured is through an economic phenomenon called the fiscal multiplier.

There have been a number of recent studies that try to identify what the fiscal multiplier is right now, and they range from 1.4 to 3.7, which means that

for every $1 you cut, the economy takes a $1.40 hit. There is an extra 40-cent harm for each $1 cut to our national economy.

If this one is right, 3.7, then every $1 cut is $3.70 worth of harm to our economy. It is a multiplier of damage from government cuts. So shrink the GDP, which we do if we have a fiscal multiplier of 1, and collect less taxes. Less taxes means less of the deficit reduction that is supposedly achieved by the budget cuts. It is a vicious cycle that could keep our economy weak and our deficits high. We can go backward, and Europe proves it from Spain to Portugal to Greece.

Countries slashed their budgets and things got worse, double-digit unemployment and negative growth. We have a U.S. unemployment rate of about 7.5 percent. That is way too high, but it is way better than 27 percent in Spain, 27 percent in Greece, and 16 percent in Portugal. We had 2.3 percent growth last year. They had negative growth rates. Negative growth rates. Their economies contracted.

The evidence from the austerity experiment is in countries that cut the deepest hurt themselves the worst. As we can see, employment in the eurozone is worse by about 20 percent since the major austerity programs kicked in.

Over that same time period unemployment in the United States is better by about 25 percent. Their policies, unemployment worse by 20 percent; our policies, employment better by 25 percent. A lot of these Republican calls for harmful U.S. austerity cited a 2010 paper called ''Growth in a Time of Debt'' by Harvard economists Reinhart and Rogoff. Republicans loved Reinhart and Rogoff. They cited them at least five dozen times on the House and Senate floors to justify their demands for budget cuts.

They cannot get enough of Reinhart and Rogoff. It turns out there is a big problem. There were numerous errors in Reinhart and Rogoff's computations; math errors, programming errors, dropping a column of data. Oh, oops. With the fiscal multiplier over 1, the best thing we can do to accelerate our recovery is to lift the harmful European-style sequester cuts. The Job Preservation and Sequester Replacement Act of 2013 would do just that, through September 30, giving us time to negotiate a broader compromise.

Cosponsored by Chairman LEVIN, Chairman HARKIN, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator MERKLEY, Senator SCHATZ, and Senator WARREN, it would replace the sequester from the Buffet rule and from closing corporate tax loopholes, sensible tax changes that on their own we should do because they make the Tax Code fairer.

The Buffet rule would ensure that multimillion-dollar earners pay at least a 30-percent effective Federal tax rate. Last year we debated whether the top income tax rate should be 35 percent or 39.6 percent. But the fact is that many at the top, people making hundreds of millions of dollars in a single year, will not pay anything close to that rate. Why? Because the Tax Code is riddled with special provisions that favor ultra-high-income earners.

For example, investment income is taxed at the special rate of 20 percent. The so-called carried interest loophole allows billionaire private equity fund managers to pay this low rate. So many of them pay the same tax rate or even less than a hard-working average firefighter or brick mason in Rhode Island making $50,000 a year. So at $200 million a year, they are paying the same tax rate as folks making $50,000 a year. The Buffet rule follows the common sense that people earning millions of dollars a year, even hundreds of millions of dollars a year, should pay higher tax rates than middle-class families. It would also cut the deficit by $71 billion.

Another loophole, the so-called Edwards-Gingrich loophole, lets high-earning professionals dodge paying payroll taxes by calling themselves corporations. We close that too, saving another $9 billion. We save another $3 billion by going after a deduction that allows private jet owners to depreciate their planes faster than commercial aircraft are allowed to be depreciated, another commonsense change.

The fourth part of the proposal would contribute $24 billion to lifting the sequester by ending tax breaks for Big Oil. Over the past decade, the five largest oil companies have reaped over $1 trillion in profits. That is trillion with a ''t''—$1 trillion in profits. While they are making that massive profit, they nevertheless pull strings in Congress to keep billions of dollars a year that regular taxpayers have to cough up for them in tax giveaways. As with all of the elements in this bill, repealing Big Oil giveaways is something we should be doing anyway, just because it is the right thing to do.

Finally, we end a tax break for companies that ship jobs overseas. Believe it or not, the Tax Code allows manufacturers to indefinitely delay paying taxes on profits in overseas operations. Ending this unfair and un-American advantage would lower the deficit by another $20 billion. Each one of those five reforms would make the Tax Code fairer for all Americans. They are each worth passing for that reason alone. They are embarrassments in our Tax Code. Getting rid of them could stop the sequester while Democrats and Republicans work together on a balanced deficit reduction package; that is, of course, if we could get Republicans to actually work with us and negotiate and go through the regular order they have claimed for so long to seek, to get to a balanced and negotiated deficit reduction package.

But as Chairman LEVIN pointed out, at the moment they refuse to even appoint conferees to begin the process. They want to be assured they will have it their way before they even begin to negotiate. As I said earlier in the speech, if that is the way they are going to behave, I want some of that action myself. I have many things I feel very strongly about.

I could be in a position to say I will not allow us to go to conference either until we are clear that we are never going to do chained CPI and put that burden on our Social Security-receiving seniors. I could do that and say we are never going to go to conference unless I get a guarantee that we are going to get a carbon fee so the big polluters are paying their share and we are not having to subsidize what they are doing to our atmosphere and oceans. I could say those things. Any one of us could say those things.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator would yield for a question, if that position were taken by all of us, that is a guarantee of inaction?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That is a guarantee of total gridlock and failure. That is why it is so important that no one in this body try to use that kind of hostage-taking extremist tactic, rather than allowing the regular order to continue.

Mr. LEVIN. Since I have interrupted the Senator, let me ask one additional question. I notice that even though the Senator's menu yields $127 billion, that he only requires $85 billion for the 1-year sequester replacement, which means that, for instance, if just the Buffet rule were put in place, which is a tax fairness approach, plus the bottom one, a tax break for offshoring, those two items out of this menu—and there are many other items which are not on the Senator's menu, those two items alone could reverse sequester for 1 year?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. I wish to make one more comment about offshoring. My dear friend from Rhode Island knows that my permanent subcommittee has done a lot of work on the tax breaks for offshoring. In addition to what the Senator said about delaying the tax on profits, under our Tax Code, companies which move jobs overseas get a tax deduction for the cost of the moving?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. They do.

Mr. LEVIN. If they are building a plant overseas, the cost of that plant can be deducted currently?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. It can.

Mr. LEVIN. This is perhaps the most stunning thing I have learned fairly recently. It is even possible under our Tax Code for the cost of operations of that facility to be deducted currently, while the tax on the profits or the income of that operation is delayed, which means they can cut domestic taxes by the cost of running a foreign operation currently. That takes a little bit of gimmickry to do it, but that is what is going on. I just wanted to kind of fill in that one little element of some of these offshore bonanzas, these incredible loopholes that are in the Tax Code.

As the Senator from Rhode Island said, we should get rid of some of these

things even if we had no deficit because, as the Senator put it, they are embarrassments.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Nobody has spent more time and more energy and put more effort into the way in which American income gets hidden offshore so people can avoid paying taxes and corporations can avoid paying taxes than Chairman LEVIN. He is our expert. There are indeed other loopholes that are exploited, primarily by corporations but also by very high-income taxpayers, hiding money in the Cayman islands, putting assets into Ireland and other tax havens, and refusing to treat them as American, even though it is nominally an American company. There are enumerable tricks.

I will close by making one point. Very often people look at what we are trying to accomplish, and even actually pretty honest reporters will say the Democrats actually want to raise taxes. That is the fight. Republicans want to cut spending; Democrats want to raise taxes. No. We raised taxes once already. We raised the rates for people over $450,000 thousand a year in the last big agreement. What we want to do now is to go into the Tax Code and close down the loopholes. That is all we are looking for.

What most Americans do not understand is that if we look at how much money goes out the backdoor of the Tax Code through loopholes, through special rates, through exemptions and so forth, it is very nearly the same amount of money that is actually collected through the Tax Code and becomes the revenue of the United States of America. We let almost as much money out the backdoor of the Tax Code as we collect through the Tax Code. If we take a look at the areas where Chairman LEVIN has done so much good research, that money actually never gets into the Tax Code to go out the backdoor.

If we were to count that, in addition to the money that is allowed out the backdoor of the Tax Code, there is actually more that goes out the backdoor of the Tax Code and is avoided coming through the Tax Code than is actually collected as the revenues of the United States of America.

So it is a big number. The refusal of the Republicans to let us attack one single loophole, not one loophole—every loophole is sacred right now to them—I think is unjustified. I hope the people of America understand we are not looking at more tax rate increases; we are looking only at closing these loopholes. It is a rich field to pursue because more money goes through that than actually gets collected. You can bet, if you are an average American, that when those loopholes were being carved into the Tax Code, you were not in the room. The special interests were in the room.

That is why a lot of people want to defend them. But it is also a very good reason for making a more honest Tax Code that gets rid of these loopholes. But our friends want to crisis manufacture. They want to do crisis manufacture so they can force-feed on all of us bad economic ideas that Americans do not want. I think we need to resist that.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. Again, if my friend would yield, the name of the bill which the Senator cosponsored is called Cut Unjustifiable Tax Loopholes.

There are plenty of tax deductions which are totally justified. Mortgage interest is justified, accelerated depreciation, there are all kinds of contributions.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Charitable deductions.

Mr. LEVIN. These are justifiable tax deductions. What we are talking about are the unjustifiable ones which shouldn't be there. As the Senator points out, we are not proposing tax rate increases. The way I phrase it is I am talking about collecting taxes which should be paid.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Not increasing taxes or the rates for taxes, but collecting the taxes which, in all justice, really should be collected by Uncle Sam.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Let me thank the chairman for allowing me to join him today. He has shown great leadership in this area, and I am privileged to be here with him today.

I yield the floor.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, after several hearings and five lengthy markup sessions, the Senate Judiciary Committee Tuesday evening voted with a strong bipartisan vote of 13–5 to report the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act to the full Senate. This vote demonstrated our commitment to bring millions of people out of the shadows and into American life by establishing a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants in this country. It addresses the lengthy backlogs in our current immigration system that have kept families apart sometimes for decades. It grants a faster track to the ''dreamers'' and to the agricultural workers who are an essential part of our communities and our economy. It makes important changes to the visas used by dairy farmers, tourists, and investors who create American jobs that spur our economy. It improves the treatment of refugees and asylum seekers so that the United States will remain the beacon of hope in the world.

I am immensely proud of the process through which the Judiciary Committee considered this bill. The Committee held more than 37 hours of debate in five markup sessions spread over almost 2 weeks. We considered 212 amendments offered by Republican and Democratic Senators, and voted to accept 141 of those amendments. The committee accepted amendments from nearly every member of the Judiciary Committee. Every Republican member but one offered amendments the committee voted to accept by a bipartisan majority. Senator CRUZ is the lone exception and his amendments were all defeated by bipartisan majorities.

Of the more than 300 amendments filed, more than 200 were debated. By contrast, during the committee's consideration of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, the number of amendments voted on was 11. In 2006, the committee's consideration of the Securing America's Borders Act voted on approximately 60 amendments. The quality of the debate and the effort that went into it is a testament to the committee and each of its members, even those who ultimately voted against the bill.

As Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I ensured more process and transparency than any previous committee consideration of immigration reform. Committee members filed their amendments 2 days before our first markup, giving members, their staffs and the public ample time to review those amendments so they could be thoroughly debated. For the first time in the committee's history, amendments were posted online on our committee website for the public to review. The markup meetings themselves were broadcast online and on public television so that they could be viewed across the country. Many members of the public also lined up early each morning to attend the meetings in person. Families, faith leaders, advocates and community leaders were present to witness the committee's deliberations. This was an open, thorough, and thoughtful debate.

In real time, as members accepted and rejected amendments, the committee's website was updated to reflect which amendments were modified, accepted or defeated. In addition to the live webcast and gavel-to-gavel coverage on C–SPAN, I provided regular updates through the Judiciary Committee's website, Twitter and other means. I was heartened to see a Vermont editorial describe the Judiciary Committee markup as a ''lesson in democracy.''

The committee unanimously approved my amendment to permanently authorize and further strengthen the EB–5 Regional Center Program which will benefit the economy. The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS, estimates that the EB–5 Regional Center Program has created tens of thousands of American jobs and has attracted more than $1 billion in investment in communities all across the United States since 2006. Senator SESSIONS spoke in support of my amendment before it was adopted without a single vote in opposition.

Another example of the Committee's bipartisan efforts to improve this legislation was offered by Senators HATCH, COONS and KLOBUCHAR, to increase certain immigration fees and direct a portion of the proceeds to the States to

fund science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and training that will help drive American competitiveness. Senator SCHUMER offered a second degree amendment to ensure that a percentage of the funding is used to promote STEM education in groups that are underrepresented in the sciences, such as women and racial minorities. Both amendments were accepted by the committee by unanimous consent.

The committee considered 35 amendments to strengthen the bill's border security provisions offered by both Republicans and Democrats. Of the 26 amendments accepted to this section, 10 were offered by Republicans. Senator GRASSLEY offered an amendment to expand the Comprehensive Southern Border Strategy to include all border sectors, not just high-risk sectors. The committee accepted amendments by Senators FLAKE and GRASSLEY to increase oversight of DHS enforcement strategies, and amendments by Senators SESSIONS and CORNYN to protect border communities. These amendments add to, and strengthen, the strong enforcement provisions already included in the bill.

These amendments are just a few of the amendments offered to strengthen provisions in the pre-Title and Title I border security provisions and promote jobs and innovation in the non-immigration visa provisions in Title IV of the bill. Other bipartisan proposals to provide assistance for American workers to apply for jobs in the technology sector and establish employee reporting requirements to address potential abuse of the visa system have also been adopted.

The Judiciary Committee debated and accepted 48 amendments offered by Republican members. I was encouraged by the committee's open and respectful debate. In a time where partisan brinksmanship has become the norm, the Judiciary Committee was able to demonstrate the need for compromise and find common ground to stand on in pursuit of comprehensive immigration reform. The result of our committee's consideration is a stronger, more bipartisan bill, and I look forward to working with the rest of the Senate to ensure its passage.

The bill is not the one that I would have drafted. I voted for amendments that were rejected and against amendments that were accepted. The bill mandates more than $1.5 billion of more southern border fencing, which I believe a mistake. My greatest disappointment is that the legislation that comes from the Senate Judiciary Committee does not recognize the rights of all Americans, including gay and lesbian Americans who have just as much right to spousal immigration benefits as anyone else. I will continue my efforts to end the needless discrimination so many Americans face in our immigration system. This discrimination serves no legitimate purpose and it is wrong.

Since the beginning of this Congress, I have tried to make comprehensive immigration reform our top legislative priority in the Senate Judiciary Committee. In January at Georgetown University Law Center, I outlined my expectation that comprehensive immigration reform would be the matter to which the Judiciary Committee would devote itself this spring and announced an early hearing to highlight the national discussion. I followed through. The committee held three hearings on comprehensive immigration reform in February and March.

I have said since the beginning of the year that I was looking forward to seeing principles turned into legislation. The Judiciary Committee has now advanced such a bill. We completed our work a month later than I had hoped, but we had to begin much later than I had hoped. We were able to make up ground by concentrating our efforts during the 5 weeks since the bill was introduced in which we held three more hearings and five extended markup sessions.

I have favored an open and transparent process during which all 18 Senators serving on the Senate Judiciary Committee had the opportunity to participate and to propose or oppose ideas for reform. The Majority Leader agreed that we needed regular order in the consideration of comprehensive immigration reform. The process took time and was not easy. There were strongly-held, differing points of view.

I am encouraged that after two resounding presidential defeats, some Republican politicians are concerned enough about the growing Hispanic voting population that they are abandoning their former demagoguery and coming to the table. In what is being called its ''autopsy'' of the last election, the Republican National Committee wrote: ''Hispanic voters tell us our Party's position on immigration has become a litmus test, measuring whether we are meeting them with a welcome mat or a closed door.'' After slamming the door on our efforts for comprehensive immigration reform during the Bush administration, I welcome Republicans to this effort. I continue to fear that some merely want to talk the talk while looking for excuses to abandon what needs to be a bipartisan effort.

Few topics are more fundamental to who and what we are as a Nation than immigration. The Statue of Liberty has long proclaimed America's welcome: ''Give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. . . . Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!'' That is what America has stood for and what we should continue to represent. Immigration throughout our history has been an ongoing source of renewal of our spirit, our creativity and our economic strength.

In the course of our deliberations I have quoted my friend of many years, Ted Kennedy. In the summer of 2007, as our effort at comprehensive immigration reform was being blocked in the Senate, he spoke about his disappointment and our resolve. He said: ''A minority in the Senate rejected a stronger economy that is fairer to our taxpayers and our workers. A minority of the Senate rejected America's own extraordinary immigrant history and ignored our Nation's most urgent needs. But we are in this struggle for the long haul. . . . As we continue the battle, we will have ample inspiration in the lives of the immigrants all around us.'' I have taken inspiration from many sources, from our shared history as immigrants and as Americans, from the experiences of my own grandparents, and from our courageous witnesses Jose Antonio Vargas and Gaby Pacheco and from the families that can be more secure when we enact comprehensive immigration reform.

The dysfunction in our current immigration system affects all of us and it is long past time for reform. I hope that our history, our values, and our decency can inspire us finally to take action. We need an immigration system that lives up to American values and helps write the next great chapter in American history by reinvigorating our economy and enriching our communities. Together we can work to pass a bill that repairs our broken immigration system.

POSTAL REFORM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this year, as I do every year, I have met with many Vermonters who have come up to me to express their views about the future of the U.S. Postal Service. But this year, these meetings have taken a different tone. Today, rather than asking me how the Senate can make a durable and effective institution even stronger, Vermonters ask me how the Senate can stave off the impending default of the Postal Service. I hear these questions from businesses, from private citizens, and from postal employees. I am stopped by Vermonters in the grocery store or at the gas pump, wanting to know what we in the Senate will do. Vermont, because of our mostly rural population, is more dependent on the Postal Service than are urban and densely populated States. Vermonters, almost to a person, subscribe to Ben Franklin's vision of a public Postal Service that guarantees the delivery of mail to everyone.

These questions about the coming collapse of the Postal Service are strange to say the least. The USPS posted a $100 million profit from its business operations during the first quarter of fiscal year 2013. So how is it that a company that made $100 million in the first quarter of this fiscal year is in financial trouble? As in far too many other instances, the problem is not with the Postal Service, the problem is with the United States House of Representatives.

In 2006, by unanimous consent, the Senate took up and passed the House's Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act. One of the provisions of this bill, meant to shore up the long-term security of postal retiree health benefits, required that the Postal Service begin the prepayment of health benefits 75 years in advance. While no other public agency or private business stipulates this degree of prepayment, I consented in 2006 because the economy was strong, the Postal Service could manage these prepayments, and I believed that any needed changes to the proposal could be made with the same level of bipartisan comity as in 2006. How wrong I was.

Of course, since 2006, the economy has collapsed, first-class mail volume has fallen precipitously, and bipartisanship in the Congress has taken a nose dive. These factors together explain how the U.S. House of Representatives has converted a $100 million profit in the first quarter of fiscal 2013 into a $1.3 billion loss. While many American businesses have gone under during the Great Recession and others have struggled just to stay afloat, House Republicans have refused to budge on the health benefits prepayment.

You may ask why the onus resides at the feet of House Republicans. After all, the Senate consented to the 2006 House Republican-sponsored bill. But since that time, only the U.S. Senate has taken measures to solve the problem. Last year we took up and passed the 21st Century Postal Service Act of 2012, which would have lightened the fiscal burden on the Postal Service until its lost revenues from the economic slump and reductions in first-class mail could be offset by growth into the package delivery market. This bill was passed on a bipartisan basis here in the Senate despite record-breaking partisanship by the Senate minority. I should note, as with any bipartisan measure, there were provisions in this bill with which I disagreed. Yet it turned out to make little difference, since the Senate bill languished in the House. In fact, the House even failed to take up its own bill and pass it as an alternative to the Senate proposal.

Meanwhile, the Postal Service continues to stagger under the crushing burden of 75 years of prepayments for retiree health benefits. This effort, which originally looked like a reasonable effort to shore up retiree benefits, has become the proverbial albatross.

Rather than addressing this problem, the strategy of the House of Representatives appears to be to force the Postal Service into default, at which point their draconian demands for slashing cuts will look reasonable by comparison to their manufactured crisis. If this strategy sounds familiar, it should—it is the same strategy Republicans used to negotiate the Budget Control Act of 2011, using U.S. credit worthiness as a hostage they seemed more than willing to kill. This strategy ultimately cost the United States its triple-A rating with Standard and Poor's and an estimated $1.3 billion in additional interest payments in 2011 alone, according to the Government Accountability Office. And that figure will escalate with time. That's $1.3 billion more that taxpayers will pay to Chinese lenders and Wall Street banks in order for Republicans to secure sequestration cuts to Medicare cancer treatments, cut National Guard technicians' salaries through furlough, and reduce Head Start programs for needy children.

The strategy worked so well in the summer of 2011 that it has overtaken everything else in the Republican playbook. Unable to sell a shrinking vision of America to voters in 2012, Republicans are left with procedural mechanisms to obtain their desired outcome. Ironically, if they are successful, they are likely to simultaneously celebrate victory and blame President Obama and Senate Democrats for letting them get their way. If that seems like an absurdity, compare the conflicting statements of the Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER and Chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee GREG WALDEN on proposed cuts to Social Security in the President's 2014 budget proposal. The President finally proposed reductions to entitlement programs after Republicans had long demanded such cuts, eliciting muted praise from Speaker BOEHNER while Chairman WALDEN accused the President of ''going after seniors.'' I should note that as part of House leadership, Chairman WALDEN works for Speaker BOEHNER.

So do not be surprised when a new rendition of this plan causes a default by the Postal Service, after which Republicans demand reductions in the Postal Service's competitive product line and massive layoffs of postal employees. I supported last year's Senate postal reform bill in the hope of striking a compromise. But there are better ways to balance the Postal Service's books, and recognizing that the House has refused compromise, I am glad to join Senator SANDERS and other Democratic Senators in a full-throated articulation of a better vision for the USPS.

This vision is articulated by our bill, the Postal Service Protection Act of 2013. This bill would allow the Postal Service to recover huge retirement pension overpayments estimated by the Inspector General of USPS to be $75 billion. It would alleviate the remaining health benefits prefunding requirement. It would protect postal customers from having their local postal facilities closed without the Postal Service following proper criteria. The bill would permit the Postal Service to sell non-postal products and services. It would allow the mailing of beer or wine by a licensed manufacturer in accordance with the laws of the States. It would permanently protect one of the Postal Service's greatest commercial advantages over its competitors, Saturday delivery. And it would set the table for long-term growth into the package delivery market by establishing a Chief Innovation Officer and a Postal Innovation Advisory Commission.

Like any business enterprise, the Postal Service cannot cut its way to greatness. It must find areas where it can grow. The Postal Service Protection Act of 2013 would give the Postal Service the financial breathing room and innovation mechanisms it needs to chart a new and sustainable course in the next century, when email and package delivery will supplant first class mail. These changes do not diminish our commitment to Ben Franklin's vision; they facilitate its renewal, recognizing that while change is not easy, it is also unavoidable. In that spirit, I call on all Senators to join me in cosponsoring Senator SANDERS' Postal Service Protection Act and in keeping faith with Americans by protecting an indispensable American institution.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN VARRICCHIONE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a man who is a leading contributor to the preservation of the Italian community in Burlington, VT.

John Varricchione grew up in a former Italian neighborhood adjacent to downtown Burlington. I have my own fond memories of that neighborhood, travelling with my mother—a first generation Italian-American—from Montpelier to Burlington to shop in the small, family-owned, Italian markets there. Only remnants of the neighborhood remain, as most of it was lost to urban renewal in the 1960s.

I had the pleasure of joining John and other members of the Vermont Italian Club for the dedication of a historic marker, which serves as a reminder of the wonderful neighborhood in which he grew up, and of the people who lived there. John was instrumental in making the marker possible. We all shared wonderful Italian food after the dedication ceremony. I was honored to be part of such a special event.

John never moved far from the old neighborhood. He stayed in Vermont and became an outstanding teacher and coach at Rice Memorial High School—a Catholic school in South Burlington—where he became affectionately known among students as ''Mister V.'' Many Rice graduates consider him a favorite teacher.

John's contributions to the Vermont Italian Club, and his efforts to preserve our State's Italian heritage, are many. In honor of his work, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in The Burlington Free Press on May 10, 2013, ''Fragrant memories of Burlington's deep Italian roots,'' be printed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, May 10, 2013]

FRAGRANT MEMORIES OF BURLINGTON'S DEEP ITALIAN ROOTS

(By Melissa Pasanen)

John Varricchione, 66, has strong memories of growing up in the heart of Burlington's Little Italy, he said last Monday while he and his wife helped their friend Mary Anne Gucciardi make a batch of her famous meatballs in their Burlington kitchen.

At one point, Varricchione donned an apron imprinted with the name of the Vermont Italian Club and three photos from the early 1900s of three families who were among the pillars of the community: the Eveltis, the Varricchiones and the Merolas.

His grandfather, Luigi Varricchione, originally came to Burlington in 1912 at the suggestion of the Merolas who preceded him and who hailed from the same town about an hour east of Naples back in Italy.

The family first lived on Cherry Street at the core of the Italian neighborhood, and Luigi Varricchione made wine in his basement like many of the area's Italian families. He was a member of the Vermont Italian Club in the 1930s when it was men-only, although the club hosted regular meals for everyone, charging 50 cents for men and a quarter for women and children. The club maintains the tradition with an annual fundraising dinner in late winter or early spring. (See vermontitalianclub.org for more information.)

Varricchione remembers back to when he was 9 or 10 ''going to mass with my father at the old Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception'' and then walking a block to where his grandmother lived on South Union Street with one of her sons after her husband passed away.

''There were grapevines growing up the wall and a garden in the back for herbs,'' Varricchione recalled. ''Grandma would often be making pasta from scratch and it would be hanging all over on wooden drying racks or laid out on the bed on a clean sheet. She would serve me a bowl of pasta with sauce or a bowl of her greens and beans. On occasion,'' he added, ''she'd pull out the anisette and little Johnny got to taste.''

Both Varricchione and Gucciardi recalled the bustling Italian stores with cheeses and salamis hanging from the ceiling and shelves holding big jars of olives and boxes of torrone, Varricchione's favorite nougat candy.

''We'd go to the store for penny candy,'' said Varricchione. ''There was Merola's and also Izzo's Market. Both stores were very generous in allowing people to buy on credit.'' The whole neighborhood was lost to urban renewal by the late 1960s, Varricchione explained sadly.

Looming large in his recollections was the image of the Italian mama ''with plenty of love and food to share,'' Varricchione said. There were always many mouths to feed, he said with a chuckle: ''There weren't too many small Italian families.''

Varricchione's parents, Francesco and Simone (known as Si), raised their eight children at 85 Bank St. and then 78 Pine St. (now a law office).

''We would have crowds to eat,'' said Varricchione, recalling with relish how his mother browned pork chops and then slow-braised them in red sauce. Even though his mother, like Gucciardi's mother, was originally French-Canadian, she learned all the Italian recipes and became a true Italian mama and then nonna.

In a family history written by Varricchione's wife, Joanne, she describes the scene:

''Everyone managed to squeeze around the kitchen table while Nona [sic] stood watch over the stove, stirring her delicious sauce. The menu seldom varied: spaghetti and meatballs, chicken or pork, salad, wine, garlic bread and ice cream. The laughter and commotion only added to the wonderful aromas and meals she prepared . . . Si seldom sat down and ate with the family; she preferred to make sure everyone had enough to eat. ('Does anyone need more sauce?' was the question she always asked.) 'No, Ma. Come and sit down.' 'I will in a minute.' It was a habit she never broke.''

TRIBUTE TO MARY ANNE GUCCIARDI

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont is home to many treasures, from our natural beauties to our manufactured goods to our award-winning agricultural industry. It is also home to many spirited personalities, and today I would like to honor one of them: a good friend and talented cook, Mary Anne Gucciardi. Affectionately known as ''Mama Gucc'' to those who have had the good fortune of sitting at her dining room table, she makes newcomers feel like old friends. For more than two decades, she has opened her home to hundreds of University of Vermont sports teams, from skiing to soccer, hockey to basketball. Her menu includes classics like baked stuff mushrooms, chicken cacciatore, and of course meatballs and sauce. The mere mention of her name makes both coaches' and athletes' mouths water.

Mama Gucc grew up in Haverhill, Massachusetts, the daughter of an Italian-American father and a French-Canadian mother. It was her mother's Italian mother-in-law who served as the inspiration for Mama Gucc's gourmet Italian favorites. As the grandson of Italian immigrants myself, I have benefited from Mama Gucc's lavish feasts. She has made me feel right like I was right back in my own mother's kitchen. Mary Anne's heart is even bigger than her generous portions. She has not only cooked for hundreds of athletes, hosted distinguished guests such as bishops, senators and governors, but she has prepared countless charity dinners, raising over $50,000 in scholarships in memory of a UVM student, Kevin Roberson, tragically killed in a car accident. Her love for cooking and for hosting has made ''Mama Gucc'' a surrogate mother for the lucky student-athletes to come through her door, making those students, sometimes hundreds of miles from their families, feel right at home. In 1999, The University of Vermont honored Mama Gucc and her husband by naming a new fitness facility the Richard and Mary Anne Gucciardi Recreation and Fitness Center, a tribute most rightfully deserved.

From every Vermonter who has indulged in Mama Gucc's famous cooking, and has been blessed with her warm hospitality and generous support, we thank Mary Anne Gucciardi for providing a home-away-from-home to all who have passed through her doors.

I ask unanimous consent that The Burlington Free Press article, ''Celebrating the Italian Mama,'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, May 10, 2013]

''CELEBRATING THE ITALIAN MAMA''

Among iconic maternal figures, the Italian mama or nonna (grandmother) hovering over a fragrant pot of tomato sauce ranks high—and few bring the legend to life better than South Burlington's Mary Anne Gucciardi.

Recently in the Burlington kitchen of friends, Gucciardi, 80, known as Mama Gucc (pronounced ''gooch''), arrived not only with ingredients to make her famous meatballs and sauce, but also containers of meatballs and sauce, Italian wedding soup and sausage Calabrese to give away.

''You get back what you give out,'' said the mother of four and grandmother of four with a smile and a shrug.

If that were literally the case, Gucciardi would be swimming in an ocean of herb-flecked tomato sauce with meatballs.

For more than two decades until just a few years ago, Gucciardi regularly cooked huge Italian feasts for a number of University of Vermont sports teams with the support of her husband and family. Her multi-course dinners—usually once a season for the ski, soccer, hockey and basketball teams—included a variety of home-cooked Italian classics like minestrone, baked stuffed mushrooms, chicken cacciatore, meatballs and sauce, and lasagna for as many as 40 team members.

''She opened up her home to us,'' said longtime UVM men's ice hockey coach, Mike Gilligan. ''She just treated the kids and the coaches like they were her own family.''

''Mama Gucc was just wonderful,'' agreed former men's basketball coach, Tom Brennan. ''She took care of us before we got pretty,'' he joked, referring to the pre-championship-era of his team. ''The food was always so lavish, from soup to nuts . . . You know these kids, they eat like horses. Everybody would eat until they couldn't stand up.''

''She was always there for us,'' Brennan continued, recalling how Gucciardi accompanied the team to the 1993 funeral of their recently graduated teammate, Kevin Roberson, who had been tragically killed in a car accident. ''It was so comforting to have her there and she brought a big pile of food.''

In addition, the Gucciardi family held frequent dinner parties for distinguished guests including coaches, senators, governors, professors and bishops, and also cooked countless benefit dinners, which raised more than $50,000 for a UVM scholarship fund in Roberson's name. In September 1999, UVM honored Gucciardi and her husband by naming a new 6,000-square-foot fitness facility the Richard and Mary Anne Gucciardi Recreation and Fitness Center.

It all began after Gucciardi met some student-athletes while helping with a Newman Catholic Center fundraiser, she explained while mixing together a double batch of meatballs. (''I never make a single batch,'' she said.) During winter break, when athletes often had to stay on campus to train, she said, ''they were away from home, looking for a good meal. There was a lot of joy in seeing them enjoy the food.''

Gucciardi also shared a more personal motivation to give back after her youngest son, now 50, survived a very serious car accident when he was 3½. The family was in the process of moving to Burlington where her husband had landed a job with General Electric.

For six weeks, Gucciardi slept by her son's bedside in the hospital and prayed daily in the chapel at UVM. The local Italian community warmly welcomed them, she recalled, and offered support. ''I just always said I would give back for what was given to us,'' she said.

FAMILY RECIPES

Scraping the fat and caramelized bits from a pan of roasted Italian sausage into her sauce pot, Gucciardi explained that she has taken family recipes and ''made them my own over the years.''

She grew up in Haverhill, Mass., with an Italian-American father and a French-Canadian mother, but her mother learned to cook Italian from her mother-in-law, Gucciardi's paternal grandmother, ''a great cook,'' Gucciardi said.

After frying the onions and garlic in the sausage fat (''You just get such flavor from that,'' she explained), Gucciardi added tomato paste and canned Italian tomatoes along with a little water and generous amounts of dried parsley and basil, which would come fresh from her garden in the summer, she said.

''I never measure anything,'' she added apologetically.

Luckily for her fans, Gucciardi taught a series of cooking classes in the mid-'80s for which she had to write down her recipes. It was in that class that Gucciardi met John Varricchione, in whose Burlington kitchen she was cooking last week.

Varricchione, 66, a retired teacher and football coach at Rice Memorial High School, grew up in the center of Burlington's Italian community where, just like in Gucciardi's family, his paternal grandmother taught his French-Canadian mother to cook family favorites.

''But I never got my grandmother's recipes,'' he said with regret.

Last week, Varricchione and his wife, Joanne, helped Gucciardi form meatballs while her sauce simmered on the stove. The Varricchiones' 3-year-old grandson, Carlo Pizzagalli, popped in and out of the kitchen to visit with his grandparents and ''Mama Goose,'' as he called her.

The cooks used a small ice cream scoop to measure out each meatball, a tool Gucciardi said she adopted years ago when student-athletes helped her to produce meatballs for fundraising dinners during which they would feed more than 800. ''I had it down to a science,'' she said proudly.

Gucciardi watched her helpers with a kind but careful eye. ''If they have any cracks in them, I reject them,'' she said, explaining that they would fall apart in the sauce.

As they worked, the scent of meatballs and simmering sauce filled the kitchen. ''I can smell those meatballs cooking,'' said Gucciardi happily.

''That's always a good thing,'' agreed Varricchione.

The first batch of meatballs emerged from the oven, brown and sizzling, and the second batch went in. Gucciardi stirred a generous pinch of sugar into her sauce to balance the acidity of the tomatoes.

When the meatballs had cooled a little, Carlo tasted one and gave his full approval, followed by a big hug for the cook.

The next generation had fallen in love with the cooking of Mama Gucc.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Monday, May 27, is Memorial Day—the day Americans set aside to honor the brave men and women in uniform who have made the greatest possible sacrifice for their country.

Memorial Day was informally begun by MG John A. Logan, the head of an organization of Union Army Civil War veterans, in 1868. It is believed Major General Logan chose a date in late May because flowers would be in bloom all over the country. He asked the Nation to decorate the graves of the war dead with flowers.

Mr. President, 1.1 million Americans have died defending the country in our Nation's wars. Freedom as we know it—here at home and around the world—would not exist without their heroism.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky has played a vital role in this Nation's defense during our history. I am honored to represent Kentuckians in the Armed Forces, including those stationed at Fort Knox, Fort Campbell, the Blue Grass Army Depot, and members of the Reserves and Kentucky National Guard.

At Fort Knox, the Memorial Day ceremony this year will continue a tradition of honoring the memory of one particular fallen soldier. This year, that soldier is PFC David P. Nash of Daviess County, KY.

While serving in Vietnam on December 29, 1968, 20-year-old Private First Class Nash valiantly rolled on top of an exploding grenade to save the lives of three other soldiers. We must not forget the deeds of Private First Class Nash, or the many other men and women in uniform who gave their lives in service.

Memorial Day is a day to honor their memories, and to let their loved ones know our country has not forgotten them. I know my fellow Kentuckians agree that we are honored to fly the flag which these brave heroes sought to protect.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the importance of Memorial Day, a day that means so much to me, the Nation, and those I represent in Alaska. For many Alaskans, Memorial Day means the unofficial beginning of summer, sunlight, and enjoying the great outdoors.

But let us never forget the deep, true meaning of Memorial Day. It is about taking time to pay respect, and appreciating the sacrifices of men and women who have defended the rights and privileges we enjoy today. On this solemn day in which Americans unite to remember our Nation's fallen, we also pray for our military personnel and their families, our veterans, and all who have lost loved ones.

For over two centuries, brave men and women have laid down their lives in defense of our great Nation. These heroes have made the ultimate sacrifice so we may uphold the ideals we all cherish. Ordinary men and women of extraordinary courage have, since our earliest days, answered the call of duty with valor and unwavering devotion. America's sons and daughters have served with honor and distinction, securing our liberties and laying a foundation for lasting peace.

Memorial Day officially began nearly 100 years before Alaskan statehood, but even in our territorial days we had Alaskans who fought on our own soil against foreign enemies—one of the few States that can say such a thing. It is because of those early successes—and the success of Alaskans from then to those deployed today—that we salute our flag.

Although we may not be able to fully measure the cost of our heroes' sacrifice, we can commit ourselves to preserving their memory. So on Memorial Day 2013, I ask that we honor our fallen heroes, comfort the loved ones of those we lost, and carry on our lives in a manner that is worthy of their sacrifice. May God continue to bless our great Nation.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as Memorial Day 2013 approaches, as our fellow Americans are making plans to have cookouts, enjoy the outdoors, and spend precious time with their loved ones, I believe we should remember that the reason we are able to enjoy these moments is because of the military servicemembers who have given ''the last full measure of devotion'' in the service of our great Nation. From the American Revolution to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, brave young men and women have always answered the call to fight for our country and for our freedom. They have made many sacrifices, and as we remember in particular those who have fallen, I am inspired by their courage and dedication to freedom. The death of each one of these service men and women represents not only a tragic loss to their loved ones, but to their community and to the country.

This Memorial Day should be observed as a time for all Americans to reconnect with our history and core values by honoring those who gave their lives for the ideals we cherish. In addition to remembering the servicemembers who have fought and died in our Nation's wars, I believe that we must also take care of the servicemembers and veterans who are still with us. There are, regrettably, serious issues that still need to be addressed with regard to our military and veteran communities. Active-Duty military and veteran suicides are at record rates, Veterans Administration disability claims continue to be severely delayed, programs that assist discharged servicemembers transition to civilian life are still inadequate, and many of our servicemembers and veterans still lack the healthcare they need—and are entitled to—after a decade of war. I believe that we in the Congress must do everything we can do to remedy these problems. As George Washington famously said ''The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive veterans of early wars were treated and appreciated by our Nation.'' I believe this statement has added weight and meaning and truth with our

Nation's movement to an all-volunteer military after the Vietnam War.

With fewer than 1 percent of our Nation's population on active military duty, the gap between those who have served in uniform and those who have not has never been greater. These differences in life experiences have led to misguided perceptions of how each group views the other. The widening of this ''civilian-military gap'' makes it less likely that our servicemembers and veterans will properly reintegrate back into our society, and less likely that our best and brightest will pursue military service. As a society, we must address the problem. If we can't care for the service men and woman and their families who have made so many sacrifices on our behalf, then holidays such as Memorial Day end up having little relevance. One veteran I recently met with said to me, ''I fought proudly for my country in Afghanistan, but when I came back I didn't feel like I came back. I'm still waiting to feel like I came back.'' No American who has worn the uniform of this country should have to feel this way.

Memorial Day is a day we Americans hold close to our hearts because in the sometimes hectic pace of our daily lives, we can forget just how fortunate we are. Memorial Day reminds us. Throughout this holiday weekend we will see many American flags and flowers adorning the graves of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation. I will especially remember in my thoughts and prayers the 127 Marylanders who have been killed in our most recent conflicts, and I will remind myself that our freedom isn't free. And I will remember that the best way to honor their ultimate sacrifice is to ensure that we are unwavering in our support to care for those who do return to us wounded, ill, and injured. This Memorial Day, let us affirm our commitment to those who have returned from the fields of battle as the best way to honor their fallen comrades.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, it is important for the United States to continue its efforts to promote a close relationship with Puerto Rico and its citizens. That includes supporting a fair and democratic process for Puerto Ricans on the perennial and controversial issue of statehood.

I commend Puerto Rico's new Governor Alejandro Garcia Padilla on his work to tackle the current challenges facing the island, particularly on the economic front. Congress has long supported reciprocity between Puerto Rico and the United States, with very positive results. When the Puerto Rican economy flourishes, trade with the United States increases, helping promote job creation here at home.

I am disappointed the most recent budget proposal submitted to Congress by the White House recommends $2.5 million in fiscal year 2014 to conduct yet another referendum on Puerto Rico's political status. Allocating U.S. taxpayer dollars for this purpose is wasteful and unnecessary, since a plebiscite was just held in Puerto Rico last November on this very question.

The vote on Election Day specifically called for Puerto Ricans to express their views on the island's political status. Its backers sought to show that popular support exists for turning Puerto Rico into a State. But it is widely acknowledged that the ballot was not developed in a fair and inclusive manner. It instead presented statehood alternatives with a predetermined result in mind, to force Puerto Ricans toward an option they have rejected time and again, and to stack the deck in favor of statehood.

The first part of the ballot asked whether or not Puerto Rican voters wanted to continue their territorial status. The second portion then provided three different non-territorial alternatives: statehood, sovereign free associated state, or independence. Keeping the island's current Commonwealth status was not even listed as an option in the second round.

As expected, a slim majority—nearly 51.7 percent of the 1.9 million who voted—opted for changing the current status. However, in response to the second question, 834,191 voters chose statehood, 498,604 left the second question blank, 454,768 selected sovereign free associated state, and 74,895 favored independence. Any way you slice it, 1,028,267—or nearly 55 percent—of the Puerto Ricans who traveled to the polls voted for options other than statehood.

As Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, the first woman of Puerto Rican heritage elected to the United States House of Representatives, correctly pointed out: ''Casting a blank ballot is part of traditional form of objecting to an unfair process in Puerto Rican political history.'' In accordance with this tradition, the Commonwealth Party in Puerto Rico adopted a resolution calling on Puerto Rican voters to protest last November's plebiscite process by casting blank ballots.

When you include the nearly half a million voters who left the second question on the ballot blank, it is clear—despite the claims of some statehood proponents—that a majority of voters do not support statehood for Puerto Rico. In fact, more than 1 million, or nearly 55 percent, of Puerto Rican voters who participated in the plebiscite actually demonstrated support for something other than statehood.

A concurrent resolution was adopted last week by the legislature in Puerto Rico stating that the plebiscite on November 6, 2012, portrayed a false majority in favor of statehood and prevented an accurate vote on the option of Commonwealth status. I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of that resolution.

THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PUERTO RICO

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

THE CAPITOL

We, EDUARDO BHATIA-GAUTIER, President of the Senate, and JAIME R. PERELLÓ-BORRÁS, Speaker of the House of Representatives,

CERTIFY

That the Senate of Puerto Rico and the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico approved in final vote Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 24, introduced by Messrs. Nadal-Power and Rosa-Rodríguez and Co-sponsors Messrs. Fas-Alzamora, Tirado-Rivera, Bhatia-Gautier, Dalmau-Santiago, Torres-Torres; Mmes. López-León, González-López; Messrs. Nieves-Pérez, Péreira-Castillo, Rivera-Filomeno, Rodríguez-González, Rodríguez-Otero, Rodríguez-Valle, Ruiz-Nieves, Suárez-Cáceres, and Vargas-Morales and that the same reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

To inform the President and the Congress of the United States about the results of the plebiscite held on November 6, 2012, and support the request of the President of the United States of America for the Congress to appropriate $2.5 million to the State Elections Commission for a federally-sponsored plebiscite after conducting the appropriate voter education campaign, which incorporates all options, including the enhanced Commonwealth, based on the principles of fairness and equality; to authorize the disbursement of funds; and for other purposes.

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

On November 6, 2012 a plebiscite was held in Puerto Rico along with the general elections. The results of such plebiscite were inconclusive because none of the options on Puerto Rico's political status that received a majority of votes. Said plebiscite consisted of two separate questions, formulated by the preceding pro-statehood government administration, which favored statehood for Puerto Rico, in order to portray a false majority in favor of statehood and prevent such formula from competing against the Commonwealth option that had been favored by the people of Puerto Rico in all previously-held plebiscites.

The results were the following: the first question asked voters whether or not Puerto Rico should maintain its current form of political status. Nine hundred seventy thousand nine hundred ten (970,910), that is, fifty-one point seven percent (51.7%) of the people voted ''NO''; whereas eight hundred twenty-eight thousand seventy-seven (828,077), that is, forty-four point one percent (44.1%) of the people voted ''YES.'' However, a total of sixty-seven thousand two hundred sixty-seven (67,267) voters cast a blank ballot, which accounted for three point six percent (3.6%) of voters.

The second question asked voters to choose from options that excluded the current political status. Statehood received eight hundred thirty-four thousand one hundred ninety-one (834,191), or forty-four point four percent (44.4%) of the votes cast; sovereign free associated state received four hundred fifty-four thousand seven hundred sixty-eight (454,708), or twenty four point three percent (24.3%) of the votes cast; and independence received seventy four thousand eight hundred ninety-five (74,895), or four percent (4) of the votes cast. However, such question received a total of four hundred ninety-eight thousand six hundred four (498,604)blank votes, which accounted for twenty-six point live percent (26.5%) of the votes cast. These results should not surprise us, since the preceding Legislative Assembly approved the

plebiscite disregarding the procedural and substantive consensuses required to legitimize any plebiscite held.

The Party that supported the Commonwealth option, which was the political opposition at the time, objected this process. It also argued that the process was contrary to the provisions of H.R. 2499, as amended, approved by the United States House of Representatives, which included the Commonwealth among the options in the second question. Moreover, it stated that the process had been criticized by the White House because it was designed with the intent to conceal the true expression of the people of Puerto Rico.

Commonwealth supporters employed two methods to express their opposition. On the one hand, the Governing Board of the Party supporting the Commonwealth option adopted a resolution asking voters to protest the process by casting a blank ballot, On the other hand, a significant number of pro-Commonwealth leaders openly conducted campaigns in favor of the Sovereign Free Associated State option.

There is no doubt that the voters who wish to express their dissatisfaction with the proposals or the candidates in the ballot, traditionally do so by spoiling their ballots, casting a blank ballot, or voting for a fictional character.

If the United States Congress wishes to know the amount of Puerto Rican voters against statehood for Puerto Rico, the blank ballots should be taken into account because such votes clearly express the intent of voters against statehood. Thus, it should be understood that votes cast in favor of statehood did not exceed forty-four point four percent (44.4%), which shows a two percent (2%) decrease in the historical peak it achieved in 1998. In other words, fifty-five point six percent (55.6%) of Puerto Rican voters rejected statehood in the 2012 plebiscite.

Previously, in 1998, the pro-statehood party had also designed a unilateral and exclusionary plebiscite; nonetheless, voters had the option to vote for ''None of the Above.'' The ''None of the Above'' option received fifty point three percent (50.3%) of the votes cast, followed by Statehood and Independence, which received forty-six point five percent (46.5%) and two point five percent (2.5%) of the votes cast, respectively. The results of the 1998 plebiscite were consistent with those of the 1993 plebiscite, in which the Commonwealth option received forty-eight point six percent (48.6%) of the votes cast, whereas Statehood and Independence received forty-six point three percent (46.3%) and four point four percent (4.4%) of the votes cast, respectively. The only other event of this kind held since the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in 1952, took place in 1967. In the 1967 plebiscite, the Commonwealth received sixty point three percent (60.3%) of the votes cast, while Statehood received thirty-nine percent (39%).

Unfortunately, the preceding government administration in Puerto Rico, whose term ended in December 2012, failed to sponsor a process that would include the recommendations of the President's Task Force on Puerto Rico's Status appointed by President Barack Obama. Such Task Force proposed—on a Report released in March 2011—various methods to ask Puerto Ricans about their political status in a manner that is fair for the supporters of all options. Furthermore, it also failed to address the issue of Puerto Rico's political status in an inclusive and responsible manner,

On April 10, 2013, President Barack Obama included in the budget proposal for the fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of $2.5 million to the State Elections Commission in order to conduct a voter education campaign and a plebiscite which would include all constitutionally viable status options. The action taken by the President of the United States shows that the plebiscite designed by the preceding government administration lacks legitimacy or credibility before the government of the United States of America.

In light of the history of imposed and exclusionary plebiscites that only attest to our people's division with regard to this issue, it is necessary to inform the President and the Congress of the United States about the true results of the plebiscite held on November 6, 2012.

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

Section 1.—To inform the President and the Congress of the United States about the results of the plebiscite held on November 6, 2012, and support the request of the President of the United States of America for the Congress to appropriate $2.5 million to the State Elections Commission for a federally-sponsored plebiscite, after conducting the appropriate voter education campaign, which incorporates all options, including the enhanced Commonwealth, based on the principles of fairness and equality; to authorize the disbursement of funds; and for other purposes.

Section 2.—The results of the 2012 plebiscite were the following: in the first question, which asked voters whether or not Puerto Rico should continue to have its current form of political status, the ''NO'' option received fifty-three point nine percent (53.9%) of the votes cast, whereas the ''YES'' option received forty-six percent (46%). The results of the second question, which asked voters to choose from the options that did not included the current status, were the following: the statehood option received forty-four point four percent (44.4%) of the votes cast (834,191); the ''sovereign free associated state'' received twenty-four point three percent (24.3%) of the votes east (454,768); the independence option received four percent (4%) of the votes cast (74,895), and blank ballots accounted for twenty-six point five percent (26.5%) of the votes cast (498,604).

Section 3.—The foregoing shows that the representations made before the United States Congress stating that the statehood option was favored by the majority of Puerto Ricans, does not accurately reflect the results of the plebiscite on Puerto Rico's status held on November 6, 2012.

Section 4.—A copy of this Concurrent Resolution shall be delivered to the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State of the United States, to all the Members of the 113th United States Congress, as well as to all pertinent government and nongovernmental organizations, human rights organizations, and the local, national, and international media, among others.

Section 5.—A certified copy of this Concurrent Resolution shall be translated into English and delivered by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico to the members of the United States Congress.

Section 6.—This Concurrent Resolution shall take effect immediately after its approval.

In witness whereof we hereunto sign and affix the Seal of the Senate and the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico. Issued this Tuesday, 14th of May of 2013, at our offices at the Capitol Building, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

EDUARDO BHATIA-GAUTIER,
President of Senate.
JAIME R. PERELLÓ-BORRÁS,
Speaker of House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. SCOTT

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to take a few minutes to recognize a true American hero from my home State of Illinois. George W. Scott of Williamsville, IL, was an airman in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II and is a survivor of a group of airmen who were imprisoned at the Buchenwald Concentration Camp by the Nazi government.

Many people have heard of Buchenwald, one of the first and one of the largest concentration camps in Germany. But few people have heard the story of the Lost Airmen of Buchenwald, of which George was one.

In 1944, George was flying a Douglas A–20 Havoc aircraft barely 500 feet off the ground over France when he was shot down by German anti-aircraft guns. He was able to escape the aircraft before it crashed, and he escaped capture for a short time. George hid in bushes and in barns. He even milked a few cows for nourishment. He was fortunate to be taken in by a French family who provided food and shelter. But soon after, he was discovered by the Nazi patrols scouring France for resistance fighters or Allied soldiers and airmen.

George was transported to Buchenwald Concentration Camp in Germany, where he joined 168 Allied airmen from six countries. These airmen were not afforded the Prisoner of War protections outlined in The Hague and Geneva Conventions. Instead, they were classified as ''Terrorflieger,'' or terror flyers, considered criminals and spies, and were not given a trial.

At Buchenwald, the conditions were unimaginable. Many prisoners starved to death within 3 months of imprisonment. Prisoners were beaten, scarcely fed, and forced to work grueling shifts. But the Allied airmen organized themselves into units based on their nationality, appointed commanding officers, and instilled discipline and order. This self-imposed military hierarchy helped them to build morale, work as a team, and increase their chances of survival.

But those chances remained low. George and his fellow airmen were scheduled to be executed at Buchenwald on the orders of Adolf Hitler. Facing their impending execution, the airmen managed to pass a note detailing their captivity in the camp to the nearby Luftwaffe. After visiting the camp, German Luftwaffe officers demanded that the airmen be transferred to their custody. George and his fellow airmen were transferred to a POW camp and liberated when the Russian Army reached the camp in 1945.

It is a remarkable story and one that the U.S. Government kept quiet after the war. Yet George and his fellow airmen deserve immense credit and long-overdue recognition for their immeasurable contribution to the Allied war effort and their unimaginable pain and suffering.

When asked how George managed, at 19 years old, to survive in the unbearable conditions of Buchenwald, he says

that he thought often of his mother and maintained the resolve that ''every time they hit you, you just get back up.''

Now, some 69 years later, George lives just outside of my hometown of Springfield, in Williamsville, IL. He is blessed with a wonderful family, who is steeped in pride and loves him deeply.

I am particularly impressed by George's dedication to our nation, and I hope to express the thanks of a grateful Nation for his service. George is a shining example of the American ideal, fighting for what is right in the face of immense adversity.

REMEMBERING ANNE G. MURPHY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Ms. Anne G. Murphy.

Ms. Murphy, a Rhode Islander by birth and a strong advocate for the arts, passed away in April at the age of 74.

Throughout her distinguished lifetime and career, Ms. Murphy worked to defend Federal investments in the arts. After graduating from Rhode Island College in 1959, she volunteered on the presidential campaign of Senator John F. Kennedy and taught elementary school in Rhode Island before relocating to Washington, DC to work on the staffs of two Representatives from Rhode Island, Congressmen John Fogarty and Robert Tiernan. While in Congressman Fogarty's office, she helped contribute to legislation that led to the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA.

After leaving Capitol Hill, Ms. Murphy continued serving in the arts arena. She worked at both the NEA and the Public Broadcasting Service, and then joined the American Arts Alliance, where she served as executive director in the 1980s and early 1990s. As the leader of this major arts advocacy group, now known as the Performing Arts Alliance, Ms. Murphy defended arts programs from budget cuts and other attacks.

Ms. Murphy also served on the board of the Corcoran Gallery of Art and was a co-chair of the annual Washington Project for the Arts Gala. During the 2000s, she served as the director and co-chair of the nonprofit digital technologies research organization, Digital Promise.

I know how proud Congressman Tiernan remains of the important work that Anne did while working in his office and in her endeavors that followed in the arts community, and I want to share and echo his sentiments. We remember and thank Anne for her tireless efforts to support and protect federal investment in the arts. We are all beneficiaries of her advocacy.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES E. WELCH

• Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Charles E. Welch, who I have had the privilege of knowing for more than three decades. Known to his many friends as Chuck, he is a World War II veteran, humanitarian, lawyer and leader in the business community in the State of Delaware.

Born in 1925, Chuck is a native of Columbus, OH. He graduated with a B.S. in Business Administration in 1949 from The Ohio State University, 19 years ahead of me, and went on to receive his Juris Doctor in 1951 from the same institution. He served in the United States Army from 1943 to 1946 as a rifle platoon leader and later served as a company commander in the Judge Advocate General Corps from 1952 to 1955. During this time, he was also employed by the Ohio Tax Department as Chief Counsel from 1951 to 1958.

Chuck later moved to Delaware to work for the DuPont Company. There, he rose through the ranks and held the position of General Counsel until 1979 when he was appointed by DuPont CEO Irving S. Shapiro to the newly created position of Vice President for External Affairs. After a distinguished 26-year career with DuPont, Chuck retired from the company. He did not retire from an active life as a husband, father, grandfather and community leader. At an age when a lot of people are ready to slow down, Chuck picked up the pace.

Chuck's commitment to the community and State was demonstrated most clearly through his passion for education and helping the disabled. Chuck and his late wife Charma understood the struggles of special needs children and were the driving forces behind the development of The Mary Campbell Center, a remarkable facility for individuals with physical and cognitive disabilities. Chuck and Charma, who themselves were parents of a special needs child, had the shared vision to develop a safe, loving place for children and young adults, and since its opening in 1976, The Mary Campbell Center has touched the lives of literally thousands of people.

Chuck and Charma were the parents of six children: Ed, Patricia, John, Mary Beth, and the late Jeff and Charmie, the inspiration for The Mary Campbell Center. Chuck is now married to Barbara G. Welch.

In addition to his work with The Mary Campbell Center, Chuck was a member of the Mt. Pleasant Board of Education from 1967–1973, Chair of the Vocational Education Task Force in 1986, Chair of the Delaware Compensation Review Commission, Member of the Judicial Nominating Commission, Chair of the Committee to Reorganize Farmers Bank, Head of the Commission to study New Castle County Government, Director of the Wilmington Medical Center, Past President of the Delaware Foundation for Retarded Children and of United Cerebral Palsy, and was appointed by the Governor as President of the State Board of Education in 1986 where he served for 3 years. He was also a member of the committee for the Delaware Justice Center, President of the Rockledge Community Association and Chairman of the Advisory Board of The Mary Campbell Center where he continues to serve to this day.

Over the years, Chuck's guidance to both Democratic and Republican party leaders has proven pivotal to Delaware's success. He served as co-chair of Governor Mike Castle's transition team and a member of my transition team when I was elected Governor. For both Mike and me, Chuck has been an invaluable adviser and a wonderful friend.

Chuck's lifetime of serving others has attracted many prestigious awards and distinctions including The Marvel Cup from the Delaware State Chamber of Commerce, The J. Thompson Brown Award for Family Service, The Good Government Award from the Civic League for New Castle County, the Heart Association's Gilliam Award, an award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the First State Distinguished Service Award from the Delaware State Bar Association.

I am proud to congratulate my longtime friend on a lifetime of achievement. He is a role model for us all. The people of Delaware, and especially the many children and adults who have benefitted from his good work, are certainly fortunate to count Chuck as a fellow Delawarean. The First State is a far better place in which to live and work because of his stewardship and his leadership.•

CONGRATULATING STEVE McGOWAN

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate my friend Steve McGowan for receiving this year's Silver Buffalo Award from the Boy Scouts of America. This is the highest commendation Scouting extends to individuals for their distinguished service to the organization, and I am so proud that the Boy Scouts have honored Steve for his extraordinary efforts on their behalf.

Steve McGowan is a very successful lawyer in Charleston, WV, with the law firm of Steptoe & Johnson. And even though his law practice is demanding, Steve has devoted countless hours to the Boy Scouts of America as a volunteer. This should come as no surprise to anyone who knows Steve. He was, after all, an Eagle Scout long before he ever was a lawyer.

The Boy Scouts of America inaugurated the Silver Buffalo Award in 1926, and in its 87-year history only 732 awards have been presented. This year, Steve is one of 12 Americans chosen to receive the award—and the first ever from West Virginia to be so honored. And in receiving the Silver Buffalo Award, Steve now holds all three of the Boy Scouts highest commendations for

adult Scout leaders and volunteers, having already been awarded the Silver Beaver and Silver Antelope Awards.

Steve's background in Scouting was one of the reasons I reached out to him in 2007 when the Boy Scouts decided to move their National Jamboree from a Virginia military base to a permanent location. As Governor, I assembled a team of government officials and private volunteers to identify the best site in West Virginia and market it to the Boy Scouts. I called the group the West Virginia Project Arrow Task Force, and it was headed by Steve McGowan.

The competition with other States was tough. Proposals were submitted for 82 sites in 28 States. But with Steve as its chief, the West Virginia Project Arrow Task Force hit the bull's eye. The Boy Scouts chose a home in West Virginia—a 10,600-acre site in the New River Gorge, with easy access to whitewater rafting, hiking, bicycling and rock climbing.

And this July, this permanent new home for the National Jamboree, the Summit Bechtel National Family Scout Reserve, will welcome more than 40,000 Boy Scouts and their leaders from all across the country to their 10-day long gathering of Scouts. This is going to be a wonderful experience for the Scouts. But it's also going to be an unprecedented opportunity for the entire world to see West Virginia hospitality at its best.

Steve McGowan helped to make all of this happen. And on Friday, when he accepts his Silver Buffalo Award at the Boy Scouts of America National Annual Meeting in Dallas, I hope he will take a well-deserved bow for all his contributions to Scouting. The Boy Scouts oath begins with a promise to do one's best and to do one's duty to God and country, and that is a promise Steve McGowan has kept every day.

Again, I extend my sincerest congratulations to him on being honored with the Silver Buffalo Award, and I thank him for all he has done for the Boy Scouts of America, for God and country and for the great State of West Virginia.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL KEITH KLEMMER

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate Arkansas's native son, Col. Keith Klemmer, for attaining to the rank of Brigadier General. On June 1 of this year, Col. Klemmer will receive this well-deserved promotion to the rank of Brigadier General at a ceremony in Arkansas.

Colonel Klemmer has served in a variety of positions in the 39th Infantry Brigade, 142nd Fires Brigade, and 87th Troop Command including Battery Commander, Battalion S3, Battalion XO, Battalion Commander, Brigade FSO, Brigade XO, and Brigade Commander. He is a veteran of both Operation Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Colonel Klemmer entered Title 32 Active Guard/Reserve service as a full-time soldier in March 1994. His full-time assignments have included Battalion Training Officer, Battalion and Brigade Administrative Officer, Recruiting and Retention Executive Officer, Recruiting and Retention Manager, Deputy Property and Fiscal Officer for Arkansas, State Training Officer, and Chief of Staff for the Arkansas Army National Guard.

Since October of 2011, Colonel Klemmer has served as the Chief of Staff for the Arkansas Joint Force Headquarters, where he is responsible for synchronizing efforts of unit readiness, force structure, and the sustainment of the National Guard for mobilization and domestic missions, a position which he has commanded with distinction.

Colonel Klemmer is a graduate of Arkansas State University and received a master's degree from the United States Army War College in 2007. He has received numerous awards and decorations for his service to our country, which include two Bronze Star Medals, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Achievement Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Arkansas Commendation Medal, and the Ancient Order of Saint Barbara. His career has been so impressive that he was inducted into the Arkansas Recruiting and Retention Hall of Fame in 2003.

In addition to his excellent military career, Colonel Klemmer is also an assistant scoutmaster for the Boy Scouts, serves as a deacon at his church in Russellville, AK, and is often a featured speaker for numerous local Memorial Day and Veteran's Day events. He and his wife, Sandra, have raised two wonderful children, Rachel and Gunner. Rachel graduated Summa Cum Laude from Harding University in 2010 and served as an intern in my Washington, D.C. office, while Gunner is currently a Trustee Scholar at Harding University.

Colonel Klemmer is a valued servant to the people of Arkansas and the United States of America. Our State and Nation have been fortunate to have Colonel Klemmer's 30 years of service, and I can only hope he can serve another 30 years. I thank him again for his dedication and commitment to keeping our Nation and State safe.●

TRIBUTE TO NORM BROWNSTEIN

● Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today, I rise on behalf of Senator BENNET and myself to speak about a very special Coloradan on the occasion of his 70th birthday—Mr. Norm Brownstein. I am joined by two of my esteemed colleagues, who associate themselves with these remarks today: Majority Leader HARRY REID and my fellow Colorado senator MICHAEL BENNET.

Norm Brownstein is someone who many Americans may not know, but he is someone who has had an indelible effect on our Nation's public policy over the past several decades.

At root, Norm's story is an American success story. A Coloradan, a husband, a father of three, and a grandfather of four, Norm is someone who advocates passionately on behalf of the causes in which he believes. He is a man who rose from nothing to be involved at the apex of many of our country's most important political debates.

We are proud today to speak on the floor of the United States Senate on behalf of a man known by many of us as the ''101st Senator,'' to wish him a happy birthday, and, on behalf of so many of our colleagues, to let the American people know a little bit about this man.

The son of a Russian immigrant, and an orphan in his teenage years, Norm was not afforded the opportunities granted to many others who find success. And yet, despite his hardships, Norm excelled at academics, and, while working part time at a bicycle shop, became the first in his family to graduate from college. After getting his degree at the University of Colorado in Boulder, he went on to get a law degree there.

Norm may have done well in school, but in the late 1960s the Nation's top firms were not as hospitable as they should have been to talented Jewish lawyers. But that did not stop him. Norm and his childhood friend Steve Farber decided to open up their own firm in 1968 and away they went. Today, that firm—Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck—has 240 lawyers and consultants and 10 offices.

At first, Norm was not involved in politics—instead focusing on building his firm through real estate and other traditional legal work. But as Norm's legal practice grew, so too did his community involvement, as well as his interest in policy and politics.

Norm's firm already was involved very much in Denver and Colorado from a civic standpoint as well as with Colorado's political leaders. But Norm decided to take it to the next level and work with as many political leaders in the country as he could, both Democrats and Republicans. But, unlike so many who develop political relationships to pursue a narrow personal agenda, Norm pursued these political relationships based on his love of Israel and his desire to promote America's relationship with our most important ally in the Middle East. He joined the board of AIPAC, the American/Israel Public Affairs Committee, and if a Member of Congress supported Israel, Norm worked with that Member, to help them help the United States and Israel. This went on for decades. After a while, Norm knew so many Senators so well, he was presented in 2003 with a photograph of this Chamber, with the signature of every senator in the body at that time, to go with a plaque previously signed by several of our colleagues with the title ''our 101st Senator''.

Over the years, folks would ask for Norm's help in Washington, DC, and eventually he decided to open an office in Washington in the late-1990s. Like his challenging childhood, and his rough introduction to the legal community, Norm faced numerous obstacles in opening a DC office operating out of Denver. But as with everything else he set his mind to, this effort also thrived. Today, Brownstein's DC office has risen from a meager shop of two people in 1997 to being at the top of its field.

In a tribute to Norm's many decades of work and successes, the Smithsonian Institution recently honored him in a permanent exhibit displaying 89 Americans who have had a profound impact on America's politics and policy. His colleagues in this exhibit include a who's who of major American political figures and business leaders including: our former Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, the current House Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR, our current U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, the business icon and entrepreneur Steve Case, and the list goes on. It is not easy to be mentioned on a list of the most influential people in our Nation's political discourse when you are not in government. So it makes us proud that such a list would include a homegrown lawyer from Denver.

And through all of his policy and political work, Norm has always remained true to his core—helping Israel and helping the people of Colorado. For example, in our home State, Norm has worked with the U.S. Congress to, among other things: help the University of Colorado build its Health Sciences Center as well as obtain federal funding to research Down Syndrome; help the City of Denver obtain federal funding to build the Denver International Airport; and help National Jewish Health obtain federal funding for life saving respiratory projects.

This next example is instructive of where Norm's heart is—finding opportunities that intersect with good business, good public policy, and good benefits to everyday Americans. A number of years ago, some of our colleagues were talking about changing the laws involving foundations, because they thought there were a lot of abuses there. These were well-intentioned changes, but they would have prevented a particular philanthropist in Colorado from providing full-ride scholarship programs to students who could not otherwise afford to go to college in the State. Norm worked tirelessly on this issue. He educated numerous Members and staffs about the anomalous effect the pending proposals would have. His efforts led to a restructuring of the proposed law that allowed the bank that this philanthropist owned to stay private, and more importantly, stay involved. This bank is now the largest bank in Colorado, and it houses one of the largest scholarship programs in the United States—and literally thousands of students will get to go to college because of Norm Brownstein's work.

Norm's incredible life story is one that could and should be instructive to us in these partisan times. His talent and work ethic are enormous. His love of the United States and Israel is limitless. And his affection for so many of us here in Congress is 100 percent genuine. And while his passion for politics and public policy is boundless, Norm does not care if you are a Democrat or a Republican. Instead, he just cares about you the person. Partisanship is a dirty word to Norm. We should all take a page from his playbook.

There are many of us here in the Congress who know Norm Brownstein as a friend and we are truly blessed. We hope we have helped you get to know him a little bit better too. Happy birthday to a great Coloradan—and a truly great American.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. William, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3. An act to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes.

H.R. 271. An act to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1949. An act to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. DINGELL of Michigan.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 672(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission: Mr. Dov S. Zakheim of Silver Spring, Maryland, and Mr. Michael R. Higgins of Washington, DC.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 3 of the Protect Our Kids Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–275) the Minority Leader appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission to Eliminate Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities: Robert E. ''Bud'' Cramer of Huntsville, Alabama.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1949. An act to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 3. An act to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes.

H.R. 271. An act to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1628. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Immokalee, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1051)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1629. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Palm Beach, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0922)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1630. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Griffin, GA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1219)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1631. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of VOR Federal Airway V–595, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1004)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1632. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Areas R–6703A, B, C, D; and Establishment of Restricted Areas R–6703E, F, G, H, I, and H, J; WA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0371)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1633. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace, Omak, WA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1247)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1634. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Lakeview, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1254)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1635. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Astoria, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0853)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1636. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Portland-Hillsboro, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1142)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1637. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; St. Helena, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0283)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1638. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Caldwell, NJ'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0609)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1639. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Reading, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1270)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1640. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–266; AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1295)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1641. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Area R–6601; Fort A.P. Hill, VA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0561)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1642. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Sub-ACL (Annual Catch Limit) Harvested for Management Area 2'' (RIN0648–XC500) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1643. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries'' (RIN0648–XC593) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1644. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XC606) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1645. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XC605) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1646. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of Emergency Action to Establish Recreational Closure Authority Specific to Federal Waters Off Individual States for the Red Snapper Component of the Reef Fish Fishery'' (RIN0648–BD00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1647. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XC633) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1648. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries in the Western Pacific; American Samoa Pelagic Longline Limited Entry Program'' (RIN0648–XC629) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1649. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XC638) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1650. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic'' (RIN0648–BB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1651. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reassessment of Federal Communications Commission Radiofrequency Exposure Limits and Policies and Proposed Changes in the Commission's Rules Regarding Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields'' (FCC 13–39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1652. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 15, 74, 78, 87, 90 and 97 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Implementation of the Final Acts of the World Radiocommunications Conference (WRC, Geneva 2007), Other Allocation Issues and Related Rule Updates'' (FCC 12–140) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1653. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund; Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime'' ((RIN3060–AG49) (DA 13–564)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1654. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules'' (FCC 13–52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1655. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standards of Identity for Pisco and Cognac'' (RIN1513–AB91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1656. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13–065, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1657. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Announcement of Effective Date for Regulations Implementing the Defense Trade Cooperation Treaty between the United States and Australia'' (RIN1400–AD38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1658. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–071); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1659. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–062); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1660. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–059); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1661. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–035); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1662. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–039); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1663. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense 2013 Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Annual Reports (MARs); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1664. A communication from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Combating Terrorism Activities Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Estimates''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1665. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1666. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2012–0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1667. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA–2012–0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1668. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 99th Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1669. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Physical Protection of Irradiated Reactor Fuel in Transit'' (RIN3150–AI64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1670. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the Washington State Implementation Plan; Tacoma-Pierce County Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 9817–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1671. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status and Designation of Critical Habitat for Eriogonum codium (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and Physaria douglasii subsp. tuplashensis (White Bluffs Bladderpod)'' (RIN1018–AX72; RIN1018–AZ54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1672. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Eriogonum codium (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and Physaria douglasii subsp. tuplashensis (White Bluffs Bladderpod)'' (RIN1018–AZ54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1673. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for Eriogonum codium (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and Physaria douglasii subsp. tuplashensis (White Bluffs Bladderpod)'' (RIN1018–AX72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1674. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for 38 Species on Molokai, Lanai, and Maui'' (RIN1018–AX14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1675. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Report Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Rules on Determining Hearing Appearances'' (RIN0960–AH40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1676. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Assistance to Improve State Data Capacity—National Technical Assistance Center to Improve State Capacity to Accurately Collect and Report IDEA Data'' (CFDA No. 84.373Y) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1677. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013 and Management Report of final actions taken; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1678. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Copayments for Medications in 2013'' (RIN2900–AO58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1679. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1042)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1680. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1094)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1681. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0933)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1682. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0809)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1683. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0994)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1684. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0413)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1685. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0932)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1686. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0938)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1687. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0803)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1688. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0935)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1689. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0333)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1690. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0937)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1691. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1073)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1692. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0936)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1693. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2009–0288)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1694. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1297)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1695. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0307)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1696. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1087)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1697. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1014)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1698. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0630)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1699. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2009–0951)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1700. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0631)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1701. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0111)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1702. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1105)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1703. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0810)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1704. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1036)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1705. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–18033)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1706. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2004–180633)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1707. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0880)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1708. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls Royce Deutschland Ltd and Co KG Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1100)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1709. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1127)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1710. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0196)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1711. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Grob-Werke Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0013)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1712. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0306)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1713. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1131)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1714. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1217)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1715. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1148) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1716. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BRP–Powertrain GmbH and Co KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0263)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 2, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1717. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Kelowna Flightcraft R and D Ltd. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0330) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1718. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0348)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1719. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0773)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1720. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1303)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1721. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0817)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1722. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XC542) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1723. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions Nos. 1 and 2'' (RIN0648–XC631) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1724. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments'' (RIN0648–BD14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1725. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XC612) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1726. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2013 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish'' (RIN0648–XC626) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1727. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Exempted Fishery for the Spiny Dogfish Fishery in the Waters East and West of Cape Cod, MA'' (RIN0648–BC50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1728. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Final 2013–2015 Spiny Dogfish Fishery Specifications'' (RIN0648–BC85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1729. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan; Correcting Amendment'' (RIN0648–BC75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1730. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries'' (RIN0648–XC651) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1731. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule To Extend the Increase of the Commercial Annual Catch Limit for South Atlantic Yellowtail Snapper'' (RIN0648–BC59) received in the Office of

the President of the Senate on May 22, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Rachel Elise Barkow, of New York, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2017.

Charles R. Breyer, of California, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2015.

William H. Pryor, Jr., of Alabama, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2017.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1028. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor , and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. KING, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 1029. A bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KING):

S. 1030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an energy investment credit for energy storage property connected to the grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care through expanded health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1032. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Uniform Code of Military Justice related to sex-related offenses committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1033. A bill to authorize a grant program to promote physical education, activity, and fitness and nutrition, and to ensure healthy students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) (by request):

S. 1034. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1035. A bill to require an independent alternative analysis of the consideration of the use of targeted lethal force against a particular, known United States person knowingly engaged in acts of international terrorism against the United States and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. REID (for Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1036. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a partnership program in foreign languages; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1037. A bill to ensure adequate protection of the rights under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1038. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1039. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship to include spouses of members of the Armed Forces who die in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1040. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1041. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to afford crime victims' rights to victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1042. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide support to university law school programs that are designed to provide legal assistance to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 1043. A bill to promote innovative practices for the education of English learners and to help States and local educational agencies with English learner populations build capacity to ensure that English learners receive high-quality instruction that enables them to become proficient in English, access the academic content knowledge needed to meet State challenging academic content standards, and be prepared for postsecondary education and careers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1044. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D–Day, June 6, 1944; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1045. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1046. A bill to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1047. A bill to provide for the issuance and sale of a semipostal by the United States Postal Service to support effective programs targeted at improving permanency outcomes for youth in foster care; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. 1048. A bill to revoke the charters for the Federal National Mortgage Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation upon resolution of their obligations, to create a new Mortgage Finance Agency for the securitization of single family and multifamily mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1049. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JOHANNS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1050. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure the issuance of regulations applicable to the Coast Guard regarding consideration of a request for a permanent change of station or unit transfer submitted by a member of the Coast Guard who is the victim of a sexual assault; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 1051. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to ensure that footwear furnished or obtained by allowance for enlisted members of the Armed Forces upon their initial entry into the Armed Forces complies with domestic source requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1052. A bill to create and expand innovative teacher and principal preparation programs known as teacher and principal preparation academies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1053. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1054. A bill to establish Golf Butte National Conservation Area in Clark County, Nevada in order to conserve, protect, and enhance the cultural, archaeological, natural, wilderness, scientific, geological, historical, biological, wildlife, educational, and scenic resources of the area, to designate wilderness areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1055. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to establish the National Program for Arts and Technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

S. 1057. A bill to prohibit the use of unmanned aircraft systems by private persons to conduct surveillance of other private persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1058. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize per diem payments under comprehensive service programs for homeless veterans to furnish care to dependents of homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 1059. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem any person who has received an award from the Armed Forces of the United States for engagement in active combat or active participation in combat to have satisfied certain requirements for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1060. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate emergency medical services personnel training and certification curriculums for military veterans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1061. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to designate certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs as health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1062. A bill to improve quality and accountability for educator preparation programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1063. A bill to improve teacher quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1064. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1065. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to improve the quality of infant and toddler care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1066. A bill to allow certain student loan borrowers to refinance Federal student loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. REID, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COONS, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1067. A bill to establish within the Department of Education the Innovation Inspiration school grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1068. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1069. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1070. A bill to make it unlawful to alter or remove the unique equipment identification number of a mobile device; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1071. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make improvements to support facilities for National Historic Sites operated by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1072. A bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1073. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve the coordination of refinery outages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1074. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Easter Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1075. A bill to extend the phase-in of actuarial rates for flood insurance for certain properties under the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1076. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of monthly annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan to a supplemental or special needs trust established for the sole benefit of a disabled dependent child of a participant in the Survivor Benefit Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1077. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the reauthorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1078. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide certain TRICARE beneficiaries with the opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1079. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement to promote the artificial reefs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1080. A bill to amend and reauthorize certain provisions relating to Long Island Sound restoration and stewardship; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1081. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand and enhance authorities on protected communications of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1082. A bill to promote Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1083. A bill to provide high-quality public charter school options for students by enabling such public charter schools to expand and replicate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. Res. 153. A resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 154. A resolution supporting political reform in Iran and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. Res. 155. A resolution recognizing the City of Erie, Pennsylvania, for its critical role in the development and construction of the fleet of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry during the War of 1812; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. Res. 156. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the 10-year anniversary of NATO Allied Command Transformation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 157. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that telephone service must be improved in rural areas of the United States and that no entity may unreasonably discriminate against telephone users in those areas; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 158. A resolution to authorize the production of records by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit veterans who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces entitled to such travel.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the ''Doolittle Tokyo Raiders'', for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 415

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to clarify the collateral requirement for certain loans under section 7(d) of the Small Business Act, to address assistance to out-of-State small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 420

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to longstanding regulatory rule.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to establish pilot projects under the Medicare program to provide incentives for home health agencies to furnish remote patient monitoring services that reduce expenditures under such program.

S. 604

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, 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. 650

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers.

S. 674

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to require prompt responses from the heads of covered Federal agencies when the Secretary of Veterans Affairs requests information necessary to adjudicate claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

S. 699

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to reallocate Federal judgeships for the courts of appeals, and for other purposes.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 723

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 723, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 731, a bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on general risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to community banks.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 777

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to restore the previous policy regarding restrictions on use of Department of Defense medical facilities.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis

of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 820

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, and for other purposes.

S. 825

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 825, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 831

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 831, a bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations before December 31, 2017, under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 871

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 871, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance assistance for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013–2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 941

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 941, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent discriminatory misconduct against taxpayers by Federal officers and employees, and for other purposes.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 950

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 950, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 953, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 958

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 958, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level, and for other purposes.

S. 964

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 964, a bill to require a comprehensive review of the adequacy of the training, qualifications, and experience of the Department of Defense personnel responsible for sexual assault prevention and response for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 975

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 975, a bill to provide for the inclusion of court-appointed guardianship improvement and oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009.

S. 992

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 992, a bill to provide for offices on sexual assault prevention and response under the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, to require reports on additional offices and selection of sexual assault prevention and response personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 1006

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1006, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. 1009

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1009, a bill to reauthorize and modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1009, supra.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow credits for the purchase of franchises by veterans.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to protect individual privacy against unwarranted governmental intrusion through the use of the unmanned aerial vehicles commonly called drones, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 134

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 134, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that all incidents of abusive, unsanitary, or illegal health care practices should be condemned and prevented and the perpetrators should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

AMENDMENT NO. 953

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 953 proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 965

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 965 proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 978

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 978 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1026

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1026 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1027

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1027 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1057

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1057 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1075

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1075 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1077

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1077 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1079

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1079 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1088

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1088 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1092

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1092 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1104

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1104 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1106

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1106 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1115

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1115 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KING):

S. 1030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an energy investment credit for energy storage property connected to the grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am being joined by my colleagues Senators COLLINS, MERKLEY, and KING on the introduction of the Storage Technology for Renewable and Green Energy Act of 2013 or the STORAGE 2013 Act. The purpose of the bill is to promote the deployment of energy storage technologies to make the electric grid operate more efficiently and help manage intermittent renewable energy generation from wind, solar, and other sources that vary with the time of day and the weather.

Traditionally, peak demand has been met by building more generation and transmission facilities, many of which sit idle much of the time. The Electric Power Research Institute's White Paper on storage technology observed that 25 percent of the equipment and capacity of the U.S. electric distribution system and 10 percent of the generation and transmission system is needed less than 400 hours a year. Peak generation is also often met with the least efficient, most costly power plants. Energy storage systems offer an alternative to simply building more generation and transmission to meet peak demand because they allow the current system to meet peak demands by storing less expensive off-peak power, from the most cost-efficient plants, for use during peak demand.

The growth of renewable energy from wind and solar and other intermittent renewable sources, like wave and tidal energy, raises yet another challenge for the electric grid that storage can help address. These renewable sources deliver power at times of the day or night when they might not be needed or fluctuate with the weather. Energy storage technology allows these intermittent sources to store power as it is generated and allow it to be dispatched when it is most needed and in a predictable, steady of stream of electricity no longer at the vagaries of weather conditions. And equally important, it allows this intermittent generation to more closely match demand. Instead of trying to find a place to sell power at 3:00 am in the morning when demand is down, wind farms for example would be able to sell their power at 3:00 pm in the afternoon when demand is up.

The STORAGE 2013 Act is substantially similar to the STORAGE Act of 2011 I introduced last Congress. It offers investment tax credits for three categories of energy storage facilities that temporarily store energy for delivery or use at a later time. The bill is technology neutral and does not pick storage technology ''winners'' and ''losers'' either in terms of the storage technology that is used or in terms of the source of the energy that is stored. The electricity can come from a wind farm or it can come for a coal or nuclear plant. Pumped hydro, compressed air, batteries, flywheels, and thermal storage are all eligible technologies as are smart-grid enabled plug-in electric vehicles.

First, the STORAGE 2013 Act provides a 20 percent investment tax credit of up to $40 million per project for storage systems connected to the electric grid and distribution system. A total of $1.5 billion in these investment credits are available for these grid connected systems. Developers would have to apply to the Treasury Department and DOE for the credits, similar to the process used for the green energy manufacturing credits the ''48C'' program. This is a 20 percent credit so that means the actual cost of the project that would be eligible for the full credit would be $200 million.

The act also provides a 30 percent investment tax credit of up to $1 million per project to businesses for on-site storage, such as an ice-storage facility in on office building, where ice is made at night using low-cost, off-peak power and then used to help air-condition the building luring the day while reducing peak demand. This is a 30 percent credit so the cost of the actual projects that would get the full credit amount would be around $3.3 million.

One change from last year's version of the bill is that the minimum size for storage systems to be eligible for this credit is now 5 kWh, whereas it was 20 kWh before. 20 kWh is a reasonable size or industrial energy consumers and big-box stores, but a 5 kWh limit is a size that makes sense for small businesses. This change will allow small businesses to participate in pioneering storage on the grid, and will incentivize storage companies to create leasing models for residential users. Leasing models are proving very successful at increasing grid-connected residential solar, and this credit will open up a whole new market for storage to follow suit.

But if homeowners want to install storage on their own, they will be able to. The Act also provides for 30 percent tax credit for homeowners for on-site

storage projects to store off-peak electricity from solar panels or from the grid for later use during peak hours.

As the EPRI white paper noted ''(d)espite the large anticipated need for energy storage solutions within the electric enterprise, very few grid-integrated storage installations are in actual operation in the United States today.'' The purpose of the STORAGE 2013 Act is to help jump start the deployment of these storage solutions so that renewable energy technologies can increase their economic value to the electric grid while reducing their power integration costs as well as to improve the overall efficiency of the electrical system.

I urge my colleagues to take a closer look at what storage technologies can do to help reduce the cost of electricity and improve the performance of the electric grid and renewable energy technologies. If they do, I am confident my colleagues will join Senators COLLINS, MERKLEY, and KING in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

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. 1030

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 ''Storage Technology for Renewable and Green Energy Act of 2013'' or the ''STORAGE 2013 Act''.

SEC. 2. ENERGY INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR ENERGY STORAGE PROPERTY CONNECTED TO THE GRID.

(a) UP TO 20 PERCENT CREDIT ALLOWED.—Subparagraph (A) of section 48(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subclause (IV) of clause (i),

(2) by striking ''clause (i)'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''clause (i) or (ii)'',

(3) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and

(4) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) as provided in subsection (c)(5)(D), up to 20 percent in the case of qualified energy storage property, and''.

(b) QUALIFIED ENERGY STORAGE PROPERTY.—Subsection (c) of section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) QUALIFIED ENERGY STORAGE PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified energy storage property' means property—

''(i) which is directly connected to the electrical grid, and

''(ii) which is designed to receive electrical energy, to store such energy, and—

''(I) to convert such energy to electricity and deliver such electricity for sale, or

''(II) to use such energy to provide improved reliability or economic benefits to the grid.

Such term may include hydroelectric pumped storage and compressed air energy storage, regenerative fuel cells, batteries, superconducting magnetic energy storage, flywheels, thermal energy storage systems, and hydrogen storage, or combination thereof, or any other technologies as the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall determine.

''(B) MINIMUM CAPACITY.—The term 'qualified energy storage property' shall not include any property unless such property in aggregate has the ability to sustain a power rating of at least 1 megawatt for a minimum of 1 hour.

''(C) ELECTRICAL GRID.—The term 'electrical grid' means the system of generators, transmission lines, and distribution facilities which—

''(i) are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or State public utility commissions, or

''(ii) are owned by—

''(I) the Federal government,

''(II) a State or any political subdivision of a State,

''(III) an electric cooperative that is eligible for financing under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.), or

''(IV) any agency, authority, or instrumentality of any one or more of the entities described in subclause (I) or (II), or any corporation which is wholly owned, directly or indirectly, by any one or more of such entities.

''(D) ALLOCATION OF CREDITS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of qualified energy storage property placed in service during the taxable year, the credit otherwise determined under subsection (a) for such year with respect to such property shall not exceed the amount allocated to such project under clause (ii).

''(ii) NATIONAL LIMITATION AND ALLOCATION.—There is a qualified energy storage property investment credit limitation of $1,500,000,000. Such limitation shall be allocated by the Secretary among qualified energy storage property projects selected by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, for taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of the STORAGE 2013 Act, except that not more than $40,000,000 shall be allocated to any project for all such taxable years.

''(iii) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In making allocations under clause (ii), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall select only those projects which have a reasonable expectation of commercial viability, select projects representing a variety of technologies, applications, and project sizes, and give priority to projects which—

''(I) provide the greatest increase in reliability or the greatest economic benefit,

''(II) enable the greatest improvement in integration of renewable resources into the grid, or

''(III) enable the greatest increase in efficiency in operation of the grid.

''(iv) DEADLINES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—If a project which receives an allocation under clause (ii) is not placed in service within 2 years after the date of such allocation, such allocation shall be invalid.

''(II) SPECIAL RULE FOR HYDROELECTRIC PUMPED STORAGE.—Notwithstanding subclause (I), in the case of a hydroelectric pumped storage project, if such project has not received such permits or licenses as are determined necessary by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, within 3 years after the date of such allocation, begun construction within 5 years after the date of such allocation, and been placed in service within 8 years after the date of such allocation, such allocation shall be invalid.

''(III) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMPRESSED AIR ENERGY STORAGE.—Notwithstanding subclause (I), in the case of a compressed air energy storage project, if such project has not begun construction within 3 years after the date of the allocation and been placed in service within 5 years after the date of such allocation, such allocation shall be invalid.

''(IV) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may extend the 2-year period in subclause (I) or the periods described in subclauses (II) and (III) on a project-by-project basis if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, determines that there has been a good faith effort to begin construction or to place the project in service, whichever is applicable, and that any delay is caused by factors not in the taxpayer's control.

''(E) REVIEW AND REDISTRIBUTION.—

''(i) REVIEW.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the STORAGE 2013 Act, the Secretary shall review the credits allocated under subparagraph (D) as of the date of such review.

''(ii) REDISTRIBUTION.—Upon the review described in clause (i), the Secretary may reallocate credits allocated under subparagraph (D) if the Secretary determines that—

''(I) there is an insufficient quantity of qualifying applications for certification pending at the time of the review, or

''(II) any allocation made under subparagraph (D)(ii) has been revoked pursuant to subparagraph (D)(iv) because the project subject to such allocation has been delayed.

''(F) DISCLOSURE OF ALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall, upon making an allocation under subparagraph (D)(ii), publicly disclose the identity of the applicant, the location of the project, and the amount of the credit with respect to such applicant.

''(G) TERMINATION.—No credit shall be allocated under subparagraph (D) for any period ending after December 31, 2020.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after the date of the enactment of this Act, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SEC. 3. ENERGY STORAGE PROPERTY CONNECTED TO THE GRID ELIGIBLE FOR NEW CLEAN RENEWABLE ENERGY BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 54C(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) QUALIFIED RENEWABLE ENERGY FACILITY.—The term 'qualified renewable energy facility' means a facility which is—

''(A)(i) a qualified facility (as determined under section 45(d) without regard to paragraphs (8) and (10) thereof and to any placed in service date), or

''(ii) a qualified energy storage property (as defined in section 48(c)(5)), and

''(B) owned by a public power provider, a governmental body, or a cooperative electric company.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. ENERGY INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR ONSITE ENERGY STORAGE.

(a) CREDIT ALLOWED.—Clause (i) of section 48(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subclause (III),

(2) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subclause (IV), and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

''(V) qualified onsite energy storage property,''.

(b) QUALIFIED ONSITE ENERGY STORAGE PROPERTY.—Subsection (c) of section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) QUALIFIED ONSITE ENERGY STORAGE PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified onsite energy storage property' means property which—

''(i) provides supplemental energy to reduce peak energy requirements primarily on the same site where the property is located, or

''(ii) is designed and used primarily to receive and store, firm, or shape variable renewable or off-peak energy and to deliver such energy primarily for onsite consumption.

Such term may include thermal energy storage systems and property used to charge plug-in and hybrid electric vehicles if such property or vehicles are equipped with smart grid equipment or services which control time-of-day charging and discharging of such vehicles. Such term shall not include any property for which any other credit is allowed under this chapter.

''(B) MINIMUM CAPACITY.—The term 'qualified onsite energy storage property' shall not include any property unless such property in aggregate—

''(i) has the ability to store the energy equivalent of at least 5 kilowatt hours of energy, and

''(ii) has the ability to have an output of the energy equivalent of 1 kilowatts of electricity for a period of 5 hours.

''(C) LIMITATION.—In the case of qualified onsite energy storage property placed in service during the taxable year, the credit otherwise determined under subsection (a) for such year with respect to such property shall not exceed $1,000,000.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after the date of the enactment of this Act, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SEC. 5. CREDIT FOR RESIDENTIAL ENERGY STORAGE EQUIPMENT.

(a) CREDIT ALLOWED.—Subsection (a) of section 25D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting '', and'', and

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

''(6) 30 percent of the qualified residential energy storage equipment expenditures made by the taxpayer during such taxable year.''.

(b) QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL ENERGY STORAGE EQUIPMENT EXPENDITURES.—Section 25D(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) QUALIFIED RESIDENTIAL ENERGY STORAGE EQUIPMENT EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified residential energy storage equipment expenditure' means an expenditure for property—

''(A) which is installed in or on a dwelling unit located in the United States and owned and used by the taxpayer as the taxpayer's principal residence (within the meaning of section 121), or on property owned by the taxpayer on which such a dwelling unit is located,

''(B) which—

''(i) provides supplemental energy to reduce peak energy requirements primarily on the same site where the property is located, or

''(ii) is designed and used primarily to receive and store, firm, or shape variable renewable or off-peak energy and to deliver such energy primarily for onsite consumption, and

''(C) which—

''(i) has the ability to store the energy equivalent of at least 2 kilowatt hours of energy, and

''(ii) has the ability to have an output of the energy equivalent of 500 watts of electricity for a period of 4 hours.

Such term may include thermal energy storage systems and property used to charge plug-in and hybrid electric vehicles if such property or vehicles are equipped with smart grid equipment or services which control time-of-day charging and discharging of such vehicles. Such term shall not include any property for which any other credit is allowed under this chapter.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) (by request):

S. 1034. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, Senator INHOFE and I are introducing, by request, the administration's proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014. As is the case with any bill that is introduced by request, we introduce this bill for the purpose of placing the administration's proposals before Congress and the public without expressing our own views on the substance of these proposals. As Chairman and Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee, we look forward to giving the administration's requested legislation our most careful review and thoughtful consideration.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1038. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation in the Senate that would prohibit the use of racial profiling by Federal, State, or local law enforcement agencies. This legislation is entitled the End Racial Profiling Act, ERPA, 2013. I thank my colleagues who have joined me as original cosponsors of this legislation, including Senators DURBIN, BLUMENTHAL, COONS, HARKIN, MENENDEZ, STABENOW, LEVIN, MIKULSKI, WARREN, BOXER, GILLIBRAND, LAUTENBERG, and HIRONO.

Last year, the Nation's attention was riveted to the tragic, avoidable death of Trayvon Martin in Florida in February 2012. As we all know from the news, an unarmed Martin, 17, was shot in Sanford, FL, on his way home from a convenience store, while carrying a can of iced tea and a bag of skittles.

After the tragedy, I met with faith and civil rights groups at the Center for Urban Families in Baltimore to discuss the issue of racial profiling. Joining me were representatives from various faith and civil rights groups in Baltimore, as well as graduates from the center's program. I heard there first-hand accounts of typical American families that were victims of racial profiling. One young woman recounted going to a basketball game with her father, only to have her dad detained by police for no apparent reason other than the color of his skin.

That is why I was pleased that the Justice Department, under the supervision of Attorney General Eric Holder, announced a Civil Rights Division and FBI investigation into the shooting death of Trayvon Martin. I join all Americans in wanting a full and complete investigation into the shooting death of Trayvon Martin to ensure that justice is served. There are many questions that we need answered.

Was Trayvon targeted because he was black? The State of Florida has already charged the shooter with second-degree murder, and the defendant will be given a jury trial of his peers, which begins next month in State court.

Trayvon's tragic death leads to a discussion of the broader issue of racial profiling. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ending Racial Profiling in America'' in April 2012, which was chaired by Senator DURBIN.

At the hearing I was struck by the testimony of Ronald L. Davis, the Chief of Police of the City of East Palo Alto, CA. I want to quote part of Chief Davis' testimony, in which he stated that:

[T]here exists no national, standardized definition for racial profiling that prohibits all uses of race, national origin, and religion, except when describing a person. Consequently, many state and local policies define racial profiling as using race as the 'sole' basis for a stop or any police action. This definition is misleading in that it suggests using race as a factor for anything other than a description is justified, which it is not. Simply put, race is a descriptor not a predictor. To use race along with other salient descriptors when describing someone who just committed a crime is appropriate. However, when we deem a person to be suspicious or attach criminality to a person because of the color of his or her skin, the neighborhood they are walking in, or the clothing they are wearing, we are attempting to predict criminality. The problem with such predictions is that we are seldom right in our results and always wrong in our approach.

After the hearing I was joined at a press conference by Baltimore's Rev. Dr. Jamal Bryant, a leading youth activist and advisor to the Trayvon Martin family. He echoed the call to end racial profiling by law enforcement in America:

This piece of legislation being offered by my senator, Senator CARDIN, is the last missing piece for the civil rights bill from 1965 that says there ought to be equality regardless of one's gender or one's race. Racial

profiling is in fact an extension of racism in America that has been unaddressed and this brings closure to the divide in this country.

I have called for putting an end to racial profiling, a practice that singles out individuals based on race, ethnicity, national origin, or religion.

My legislation would protect minority communities by prohibiting the use of racial profiling by law enforcement officials.

First, the bill prohibits the use of racial profiling by all law enforcement agents, whether Federal, State, or local. Racial profiling is defined in a standard, consistent definition as the practice of a law enforcement agent relying on race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin as a factor in their investigations and activities. The legislation creates an exception for the use of these factors where there is trustworthy information, relevant to the locality and time frame, which links persons of a particular race, ethnicity, or national origin to an identified incident or scheme.

Law enforcement agencies would be prohibited from using racial profiling in criminal or routine law enforcement investigations, immigration enforcement, and national security cases.

Second, the bill would mandate training on racial profiling issues, and requires data collection by local and State law enforcement agencies.

Third, this bill would condition the receipt of Federal funds by state and local law enforcement on two grounds. First, under this bill, state and local law enforcement would have to ''maintain adequate policies and procedures designed to eliminate racial profiling.'' Second, they must ''eliminate any existing practices that permit or encourage racial profiling.''

Fourth, the bill would authorize the Justice Department to provide grants to State and local government to develop and implement best policing practices that would discourage racial profiling, such as early warning systems.

Finally, the bill would require the Attorney General to provide periodic reports to assess the nature of any ongoing discriminatory profiling practices.

The bill would also provide remedies for individuals who were harmed by racial profiling.

The legislation I introduce today is supported by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, NAACP, Rights Working Group, ACLU, and numerous other national, state, and local organizations.

Racial profiling is bad policy, but given the state of our budgets, it also diverts scarce resources from real law enforcement. Law enforcement officials nationwide already have tight budgets. The more resources spent investigating individuals because of their race, religion, national origin, or ethnicity, the fewer resources directed at suspects who are actually demonstrating illegal behavior.

Using racial profiling makes it less likely that certain affected communities will voluntarily cooperate with law enforcement and community policing efforts, making it harder for our law enforcement community to combat crimes and fight terrorism.

Minorities living and working in these communities in which racial profiling is used may also feel discouraged from traveling freely, which corrodes the public trust in government. This ultimately demonizes entire communities and perpetuates negative stereotypes based on an individual's race, ethnicity, or religion.

Racial profiling has no place in modern law enforcement. The vast majority of our law enforcement officials who put their lives on the line every day handle their jobs with professionalism, diligence, and fidelity to the rule of law.

However, Congress and the Justice Department can and should still take steps to prohibit racial profiling and finally root out its use.

I agree with Attorney General Holder's remarks to the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee where he stated:

> In this Nation, security and liberty are—at their best—partners, not enemies, in ensuring safety and opportunity for all . . . In this Nation, the document that sets forth the supreme law of the land—the Constitution—is meant to empower, not exclude . . . Racial profiling is wrong. It can leave a lasting scar on communities and individuals. And it is, quite simply, bad policing—whatever city, whatever state.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the ''equal protection of the laws'' to all Americans. Racial profiling is abhorrent to that principle, and should be ended once and for all.

As the late Senator Ted Kennedy often said, ''civil rights is the great unfinished business of America.'' Let us continue the fight here to make sure that we truly have equal justice under law for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1041. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to afford crime victims' rights to victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Military Crime Victims Rights Act of 2013. There are 26,000 victims of sexual assault in the military every year; at least last year there were that number estimated. But only a fraction, some 3,000-plus, were reported.

This measure encourages more accurate and complete reporting of all kinds, by guaranteeing all victims of crimes in the military the basic rights that victims have in civilian courts under current law. These rights are not a matter of discretion, they are a legal right that victims of crimes in our Federal courts enjoy. My proposal is essentially to apply these same rights, guarantee them, in the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice fails to afford these basic rights. They are rights of decency and fairness to crime victims. It requires many of these victims to endure humiliating and insulting obstacles in their quest for justice, so it naturally discourages them from coming forward and reporting these acts, most especially the act of sexual assault.

Those rights that I believe should be applied under the Uniform Code of Military Justice are, for example, the right to protection from the accused, notice and opportunity to speak at trial, the right against unreasonable delay in trial proceedings. Those are a few of the rights that would be guaranteed. They are standards of decency and fairness that are essential to effective prosecution and the goals of good order and discipline in the military.

These fundamental rights are well-established in the civilian courts and well-esteemed by prosecutors and defendants as well as the victims, because they enable the justice system to function more fairly and effectively. Few would imagine going into a civilian court in a criminal trial without the statutory right to be protected from the accused, protection against physical threats or intimidation. Few would imagine going into a civilian court and being denied the right to appear and to speak when one's history, one's personal and sexual history is an issue in the trial. Few would imagine the denial of a right to be heard in the course of sentencing. Few would imagine unreasonable delay and permission for the accused to actually leave the country and be unavailable for the trial and thereby have that unreasonable delay. Yet in the military court, these events are routine and expected. This bill would correct that failing.

There is no reason military sexual assault victims should be given less respect or fewer rights than civilian victims of the same offense. The key to deterring crime is prosecuting and punishing it effectively, which requires reporting by victims. More than reporting, it requires cooperation. We know for a fact that victims denied rights and respect will simply not report sexual assault in the military. They fear retaliation and discouragement of many kinds in reporting serious crimes of all kinds. If sexual assault is not reported, it cannot be prosecuted. If it is not prosecuted, it certainly cannot be punished or deterred.

I became involved in this issue of victims rights in the military because of a constituent who came forward to me. I became involved in her case because she was denied basic justice. Her case was delayed. She was a victim of sexual assault in the apartment of an officer stationed in Rhode Island. She never had the opportunity to speak in court in a timely way. Her credibility was directly put at issue. She had no opportunity to rebut, in effect, the charges

brought against her. So often the victim is the one on trial. So often she or he is forced to relive that brutal, vicious predatory act of criminal conduct simply to bring charges and seek justice.

She is seeking justice not only on her own behalf but on behalf of the Nation, because it is clearly the experience, as proven by solid evidence, that a sexual offender repeats that offense. The rate of recidivism is higher for sexual offenses than any other kind of crime.

Last year I requested that the Department of Defense investigate both their failures to afford victims the right to be heard during public proceedings and victims' rights to be free from unreasonable delay and the lack of remedies available to victims. The report I received as a result of that request explained, in February, that the Department of Defense does not include the full list of crime victims rights in its directive because it references a repealed statute, one from 1990, rather than the more recent one passed by Congress, the United States Justice for All Act of 2004.

That is why still today our military services, each of them, is operating on out-of-date and inadequate victim protection. The reason is not military necessity; it is simply ignoring the law that exists right now in spirit if not in letter. My bill would correct the letter of the law to guarantee these rights.

I appreciate the investigation conducted by the Department of Defense General Counsel Robert Taylor and the military's commitment to revising their out-of-date directives and instructions, but we need a statutory remedy now, so people whose rights are violated will have a remedy, so they will have a recourse and relief when their rights are violated.

This victims bill of rights has proved feasible and effective in the civilian justice proceedings involving the very same offenses.

The rights are not novel or untested, they are well established and esteemed.

I ask today for support from my colleagues in passing this measure. It is a basic, commonsense measure. It requires a military judge—just like their civilian counterparts—to take up and decide any motion asserting a victim's rights right away. It requires an ombudsman within the Department of Defense just like the ombudsman for crime victims' rights in the Department of Justice. It requires training for judge advocates and other appropriate members of the Armed Forces and personnel of the Department to assist them in responding more effectively to the needs of victims' rights. It requires trial counsel in a military case to advise the victim that he or she can seek the advice of their own attorney with respect to these rights.

We have an opportunity and an obligation to stand for those who stand for us and defend us, and I refuse to disappoint them. I look forward to working on enacting this proposal with my colleagues in the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. military. And I would welcome the views of the response systems panel established by Congress when they have views they wish to impart.

We have the best and strongest military force in the history of the world, in the history of our Nation. Our men and women in uniform deserve a military justice system worthy of their excellence.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1046. A bill to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SCHATZ. 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. 1046

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 ''Native American Veterans' Memorial Amendments Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS' MEMORIAL.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL.—Section 3 of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 80q–5 note; 108 Stat. 4067) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''within the interior structure of the facility'' and inserting ''on the property''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking '', in consultation with the Museum, is'' and inserting ''and the National Museum of the American Indian are''.

(b) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—Section 4(a) of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 80q–5 note; 108 Stat. 4067) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting ''AND NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN '' after ''AMERICAN INDIANS ''; and

(2) in the first sentence, by striking ''shall be solely'' and inserting ''and the National Museum of the American Indian shall be''.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 1051. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to ensure that footwear furnished or obtained by allowance for enlisted members of the Armed Forces upon their initial entry into the Armed Forces complies with domestic source requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bipartisan bill cosponsored by Senator KING that would ensure the Department of Defense provides military recruits with athletic footwear made in the U.S.A.

The Berry Amendment, established by Congress in 1941, requires the Department to give preference to clothing and other items made in the United States for any contract valued at $150,000 or more.

For decades, the military issued American-made uniforms, including athletic footwear, for our troops. However since fiscal year 2002, the purpose and intent of the Berry Amendment have been undermined by a change in DOD policy. The Army, Air Force, and the Navy now provide a cash voucher that incoming servicemembers use to purchase athletic footwear, without providing any preference for domestically manufactured footwear.

DOD claims that a soldier's individual purchase of athletic footwear with a DOD-provided cash allowance is not subject to the Berry Amendment because such individual purchases fall below the simplified acquisition threshold of $150,000.

Yet, the cash allowances provided with Federal funds for athletic shoes are valued at about $15 million annually, an amount that is 100 times the minimum contract value at which the Berry Amendment applies.

Like all other clothing items issued directly by the military services, athletic footwear should be made in the U.S.A. by American companies. It is time for DoD to treat athletic footware like every other uniform item, including boots, and buy them from American manufacturers.

This bill would require DOD to comply with the Berry Amendment for footwear either issued directly to or through a cash allowance to servicemembers upon initial entry into the Armed Forces. In other words, athletic footwear would be treated like boots and all other uniform items.

In the past, opponents of ensuring compliance with the Berry amendment have argued there is an insufficient domestic market for athletic shoes, that Berry compliant shoes somehow would not provide adequate comfort or safety, and that athletic shoes are not uniform items. None of these objections withstands scrutiny.

After the Senate Armed Services Committee required DOD to conduct a market survey to determine vendor interest, DOD found that vendor interest and capacity do exist to support a Berry compliant shoe market. The report also found that at least two American companies can produce high-quality Berry compliant footwear right now in the quantity and at the price point needed. Today, a 100 percent Berry compliant shoe is on the market at a price of $68, $6 less than the current Army allowance of $74, and without requiring waivers.

The comfort argument is also based on the unfounded premise that recruits somehow would not enjoy the same degree of comfort or safety with a Berry compliant shoe. Yet the military makes no distinction for boots or other uniform shoes, to no adverse effect upon recruits. To address this concern, however, the amendment would exempt servicemembers requiring a waiver for medical reasons.

Finally, I dispute the characterization that athletic shoes are not uniform items. Federal funds are used to

purchase the shoes, and recruits are required to wear them. If this is not a uniform item, why are we allocating Federal funding at all? I would also suggest that any initial entry trainee who arrives at a physical training formation without athletic shoes would also dispute the characterization.

This bill is consistent with several Congressional interventions that have corrected a pattern of Federal agencies ignoring or narrowly interpreting domestic sourcing statutes contrary to Congress's intent.

During the Senate Armed Services Committee markup of the fiscal year 2013 NDAA, the Committee unanimously adopted an amendment offered by Senator GRAHAM to require the fabric of clothing provided to Afghanistan security forces comply with the Berry Amendment without exception or exemption.

In July 2012, 12 Senators introduced legislation to require the United States Olympic Committee adopt a policy that ceremonial athletic uniforms, including accessories such as shoes, be produced in the United States.

If American-made uniforms are appropriate for U.S. Olympic athletes and Afghan security personnel, surely our servicemembers deserve the same. Federal funds for clothing worn by new recruits should benefit American workers and American companies rather than workers overseas.

This is about supporting American manufacturing jobs and having American soldiers fight and train in American-made footwear. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to provide military recruits with athletic footwear made in the U.S.A.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1053. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. 1053

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 ''Hospice Evaluation and Legitimate Payment Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. ENSURING TIMELY ACCESS TO HOSPICE CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1814(a)(7)(D)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(a)(7)(D)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) a hospice physician, nurse practitioner, clinical nurse specialist, or physician assistant (as those terms are defined in section 1861(aa)(5)), or other health professional (as designated by the Secretary), has a face-to-face encounter with the individual to determine continued eligibility of the individual for hospice care prior to the first 60-day period and each subsequent recertification under subparagraph (A)(ii) (or, in the case where a hospice program newly admits an individual who would be entering their first 60-day period or a subsequent hospice benefit period or where exceptional circumstances, as defined by the Secretary, may prevent a face-to-face encounter prior to the beginning of the hospice benefit period, not later than 7 calendar days after the individual's election under section 1812(d)(1) with respect to the hospice program) and attests that such visit took place (in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary); and''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on January 1, 2014, and applies to hospice care furnished on or after such date.

SEC. 3. RESTORING AND PROTECTING THE MEDICARE HOSPICE BENEFIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1814(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking ''not earlier than October 1, 2013, the Secretary shall, by regulation,'' and inserting ''subject to clause (iii), not earlier than the later of 2 years after the demonstration program under subparagraph (F) is completed or October 1, 2017, the Secretary shall, by regulation, preceded by a notice of the proposed regulation in the Federal Register and a period for public comment in accordance with section 1871(b)(1),''; and

(II) in the second sentence, by inserting '' and shall take into account the results of the evaluation conducted under subparagraph (F)(ii)'' before the period; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) The Secretary shall implement the revisions in payment pursuant to clause (i) unless the Secretary determines that the demonstration program under subparagraph (F) demonstrated that such revisions would adversely affect access to quality hospice care by beneficiaries under this title.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) HOSPICE PAYMENT REFORM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

''(i) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Before implementing any revisions to the methodology for determining the payment rates for routine home care and other services included in hospice care under subparagraph (D), the Secretary shall establish a Medicare Hospice Payment Reform demonstration program (in this subparagraph referred to as the 'demonstration program') to test such proposed revisions.

''(II) DURATION.—The demonstration program shall be conducted for a 2-year period beginning on or after October 1, 2013.

''(III) SCOPE.—Any certified hospice program may apply to participate in the demonstration program and the Secretary shall select not more than 15 such hospice programs to participate in the demonstration program.

''(IV) REPRESENTATIVE PARTICIPATION.—Hospice programs selected under subclause (III) to participate in the demonstration program shall include a representative cross-section of hospice programs throughout the United States, including programs located in urban and rural areas.

''(ii) EVALUATION AND REPORT.—

''(I) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the demonstration program. Such evaluation shall include an analysis of whether the use of the revised payment methodology under the demonstration program has improved the quality of patient care and access to hospice care for beneficiaries under this title and the impact of such payment revisions on hospice care providers, including the impact, if any, on the ability of hospice programs to furnish quality care to beneficiaries under this title.

''(II) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the completion of the demonstration program, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the evaluation conducted under subclause (I), together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(iii) BUDGET NEUTRALITY.—With respect to the 2-year period of the demonstration program, the Secretary shall ensure that revisions in payment implemented as part of the demonstration program shall result in the same estimated amount of aggregate payments under this title for hospice care for the programs participating in the demonstration as would have been made if the hospice programs had not participated in the demonstration program.''.

SEC. 4. HOSPICE SURVEY REQUIREMENT.

Section 1861(dd)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(dd)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) Any entity that is certified as a hospice program shall be subject to a standard survey by an appropriate State or local survey agency, or an approved accreditation agency, as determined by the Secretary, not less frequently than once every 36 months beginning 6 months after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph.''.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1054. A bill to establish Golf Butte National Conservation Area in Clark County, Nevada in order to conserve, protect, and enhance the cultural, archaeological, natural, wilderness, scientific, geological, historical, biological, wildlife, educational, and scenic resources of the area, to designate wilderness areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Gold Butte National Conservation Area Act of 2013. This legislation will designate the Gold Butte National Conservation Area in Southern Nevada and designate wilderness within Gold Butte.

I am proud to introduce this important bill, which has been in the making for at least a decade. The establishment of the Gold Butte National Conservation Area has been supported by Clark County, the City of Mesquite, Friends of Gold Butte, the Moapa Band of Paiutes, the Nevada Resort Association, and thousands of Nevadans.

By establishing the Gold Butte National Conservation Area as a unit of the National Landscape Conservation System, managed by the Bureau of Land Management, we will conserve, protect and enhance this unique part of Southern Nevada's landscape.

The proposed National Conservation Area is located in Clark County, south of the City of Mesquite and surrounded on three sides by the Lake Mead National Recreation Area and the Grand Canyon Parashant National Monument in Arizona. Gold Butte, deemed by locals as ''Nevada's piece of the Grand

Canyon'', is recognized for its amazing sandstone formations, critical habitat for desert tortoise, mining heritage and the ancient Native American rock art that is so prevalent throughout the area. The land is home to a number of rare plants and animals such as desert tortoise, desert bighorn sheep, golden eagles, and bear poppies. The legislation will also protect current uses which include camping, hunting, hiking and riding off-highway vehicles on previously designated routes.

Gold Butte is named for the mining town of the same name comprised of approximately 1,000 miners in the early 1900s. Long since abandoned, Gold Butte shows the remnants of an early pioneer history of ranching and mining. Even before the early settlers, however, Native Americans depended on this area. The evidence of ancient people can be found nearly everywhere in Gold Butte—petroglyphs, agave roasting pits, hunting blinds, rock shelters, stone tools, pottery shards and charcoal are found across the landscape.

For decades, the Gold Butte area has been a special place for those in the surrounding community. Over 10 years ago people started noticing the impacts of increased unmanaged visitation such as litter, fires, waste and degradation of cultural and natural resources. Unfortunately, these human impacts were becoming a common occurrence in Gold Butte. It was then that a group of conservationists, sportsmen, archaeologists, tribal members, ranchers and community members formed Friends of Gold Butte and started advocating for a higher level of protection for the area. Since 2000, Friends of Gold Butte has worked to create and shape a proposal for protection of these important resources.

The National Conservation Area will also benefit the local economy by bringing tourists and outdoor enthusiasts to explore the natural beauty of this desert landscape. Nevada already benefits from $14.9 billion annually in consumer spending directly related to the outdoor recreation industry, which directly supports 148,000 jobs. Designation of the Gold Butte National Conservation Area will draw more people to the area and bring in vital tourist dollars to the City of Mesquite and to Clark County.

The legislation also designates wilderness areas within the Gold Butte National Conservation Area. These wilderness areas provide key habitat for a number of critical species, protects the cultural resources and the many primitive places in Gold Butte.

The Gold Butte National Conservation Area Act is an ambitious piece of legislation, built on years of hard work by local advocates and stakeholder input. It protects vital natural and cultural resources and preserves an important area of recreation for future generations.

I understand that more work will need to be done on this bill and I anticipate feedback by stakeholders to improve the legislation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this important legislation through the legislative process.

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. 1054

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Gold Butte National Conservation Area Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA

Sec. 101. Establishment of Gold Butte National Conservation Area.
Sec. 102. Management of Conservation Area.
Sec. 103. General provisions.
Sec. 104. Gold Butte National Conservation Area Advisory Council.

TITLE II—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Sec. 201. Findings.
Sec. 202. Additions to National Wilderness Preservation System.
Sec. 203. Administration.
Sec. 204. Adjacent management.
Sec. 205. Military, law enforcement, and emergency overflights.
Sec. 206. Release of wilderness study areas.
Sec. 207. Native American cultural and religious uses.
Sec. 208. Wildlife management.
Sec. 209. Wildfire, insect, and disease management.
Sec. 210. Climatological data collection.
Sec. 211. National Park System land.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Relationship to Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
Sec. 302. Visitor center, research, and interpretation.
Sec. 303. Termination of withdrawal of Bureau of Land Management land.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the public land in southeastern Nevada generally known as ''Gold Butte'' is recognized for outstanding—

(A) scenic values;

(B) natural resources, including critical habitat, sensitive species, wildlife, desert tortoise habitat, and geology;

(C) historic resources, including historic mining, ranching and other western cultures, and pioneer activities; and

(D) cultural resources, including evidence of prehistoric habitation and rock art;

(2) Gold Butte has become a destination for diverse recreation opportunities, including camping, hiking, hunting, motorized recreation, and sightseeing.

(3) Gold Butte draws visitors from throughout the United States;

(4) Gold Butte provides important economic benefits to Mesquite and other nearby communities;

(5) inclusion of the Gold Butte National Conservation Area in the National Landscape Conservation System would provide increased opportunities for—

(A) interpretation of the diverse values of the area for the visiting public; and

(B) education and community outreach in the region; and

(6) designation of Gold Butte as a National Conservation Area will permanently protect the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources within the area.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term ''Advisory Council'' means the Gold Butte National Conservation Area Advisory Council established under section 104(a).

(2) CONSERVATION AREA.—The term ''Conservation Area'' means the Gold Butte National Conservation Area established by section 101(a).

(3) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(4) DESIGNATED ROUTE.—The term ''designated route'' means a road that is designated as open by the Route Designations for Selected Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Located in the Northeast Portion of the Las Vegas BLM District Environmental Assessment, NV–052–2006–0433.

(5) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''management plan'' means the management plan for the Conservation Area developed under section 102(b).

(6) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''Gold Butte National Conservation Area'' and dated May 23, 2013.

(7) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(10) WILDERNESS AREA.—The term ''wilderness area'' means a wilderness areas designated by section 202(a).

TITLE I—GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Gold Butte National Conservation Area in the State.

(b) AREA INCLUDED.—The Conservation Area shall consist of approximately 348,515 acres of public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the County, as generally depicted on the Map.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Conservation Area with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct minor errors in the map or legal description.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—A copy of the map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

SEC. 102. MANAGEMENT OF CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) PURPOSES.—In accordance with this title, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and other applicable laws, the Secretary shall manage the Conservation Area in a manner

that conserves, protects, and enhances the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources of the Conservation Area.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan for the long-term protection and management of the Conservation Area.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall prepare the management plan in consultation with the State, local and tribal government entities, the Advisory Council, and the public.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The management plan shall—

(A) describe the appropriate uses and management of the Conservation Area; and

(B) include a recommendation on interpretive and educational materials regarding the cultural and biological resources of the region within which the Conservation Area is located.

(4) INCORPORATION OF ROUTE DESIGNATIONS.—The management plan shall incorporate the decisions in the Route Designations for Selected Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Located in the Northeast Portion of the Las Vegas BLM District Environmental Assessment, NV–052–2006–0433.

(c) USES.—The Secretary shall allow only such uses of the Conservation Area that the Secretary determines would further the purpose of the Conservation Area described in subsection (a).

(d) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land or interests in land located within the boundary of the Conservation Area that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall become part of the Conservation Area and be managed as provided in subsection (a).

(e) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except in cases in which motorized vehicles are needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles shall be permitted only on designated routes.

(2) MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall annually—

(A) assess the effects of the use of motorized vehicles on designated routes; and

(B) in consultation with the Nevada Department of Wildlife, assess the effects of designated routes on wildlife and wildlife habitat to minimize environmental impacts and prevent damage to cultural and historical resources from the use of designated routes.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage designated routes in a manner that—

(i) is consistent with motorized and mechanized use of the designated routes that is authorized on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(ii) ensures the safety of the people that use the designated routes;

(iii) does not damage sensitive habitat or cultural or historical resources; and

(iv) provides for adaptive management of resources and restoration of damaged habitat or resources.

(B) REROUTING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A designated route may be temporarily closed or rerouted if the Secretary, in consultation with the State, the County, and the Advisory Council, subject to subparagraph (C), determines that—

(I) the designated route is having an adverse impact on—

(aa) sensitive habitat;

(bb) natural resources;

(cc) cultural resources; or

(dd) historical resources;

(II) the designated route threatens public safety;

(III) temporary closure of the designated route is necessary to repair—

(aa) the designated route; or

(bb) resource damage; or

(IV) modification of the designated route would not significantly affect access within the Conservation Area.

(ii) PRIORITY.—If the Secretary determines that the rerouting of a designated route is necessary under clause (i), the Secretary may give priority to existing roads designated as closed.

(iii) DURATION.—A designated route that is temporarily closed under clause (i) shall remain closed only until the date on which the resource or public safety issue that led to the temporary closure has been resolved.

(C) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide information to the public regarding any designated routes that are open, have been rerouted, or are temporarily closed through—

(i) use of appropriate signage within the Conservation Area; and

(ii) the distribution of maps, safety education materials, law enforcement, and other information considered to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(4) NO EFFECT ON NON-FEDERAL LAND OR INTERESTS IN NON-FEDERAL LAND.—Nothing in this section affects ownership, management, or other rights relating to non-Federal land or interests in non-Federal land.

(5) MAP ON FILE.—The Secretary shall keep a current map on file at the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(6) ROAD CONSTRUCTION.—Except as necessary for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the Secretary shall not construct any permanent or temporary road within the Conservation Area after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM.—The Conservation Area shall be administered as a component of the National Landscape Conservation System.

(g) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife, including hunting, fishing, and trapping in the Conservation Area.

SEC. 103. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The establishment of the Conservation Area shall not create an express or implied protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Conservation Area.

(2) PRIVATE LAND.—If the use of, or conduct of an activity on, private land that shares a boundary with the Conservation Area is consistent with applicable law, nothing in this title concerning the establishment of the Conservation Area prohibits or limits the use or conduct of the activity.

(b) WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights, all public land within the Conservation Area, including any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States within the Conservation Area after the date of enactment of this Act, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(c) SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The establishment of the Conservation Area shall not affect the management status of any area within the boundary of the Conservation Area that is protected under the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

(2) CONFLICT OF LAWS.—If there is a conflict between the laws applicable to an area described in paragraph (1) and this title, the more restrictive provision shall control.

SEC. 104. GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an advisory council, to be known as the ''Gold Butte National Conservation Area Advisory Council''.

(b) DUTIES.—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to the preparation and implementation of the management plan.

(c) APPLICABLE LAW.—The Advisory Council shall be subject to—

(1) the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(d) MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Council shall include 13 members to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom, to the extent practicable—

(A) 4 members shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Mesquite, Nevada, City Council;

(B) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Bunkerville, Nevada, Town Advisory Board;

(C) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Moapa Valley, Nevada, Town Advisory Board;

(D) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Moapa, Nevada, Town Advisory Board;

(E) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Moapa Band of Paiutes Tribal Council; and

(F) 5 at-large members from the County shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the County Commission.

(2) SPECIAL APPOINTMENT CONSIDERATIONS.—The at-large members appointed under paragraph (1)(F) shall have backgrounds that reflect—

(A) the purposes for which the Conservation Area was established; and

(B) the interests of persons affected by the planning and management of the Conservation Area.

(3) REPRESENTATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the membership of the Advisory Council is fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed by the Advisory Council.

(4) INITIAL APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the Advisory Council in accordance with paragraph (1).

(e) DUTIES OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to the preparation and implementation of the management plan, including budgetary matters relating to the Conservation Area.

(f) COMPENSATION.—.Members of the Advisory Council shall receive no compensation for serving on the Advisory Council.

(g) CHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Council shall elect a Chairperson from among the members of the Advisory Council.

(2) TERM.—The term of the Chairperson shall be 3 years.

(h) TERM OF MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term of a member of the Advisory Council shall be 3 years.

(2) SUCCESSORS.—Notwithstanding the expiration of a 3-year term of a member of the Advisory Council, a member may continue to serve on the Advisory Council until a successor is appointed.

(i) VACANCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy on the Advisory Council shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(2) APPOINTMENT FOR REMAINDER OF TERM.—A member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Advisory Council shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor was appointed.

(j) TERMINATION.—The Advisory Council shall terminate not later than 3 years after the date on which the final version of the management plan is published.

TITLE II—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, and National Park Service in the County contains unique and spectacular natural, cultural, and historical resources, including—

(A) priceless habitat for numerous species of plants and wildlife;

(B) thousands of acres of land that remain in a natural state; and

(C) numerous sites containing significant cultural and historical artifacts; and

(2) continued preservation of the public land would benefit the County and all of the United States by—

(A) ensuring the conservation of ecologically diverse habitat;

(B) protecting prehistoric cultural resources;

(C) conserving primitive recreational resources; and

(D) protecting air and water quality.

SEC. 202. ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) ADDITIONS.—In furtherance of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following public land administered by the National Park Service or the Bureau of Land Management in the County is designated as wilderness and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) VIRGIN PEAK WILDERNESS.—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 18,296 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Virgin Peak Wilderness''.

(2) BLACK RIDGE WILDERNESS.—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 18,192 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Black Ridge Wilderness''.

(3) BITTER RIDGE NORTH WILDERNESS.—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 15,114 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Bitter Ridge North Wilderness''.

(4) BITTER RIDGE SOUTH WILDERNESS.—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 12,646 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Bitter Ridge Wilderness''.

(5) BILLY GOAT PEAK WILDERNESS.—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 30,460 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Billy Goat Peak Wilderness''.

(6) MILLION HILLS WILDERNESS.—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 24,818 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Million Hills Wilderness''.

(7) OVERTON WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 23,227 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Overton Wilderness''.

(8) TWIN SPRINGS WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 9,684 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Twin Springs Wilderness''.

(9) SCANLON WASH WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 22,826 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Scanlon Wash Wilderness''.

(10) HILLER MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 14,832 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Hiller Mountains Wilderness''.

(11) HELL'S KITCHEN WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 12,439 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Hell's Kitchen Wilderness''.

(12) INDIAN HILLS WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 8,955 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the ''Indian Hills Wilderness''.

(13) LIME CANYON WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 10,069 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which is incorporated in, and shall be managed as part of, the ''Lime Canyon Wilderness'' designated by section 202(a)(9) of the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 107–282).

(b) NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM.—The wilderness areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management shall be administered as components of the National Landscape Conservation System.

(c) ROAD OFFSET.—The boundary of any portion of a wilderness area that is bordered by a road shall be at least 100 feet away from the centerline of the road so as not to interfere with public access.

(d) LAKE OFFSET.—The boundary of any portion of a wilderness area that is bordered by Lake Mead or the Colorado River shall be 300 feet inland from the high water line.

(e) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of each wilderness area with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) EFFECT.—Each map and legal description under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

SEC. 203. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any reference in that Act to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary.

(b) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land or interest in land within the boundaries of a wilderness area that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall be added to, and administered as part of, the wilderness area within which the acquired land or interest is located.

(c) WATER RIGHTS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the land designated as a wilderness area—

(i) is within the Mojave Desert;

(ii) is arid in nature; and

(iii) includes ephemeral streams;

(B) the hydrology of the land designated as a wilderness area is locally characterized by complex flow patterns and alluvial fans with impermanent channels;

(C) the subsurface hydrogeology of the region within which the land designated as a wilderness area is located is characterized by ground water subject to local and regional flow gradients and artesian aquifers;

(D) the land designated as a wilderness area is generally not suitable for use or development of new water resource facilities;

(E) there are no actual or proposed water resource facilities and no opportunities for diversion, storage, or other uses of water occurring outside the land designated as a wilderness area that would adversely affect the wilderness or other values of the land; and

(F) because of the unique nature and hydrology of the desert land designated as a wilderness area and the existence of the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan, it is possible to provide for proper management and protection of the wilderness, perennial springs, and other values of the land in ways different than the methods used in other laws.

(2) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) NO RESERVATION.—Nothing in this title constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the land designated as a wilderness area.

(B) STATE RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title affects any water rights in the State existing on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water rights held by the United States.

(C) NO PRECEDENT.—Nothing in this subsection establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations.

(D) NO EFFECT ON COMPACTS.—Nothing in this title limits, alters, modifies, or amends any of the interstate compacts or equitable apportionment decrees that apportion water among and between the State and other States.

(E) CLARK COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN.—Nothing in this title limits, alters, modifies, or amends the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan with respect to the land designated as a wilderness area, including specific management actions for the conservation of perennial springs.

(3) NEVADA WATER LAW.—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the land designated as a wilderness area.

(4) NEW PROJECTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term ''water resource facility'' means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, and transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—In this paragraph, the term ''water resource facility'' does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(B) NO LICENSES OR PERMITS.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, on and after the date of enactment of this Act, neither the President nor any other officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the land designated as a wilderness area.

(d) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, any Federal land within the wilderness areas, including any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States within the Conservation Area after the date of enactment of this Act, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 204. ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.

(a) NO BUFFER ZONES.—Congress does not intend for the designation of land as wilderness areas to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the wilderness areas.

(b) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a wilderness area shall not preclude the conduct of those activities or uses outside the boundary of the wilderness area.

SEC. 205. MILITARY, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND EMERGENCY OVERFLIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act restricts or precludes—

(1) low-level overflights of military, law enforcement, or emergency medical services aircraft over the area designated as wilderness by this Act, including military, law enforcement, or emergency medical services overflights that can be seen or heard within the wilderness area;

(2) flight testing and evaluation; or

(3) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military, law enforcement, or emergency medical services flight training routes, over the wilderness area.

SEC. 206. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), the Bureau of Land Management land in any portion of the wilderness study areas located within the Conservation Area not designated as a wilderness area has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) RELEASE.—Any Bureau of Land Management land described in subsection (a) that is not designated as a wilderness area—

(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c));

(2) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the land management plans adopted under section 202 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1712); and

(B) cooperative conservation agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) shall be subject to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 207. NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.

Nothing in this title diminishes—

(1) the rights of any Indian tribe; or

(2) tribal rights regarding access to Federal land for tribal activities, including spiritual, cultural, and traditional food-gathering activities.

SEC. 208. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this title affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the wilderness areas.

(b) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), management activities to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support the populations may be carried out within the wilderness areas, if the activities—

(A) are consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) are carried out in accordance with appropriate policies, such as those set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101–405.

(2) USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—The management activities under paragraph (1) may include the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles, if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would—

(A) promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values; and

(B) accomplish the purposes described in subparagraph (A) with the minimum impact necessary to reasonably accomplish the task.

(c) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with appropriate policies such as those set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101–405, the State may continue to use aircraft (including helicopters) to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife populations, including bighorn sheep, and feral stock, horses, and burros.

(d) WILDLIFE WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Subject to subsection (f), the Secretary shall authorize structures and facilities, including existing structures and facilities, for wildlife water development projects, including guzzlers, in the wilderness areas if—

(1) the structures and facilities will, as determined by the Secretary, enhance wilderness values by promoting healthy, viable and more naturally distributed wildlife populations; and

(2) the visual impacts of the structures and facilities on the wilderness areas can reasonably be minimized.

(e) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may designate, by regulation, areas in which, and establish periods during which, for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws, no hunting, fishing, or trapping will be permitted in the wilderness areas.

(2) CONSULTATION.—Except in emergencies, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate State agency before promulgating regulations under paragraph (1).

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the wilderness areas—

(1) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the cooperative agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled ''Memorandum of Understanding between the Bureau of Land Management and the Nevada Department of Wildlife Supplement No. 9'' and signed November and December 2003, including any amendments to the cooperative agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State; and

(2) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

SEC. 209. WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take such measures in each wilderness area as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases (including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency).

(b) EFFECT.—Nothing in this Act precludes a Federal, State, or local agency from conducting wildfire management operations (including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment) in accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)).

SEC. 210. CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA COLLECTION.

Subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require, nothing in this title precludes the installation and maintenance of hydrologic, meteorologic, or climatological collection devices in the wilderness areas if the facilities and access to the facilities are essential to flood warning, flood control, and water reservoir operation activities.

SEC. 211. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM LAND.

To the extent any of the provisions of this title are in conflict with laws (including regulations) or management policies applicable to Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area designated as a wilderness area, the laws (including regulations) or policies shall control.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. RELATIONSHIP TO CLARK COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act limits, alters, modifies, or amends the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan with respect to the Conservation Area and the wilderness areas, including the specific management actions contained in the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan for the conservation of perennial springs.

(b) CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREAS.—The Secretary shall credit the Conservation Area and the wilderness areas as Conservation Management Areas, as may be required by the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (including amendments to the plan).

(c) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—In developing the management plan, to the extent consistent with this section, the Secretary may incorporate any provision of the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

SEC. 302. VISITOR CENTER, RESEARCH, AND INTERPRETATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, may establish, in cooperation with any other public or private entities that the Secretary may determine to be appropriate, a visitor center and field office in Mesquite, Nevada—

(1) to serve visitors; and

(2) to assist in fulfilling the purposes of—

(A) the Lake Mead National Recreation Area;

(B) the Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument; and

(C) the Conservation Area.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the visitor center authorized under subsection (a) is designed—

(1) to interpret the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources of each of the areas described in that subsection; and

(2) to serve as an interagency field office for each of the areas described in that subsection.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may, in a manner consistent with this Act, enter into cooperative agreements with the State, the State of Arizona, and any other appropriate institutions and organizations to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 303. TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.

(a) TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL.—The withdrawal of the parcels of Bureau of Land Management land described in subsection (b) for use by the Bureau of Reclamation is terminated.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcels of land referred to in subsection (a) consist of the Bureau of Land Management land identified on the Map as ''Transfer from BOR to BLM''.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the land reverting to the Bureau of Land Management under subsection (a).

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the Map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The Map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 1059. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem any person who has received an award from the Armed Forces of the United States for engagement in active combat or active participation in combat to have satisfied certain requirements for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that waives the naturalization requirements for non-citizen recipients of our armed forces' combat service awards. When a soldier, sailor, airman, or marine puts their life on the line for the United States, it only makes sense that we reciprocate their commitment to this nation by awarding these heroes U.S. citizenship as expeditiously as possible.

These awards include the Combat Infantryman Badge, the Combat Medical Badge, the Combat Action Badge, the Combat Action Ribbon, the Air Force Combat Action Medal, or any equivalent award recipients. They recognize a servicemember's presence under hostile fire or engagement in combat missions.

According to the Center for Naval Analysis, roughly 70,000 non-citizens enlisted in the active duty military between 1999 and 2008. These men and women have served in Operations New Dawn and Iraqi Freedom, and continue to serve today in Operation Enduring Freedom and elsewhere around the world.

The contributions of these men and women to the character of our military are unquestionable, and they possess language and cultural skills that are critical to the Department of Defense's mission. This legislation honors their service, and I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1062. A bill to improve quality and accountability for educator preparation programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we rely on our public schools to prepare the next generation for success as citizens, workers, and innovators. We have asked educators to raise the bar and educate all students to internationally competitive college and career-ready standards. To achieve these goals, we need to focus on the professionals who have the greatest impact on student learning at school—teachers and principals.

Today, I am pleased to be reintroducing the Educator Preparation Reform Act with Representative HONDA to improve how we prepare teachers, principals, and other educators so that they can be effective right from the start. We have also reintroduced the Effective Teaching and Leading Act to support teachers, librarians, and principals currently on the job through a comprehensive system of induction, professional development, and evaluation.

The Educator Preparation Reform Act builds on the success of the Teacher Quality Partnership Program, which I helped author in the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The legislation we are reintroducing today places specific attention and emphasis on principals with the addition of a residency program for new principals.

Improving instruction is a team effort, with principals at the helm. This bill better connects teacher preparation with principal preparation. The Educator Preparation Reform Act will also allow partnerships to develop preparation programs for other areas of instructional need, such as for school librarians, counselors, or other academic support professionals.

The bill also revamps the accountability and reporting requirements for teacher preparation programs to provide greater transparency on key quality measures such as admissions standards, requirements for clinical practice, placement of graduates, retention in the field of teaching, and teacher performance, including student learning outcomes. All programs—whether traditional or alternative routes to certification—will be asked to report on the same measures.

Under our legislation, states will be required to identify at-risk and low-performing programs and provide them with technical assistance and a timeline for improvement. States would be encouraged to close programs that do not improve.

The Educator Preparation Reform Act refocuses the state set-aside for higher education in Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on technical assistance for struggling teacher preparation programs and the development of systems for assessing the quality and effectiveness of professional development programs. At the same time, it allows for activities to support the development and implementation of performance assessments to measure new teachers' readiness for the classroom and enhance professional development in the core academic areas.

We have been fortunate to work with many stakeholders on this legislation. Organizations that have endorsed the Educator Preparation Reform Act include: The Alliance for Excellent Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, American Psychological Association, Association of American Universities, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, First Focus Campaign for Children, Higher Education Consortium for Special Education, Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of State Directors of Special Education, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Science Teachers Association, National School Boards Association Opportunity to Learn Action Fund, Public Education Network, Rural School and Community Trust, Silicon Valley Education Foundation, Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, The Higher Education Task Force, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and National Association of Secondary School Principals.

I look forward to working to incorporate this legislation into the upcoming reauthorizations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act. I urge my colleagues to join in this effort and support this legislation.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1063. A bill to improve teacher quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Effective Teaching and Leading Act to foster the development of highly skilled and effective educators.

In the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, building the capacity of our Nation's schools to enhance the effectiveness of teachers, principals, school librarians, and other school leaders must be among our top priorities.

Decades of research have demonstrated that improving educator and principal quality as well as greater family involvement are the keys to raising student achievement and turning around struggling schools. To strengthen teaching and school leadership, the Effective Teaching and Leading Act would amend Title II of ESEA to provide targeted assistance to

schools to develop and support effective teachers, principals, school librarians, and school leaders through implementation of comprehensive induction, professional development, and evaluation systems.

Every year across the country thousands of teachers leave the profession—many within their first years of teaching. An estimate by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future of the nationwide cost of replacing public school teachers who have dropped out of the profession is $7.3 billion annually.

There are proven and well-documented strategies to support teachers that will keep them in our schools. Evidence has shown that providing teachers with comprehensive mentoring and support during their first two years of teaching reduces attrition by as much as half and increases student learning gains. The Effective Teaching and Leading Act would help schools implement the key elements of effective multi-year mentoring and induction for beginning teachers.

The bill also significantly revises the definition of ''professional development'' in current law to foster an ongoing culture of teacher, principal, school librarian, and staff collaboration throughout schools. All too often the available professional development still consists of isolated, check-the-box activities instead of helping educators engage in sustained professional learning that is regularly evaluated for its impact on classroom practice and student achievement. Effective professional development is collaborative, job-embedded, and informed by data.

It is also clear that evaluation systems have an important role to play in educator development. Through Race to the Top, ESEA waivers, and other initiatives many states and school systems are focusing on reforming their evaluation systems. When evaluation is done right, it provides educators with individualized ongoing feedback on their strengths and weaknesses and offers a path to improvement. The Effective Teaching and Leading Act would require school districts to establish rigorous, fair, and transparent evaluation systems that use multiple measures, including growth in student achievement.

Principals and school leaders also play a leading role in school improvement efforts and managing a collaborative culture of ongoing professional learning and development. Research has shown that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among school-related factors that influence student outcomes. As such, this bill would provide ongoing high-quality professional development to principals and school leaders, including multi-year induction and mentoring for new administrators.

Recognizing the importance of creating career advancement and leadership opportunities for teachers, the Effective Teaching and Leading Act supports opportunities for teachers to serve as mentors, instructional coaches, or master teachers, or take on increased responsibility for professional development, curriculum, or school improvement activities. It also calls for significant and sustainable stipends for educators that take on these new roles and responsibilities.

The bill also requires school districts to conduct surveys of the working and learning conditions educators face so this data could be used to better target investments and professional development support.

Improving teaching and school leadership is not simply a matter of sorting the good teachers and principals from the bad. What is needed is a comprehensive and integrated approach that supports new teachers and leaders as they enter the profession; provides on-going professional development that helps them improve and their students achieve; and that fairly assesses performance and provides feedback for improvement. This is the approach taken by the Effective Teaching and Leading Act.

I worked with a range of education organizations in developing this bill, including the Alliance for Excellent Education, American Federation of School Administrators, American Federation of Teachers; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; National Association of Elementary School Principals; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; Learning Forward; the National Commission for Teaching and America's Future, and the New Teacher Center. I thank them for their input and support for the bill.

I thank Congressman MIKE HONDA of California for introducing the companion bill in the House. I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor the Effective Teaching and Leading Act and work for its inclusion in the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1074. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Easter Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2013.

This legislation is critically important, because it is a major step towards reconciling an historic wrong for Virginia and the Nation. While the Virginia Tribes have received official recognition from the Commonwealth of Virginia, acknowledgement and officially-recognized status from the federal government has been considerably more difficult due to their systematic mistreatment over the past century.

The identities of the tribal members of Virginia's Indian Tribes were stripped away by Virginia's Racial Integrity Act, a State law in effect from 1924 to 1967. Racial identifications of those without white ancestry were changed to ''colored'' on birth certificates during that period. In addition, 5 of the 6 courthouses that held the vast majority of the Virginia Indian Tribal records needed to document their history to the degree required by the Bureau of Indian Affairs Office of Federal Acknowledgement were destroyed in the Civil War.

Furthermore, Virginia Indians and England signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation in 1677. This predated the creation of the United States of America by just short of 100 years. This Treaty was never recognized by the founding fathers of the United States. Therefore, the Tribes were not granted Federal recognition upon signing treaties with the federal government like tribes in other states did.

I am proud of Virginia's recognized Indian Tribes and their contributions to our Commonwealth. The Virginia Tribes are a part of us. We go to school together, work together, and serve our Commonwealth and nation together every day. These contributions should be acknowledged, and this Federal recognition for Virginia's native peoples is long overdue.

It is my hope that the Senate will act upon my legislation this year, to give these 6 Virginia Native American Tribes the Federal recognition that is long overdue.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1077. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the reauthorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, authorized under P.L. 105–312 in 1998 and reauthorized by P.L. 107–308 in 2002, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network helps several million visitors and residents discover, enjoy, and learn about the special places and stories of the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed. Today I am introducing legislation to reauthorize this successful program.

For visitors and residents, the Gateways are the ''Chesapeake connection.'' The Network members provide an experience of such high quality that their visitors will indeed connect to the Chesapeake emotionally as well as intellectually, and thus to its conservation.

The Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure. The Chesapeake ranks as the largest of America's 130 estuaries and

one of the nation's largest and longest fresh water and estuarine systems. The Atlantic Ocean delivers half the bay's 18 trillion gallons of water and the other half flows through over 150 major rivers and streams draining 64,000 square miles within six states and the District of Columbia. The Chesapeake watershed is among the most significant cultural, natural and historic assets of our nation.

The Chesapeake is enormous and vastly diverse—how could you possibly experience the whole story in any one place? Better to connect and use the scores of existing public places to collaborate on presenting the many chapters and tales of the bay's story. Visitors and residents go to more places for more experiences, all through a coordinated Gateways Network.

Beyond simply coordinating the Network, publishing a map and guides, and providing standard exhibits at all Gateways, the National Park Service has helped Gateways with matching grants and expertise for 200 projects with a total value of more than $12 million. This is a great deal for the Bay—it helps Network members tell the Chesapeake story better and inspires people to care for this National Treasure—and it's a good deal for the Park Service. In this legislation, we cap the Gateways authorization at just $2 million annually. It serves all 150+ Gateways and their 10 million visitors. No other National Park can provide such a dramatic ratio of public dollars spent to number of visitors served.

With the National Park Service's expertise and support, Gateways have made significant progress in their mission to tell the bay's stories to their millions of members and visitors, extend access to the bay and its watershed, and develop a conservation awareness and ethic. It is time to reauthorize the Chesapeake Gateways and Watertrails program. It is my hope that the Congress will act quickly to adopt this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of th bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1077

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 ''Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Reauthorization Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 502(c) of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 105–312) is amended by striking ''fiscal years'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1083. A bill to provide high-quality public charter school options for students by enabling such public charter schools to expand and replicate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation designed to improve educational opportunities for students. The All Students Achieving Through Reform Act, or All-STAR Act, would provide Federal resources to the most successful charter schools to help them grow and replicate their success. I thank Senator KIRK, for joining me in this effort.

Across the nation, public charter schools are achieving promising results in low-income communities. I have been particularly impressed by the Noble Street schools in Chicago. Since opening its first campus in 1999, Noble Street has expanded to 12 charter high schools educating over 7,600 students from more than seventy communities, including some of Chicago's most difficult neighborhoods.

Noble Street has achieved phenomenal results. Even though seventy-five percent of students enter school with below grade level skills, Noble juniors have the highest ACT scores among Chicago open-enrollment schools. Moreover, 99 percent of Noble Street's seniors graduate and 90 percent go on to college. I see this success in action when I visit Noble Street schools. As soon as you walk in the door, you can tell that everyone in the building is focused on academic success. The students are actively engaged in their learning. Their teachers and principals are demanding and inspiring. Noble Street would like to continue to grow and educate more students in Chicago.

Every day 2.3 million students attend approximately 6,000 public charter schools nationally. Let us be honest, not all charter schools are excellent. Poor-performing charter schools should be closed. But we also need to replicate and expand the ones that are beating the odds, and we need to learn from them. The 2013 U.S. News and World Report's Best High Schools list included three public charters in its top ten and twenty-eight charter schools in its top 100. We need more excellent charters, like these and the Noble Street schools, in Illinois and around the country.

The bipartisan bill I am introducing today would help make that possible. My bill would allow the existing charter school program to fund the expansion and replication of the most successful charter schools. Schools that have achieved positive results with their students will be able to apply for Federal grants to expand, allowing them to include additional grades or to replicate the model at a new school. Successful charters across the country will be able to grow, providing better educational opportunities to thousands of students.

The bill also incentivizes the adoption of strong charter school policies by states. We know that successful charter schools can thrive when they have autonomy, freedom to grow, and strong accountability based on meeting performance targets. The bill would give grant priority to States that provide that environment. The bill also requires new levels of charter school authorizer reporting and accountability to ensure that good charter schools are able to succeed while bad charter schools are improved or shut down.

This bill will improve educational opportunities for students across the nation. Charter schools represent some of the brightest spots in urban education today, and successful models have the full support of the President and Secretary Duncan. We need to help these schools grow and bring their best lessons into our regular public schools so that all students can benefit. Supporting the growth of successful charter schools should be a part of the conversation when we take up reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I look forward to being a part of that discussion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of th bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1083

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 ''All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2013'' or ''All-STAR Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. CHARTER SCHOOL EXPANSION AND REPLICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7221 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 5211;

(2) by redesignating section 5210 as section 5211; and

(3) by inserting after section 5209 the following:

''SEC. 5210. CHARTER SCHOOL EXPANSION AND REPLICATION.

''(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to support State efforts to expand and replicate high-quality public charter schools to enable such schools to serve additional students, with a priority to serve those students who attend identified schools or schools with a low graduation rate.

''(b) SUPPORT FOR PROVEN CHARTER SCHOOLS AND INCREASING THE SUPPLY OF HIGH-QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS.—

''(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From the amounts appropriated under section 5200 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to enable the eligible entities to make subgrants to eligible public charter schools under subsection (e)(1) and carry out the other activities described in subsection (e), in order to allow the eligible public charter schools to serve additional students through the expansion and replication of such schools.

''(2) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—In determining the grant amount to be awarded under this subsection to an eligible entity, the Secretary shall consider—

''(A) the number of eligible public charter schools under the jurisdiction or in the service area of the eligible entity that are operating;

''(B) the number of new openings for students that could be created in such schools with such grant;

''(C) the number of students attending identified schools or schools with a low graduation rate in the State or area where an eligible entity intends to replicate or expand eligible public charter schools; and

''(D) the success of the eligible entity in overseeing public charter schools and the likelihood of continued or increased success because of the grant under this section.

''(3) DURATION OF GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall be for a period of not more than 3 years, except that—

''(i) an eligible entity receiving such grant may, at the discretion of the Secretary, continue to expend grant funds after the end of the grant period; and

''(ii) the Secretary may renew such grant for 1 additional 2-year period, if the Secretary determines that the eligible entity is meeting the goals of the grant.

''(B) SUBSEQUENT GRANTS.—An eligible entity that has received a grant under this section may receive subsequent grants under this section.

''(c) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—To be considered for a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The application described in paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) RECORD OF SUCCESS.—Documentation of the record of success of the eligible entity in overseeing or operating public charter schools, including—

''(i) the performance of the students of such public charter schools on the student academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) of the State where such school is located (including a measurement of the students' average academic longitudinal growth at each such school, if such measurement is required by a Federal or State law applicable to the entity), disaggregated by—

''(I) economic disadvantage;

''(II) race and ethnicity;

''(III) disability status; and

''(IV) status as a student with limited English proficiency;

''(ii)(I) the status of such schools in making adequate yearly progress, as defined in a State's plan in accordance with section 1111(b)(2)(C) or, in the case of schools for which the Secretary has waived the applicability of such section pursuant to the authority under section 9401, the status of such schools under the accountability standards authorized by such waiver; and

''(II) the status of such schools as identified schools;

''(iii) documentation of demonstrated success by such public charter schools in closing historic achievement gaps between groups of students; and

''(iv) in the case of such public charter schools that are secondary schools—

''(I) the number of students enrolled in dual enrollment, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or other college level courses;

''(II) the number of students earning a professional certificate or license through the school;

''(III) student graduation rates; and

''(IV) rates of student acceptance, enrollment, and persistence in institutions of higher education, where possible.

''(B) PLAN.—A plan for—

''(i) replicating and expanding eligible public charter schools operated or overseen by the eligible entity;

''(ii) identifying eligible public charter schools, or networks of eligible public charter schools, to receive subgrants under this section;

''(iii) increasing the number of openings in eligible public charter schools for students attending identified schools and schools with a low graduation rate;

''(iv) ensuring that eligible public charter schools receiving a subgrant under this section enroll students through a random lottery for admission, unless the charter school is using the subgrant to expand the school to serve additional grades, in which case such school may reserve seats in the additional grades for—

''(I) each student enrolled in the grade preceding each such additional grade;

''(II) siblings of students enrolled in the charter school, if such siblings desire to enroll in such grade; and

''(III) children of the charter school's founders, staff, or employees;

''(v)(I) in the case of an eligible entity described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of subsection (k)(4), the manner in which the eligible entity will work with identified schools and schools with a low graduation rate that are eligible to enroll students in a public charter school receiving a subgrant under this section and that are under the eligible entity's jurisdiction, and the local educational agencies serving such schools (as applicable), to—

''(aa) engage in community outreach, provide information in a language that the parents can understand, and communicate with parents of students at identified schools and schools with a low graduation rate who are eligible to attend a public charter school receiving a subgrant under this section about the opportunity to enroll in or transfer to such school, in a manner consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the 'Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974'); and

''(bb) ensure that a student can transfer to an eligible public charter school if the public charter school such student was attending in the previous school year is no longer an eligible public charter school; and

''(II) in the case of an eligible entity described in subparagraph (B) or (D) of subsection (k)(4), the manner in which the eligible entity will work with the local educational agency to carry out the activities described in items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I);

''(vi) disseminating to public schools under the jurisdiction or in the service area of the eligible entity, in a manner consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the 'Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974'), the best practices, programs, or strategies learned by awarding subgrants to eligible public charter schools under this section, with particular emphasis on the best practices with respect to—

''(I) focusing on closing achievement gaps; or

''(II) successfully addressing the education needs of low-income students; and

''(vii) in the case of an eligible entity described in subsection (k)(4)(D)—

''(I) supporting the short-term and long-term success of the proposed project, by—

''(aa) developing a multi-year financial and operating model for the eligible entity; and

''(bb) including, with the plan, evidence of the demonstrated commitment of current partners, as of the time of the application, for the proposed project and of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success;

''(II) closing public charter schools that do not meet acceptable standards of performance; and

''(III) achieving the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, which shall include the use of clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

''(C) CHARTER SCHOOL INFORMATION.—The number of—

''(i) eligible public charter schools that are operating in the State in which the eligible entity intends to award subgrants under this section;

''(ii) public charter schools approved to open or likely to open during the grant period in such State;

''(iii) available openings in eligible public charter schools in such State that could be created through the replication or expansion of such schools if the grant is awarded to the eligible entity;

''(iv) students on public charter school waiting lists (if such lists are available) in—

''(I) the State in which the eligible entity intends to award subgrants under this section; and

''(II) each local educational agency serving an eligible public charter school that may receive a subgrant under this section from the eligible entity; and

''(v) students, and the percentage of students, in a local educational agency who are attending eligible public charter schools that may receive a subgrant under this section from the eligible entity.

''(D) TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOL INFORMATION.—In the case of an eligible entity described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of subsection (k)(4), a list of the following schools under the jurisdiction of the eligible entity, including the name and location of each such school, the number and percentage of students under the jurisdiction of the eligible entity who are attending such school, and such demographic and socioeconomic information as the Secretary may require:

''(i) Identified schools.

''(ii) Schools with a low graduation rate.

''(E) ASSURANCE.—In the case of an eligible entity described in subsection (k)(4)(A), an assurance that the eligible entity will include information (in a language that the parents can understand) about the eligible public charter schools receiving subgrants under this section—

''(i) in the notifications provided under section 1116(c)(6) to parents of each student enrolled in a school served by a local educational agency identified for school improvement or corrective action under paragraph (1) or (7) of section 1116(c); or

''(ii) in any case where the requirements under section 1116(c) have been waived in whole or in part by the Secretary under the authority of section 9401, to parents of each student enrolled in a school served by a local educational agency that has been identified as in need of additional assistance under any accountability system established under such section.

''(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary may modify or waive any information requirement under paragraph (2)(C) for an eligible entity that demonstrates that the eligible entity cannot reasonably obtain the information.

''(d) PRIORITIES FOR AWARDING GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to an eligible entity that—

''(A) serves or plans to serve a large percentage of low-income students from identified schools or public schools with a low graduation rate;

''(B) oversees or plans to oversee one or more eligible public charter schools;

''(C) provides evidence of effective monitoring of the academic success of students who attend public charter schools under the jurisdiction of the eligible entity;

''(D) has established goals, objectives, and outcomes for the proposed project that are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable;

''(E) in the case of an eligible entity that is a local educational agency under State law, has a cooperative agreement under section 1116(b)(11); and

''(F) is under the jurisdiction of, or plans to award subgrants under this section in, a State that—

''(i) ensures that all public charter schools (including such schools served by a local educational agency and such schools considered to be a local educational agency under State law) receive, in a timely manner, the Federal, State, and local funds to which such schools are entitled under applicable law;

''(ii) provides funding (such as capital aid distributed through a formula or access to revenue generated bonds, and including funding for school facilities) on a per-pupil basis to public charter schools commensurate with the amount of funding (including funding for school facilities) provided to traditional public schools;

''(iii) provides strong evidence of support for public charter schools and has in place innovative policies that support academically successful charter school growth;

''(iv) authorizes public charter schools to offer early childhood education programs, including prekindergarten, in accordance with State law;

''(v) authorizes or allows public charter schools to serve as school food authorities;

''(vi) ensures that each public charter school in the State—

''(I) has a high degree of autonomy over the public charter school's budget and expenditures;

''(II) has a written performance contract with an authorized public chartering agency that ensures that the school has an independent governing board with a high degree of autonomy; and

''(III) in the case of an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this section, amends its charter to reflect the growth activities described in subsection (e);

''(vii) has an appeals process for the denial of an application for a public charter school;

''(viii) provides that an authorized public chartering agency that is not a local educational agency, such as a State chartering board, is available for each individual or entity seeking to operate a public charter school pursuant to such State law;

''(ix) allows any public charter school to be a local educational agency in accordance with State law;

''(x) ensures that each authorized public chartering agency in the State submits annual reports to the State educational agency, and makes such reports available to the public, on the performance of the schools authorized or approved by such public chartering agency, which reports shall include—

''(I) the authorized public chartering agency's strategic plan for authorizing or approving public charter schools and any progress toward achieving the objectives of the strategic plan;

''(II) the authorized public chartering agency's policies for authorizing or approving public charter schools, including how such policies examine a school's—

''(aa) financial plan and policies, including financial controls and audit requirements;

''(bb) plan for identifying and successfully (in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations) serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind their peers, and gifted students; and

''(cc) capacity and capability to successfully launch and subsequently operate a public charter school, including the backgrounds of the individuals applying to the agency to operate such school and any record of such individuals operating a school;

''(III) the authorized public chartering agency's policies for renewing, not renewing, and revoking a public charter school's charter, including the role of student academic achievement in such decisions;

''(IV) the authorized public chartering agency's transparent, timely, and effective process for closing down academically unsuccessful public charter schools;

''(V) the academic performance of each operating public charter school authorized or approved by the authorized public chartering agency, including the information reported by the State in the State annual report card under section 1111(h)(1)(C) for such school (or any similar reporting requirement authorized by the Secretary through a waiver under section 9401);

''(VI) the status of the authorized public chartering agency's charter school portfolio, by identifying all charter schools served by the public chartering agency in each of the following categories: approved (but not yet open), operating, renewed, transferred, revoked, not renewed, voluntarily closed, or never opened;

''(VII) the authorizing functions provided by the authorized public chartering agency to the public charter schools under its purview, including such agency's operating costs and expenses as detailed through annual auditing of financial statements that conform with general accepted accounting principles; and

''(VIII) the services purchased (such as accounting, transportation, and data management and analysis) from the authorized public chartering agency by the public charter schools authorized or approved by such agency, including an itemized accounting of the actual costs of such services; and

''(xi) has or will have (within 1 year after receiving a grant under this section) a State policy and process for overseeing and reviewing the effectiveness and quality of the State's authorized public chartering agencies, including—

''(I) a process for reviewing and evaluating the performance of the authorized public chartering agencies in authorizing or approving public charter schools, including a process that enables the authorized public chartering agencies to respond to any State concerns; and

''(II) any other necessary policies to ensure effective charter school authorizing in the State in accordance with the principles of quality charter school authorizing, as determined by the State in consultation with the charter school community and stakeholders.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary may determine how the priorities described in paragraph (1) will apply to the different types of eligible entities defined in subsection (k)(4).

''(e) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant funds for the following:

''(1) SUBGRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall award subgrants, in such amount as the eligible entity determines is appropriate, to eligible public charter schools to replicate or expand such schools.

''(B) APPLICATION.—An eligible public charter school desiring to receive a subgrant under this subsection shall submit an application to the eligible entity at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the eligible entity may require.

''(C) USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection shall use the subgrant funds to provide for an increase in the school's enrollment of students through the replication or expansion of the school, which may include use of funds to—

''(i) support the physical expansion of school buildings, including financing the development of new buildings and campuses to meet increased enrollment needs;

''(ii) pay costs associated with hiring additional teachers to serve additional students;

''(iii) provide transportation to additional students to and from the school (including providing transportation to students who transfer to the school under a cooperative agreement established under section 1116(b)(11)), as long as the eligible public charter school demonstrates to the eligible entity, in the application required under subparagraph (B), that the public charter school has the capability to continue providing such transportation after the expiration of the subgrant funds;

''(iv) purchase instructional materials, implement teacher and principal professional development programs, and hire additional non-teaching staff; and

''(v) support any necessary activities associated with the school carrying out the purposes of this section, including data collection and management.

''(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding subgrants under this subsection, an eligible entity shall give priority to an eligible public charter school that—

''(i)(I) has significantly closed any achievement gaps on the State academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) among the groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) by improving scores; or

''(II) in the case of a school in a State for which the Secretary has granted a waiver under section 9401, has significantly closed any achievement gaps among groups of students, as determined by the Secretary in accordance with any accountability standards that the Secretary has authorized through such waiver; and

''(ii) has been in operation for not less than 3 consecutive years and has demonstrated overall success, including—

''(I) substantial progress in improving student achievement, as measured—

''(aa) for tested grades and subjects, by a student's score on State academic assessments required under this Act, and other rigorous measures of student learning that are comparable across classrooms, such as the measures described in item (bb); and

''(bb) for non-tested grades and subjects, alternative measures of student learning and performance, such as student scores on pretests and end-of-course tests, student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms; and

''(II) the management and leadership necessary to overcome initial start-up problems and establish a thriving, financially viable charter school.

''(E) DURATION OF SUBGRANT.—A subgrant under this subsection shall be awarded for a period of not more than 3 years, except that an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection may, at the discretion of the eligible entity, continue to expend subgrant funds after the end of the subgrant period.

''(2) FACILITY FINANCING AND REVOLVING LOAN FUND.—An eligible entity may use not more than 25 percent of the amount of the grant funds received under this section to establish a reserve account described in subsection (f) to facilitate public charter school facility acquisition and development by—

''(A) conducting credit enhancement initiatives (as referred to in subpart 2) in support of the development of facilities for eligible public charter schools serving students;

''(B) establishing a revolving loan fund for use by an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection from the eligible entity under such terms as may be determined by the eligible entity to allow such school to expand to serve additional students;

''(C) facilitating, through direct expenditure or financing, the acquisition or development of public charter school buildings by the eligible entity or an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection from the eligible entity, which may be used as both permanent locations for eligible public charter schools or incubators for growing charter schools; or

''(D) establishing a partnership with 1 or more community development financial institutions (as defined in section 103 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702)) or other mission-based financial institutions to carry out the activities described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

''(3) ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS, DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES, RESEARCH, AND DATA COLLECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity may use not more than 7.5 percent of the grant funds awarded under this section to cover administrative tasks, dissemination activities, and outreach, including data collection and management.

''(B) NONPROFIT ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the administrative tasks, dissemination activities, and outreach described in subparagraph (A), an eligible entity may contract with an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 501(a)).

''(f) RESERVE ACCOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To assist eligible entities in the development of new public charter school buildings or facilities for eligible public charter schools, an eligible entity receiving a grant under this section may, in accordance with State and local law, directly or indirectly, alone or in collaboration with others, deposit the amount of funds described in subsection (e)(2) in a reserve account established and maintained by the eligible entity.

''(2) INVESTMENT.—Funds received under this section and deposited in the reserve account established under this subsection shall be invested in obligations issued or guaranteed by the United States or a State, or in other similarly low-risk securities.

''(3) REINVESTMENT OF EARNINGS.—Any earnings on funds received under this subsection shall be deposited in the reserve account established under this subsection and used in accordance with the purpose described in subsection (a).

''(4) RECOVERY OF FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in accordance with chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code, shall collect—

''(i) all funds in a reserve account established by an eligible entity under this subsection if the Secretary determines, not earlier than 2 years after the date the eligible entity first received funds under this section, that the eligible entity has failed to make substantial progress carrying out the purpose described in paragraph (1); or

''(ii) all or a portion of the funds in a reserve account established by an eligible entity under this subsection if the Secretary determines that the eligible entity has permanently ceased to use all or a portion of funds in such account to accomplish the purpose described in paragraph (1).

''(B) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall not exercise the authority provided under subparagraph (A) to collect from any eligible entity any funds that are being properly used to achieve such purpose.

''(C) PROCEDURES.—Sections 451, 452, and 458 of the General Education Provisions Act shall apply to the recovery of funds under subparagraph (A).

''(D) CONSTRUCTION.—This paragraph shall not be construed to impair or affect the authority of the Secretary to recover funds under part D of the General Education Provisions Act.

''(5) REALLOCATION.—Any funds collected by the Secretary under paragraph (4) shall be awarded to eligible entities receiving grants under this section in the next fiscal year.

''(g) FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—The financial records of each eligible entity and eligible public charter school receiving a grant or subgrant, respectively, under this section shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and shall be subject to an annual audit by an independent public accountant.

''(h) NATIONAL EVALUATION.—

''(1) NATIONAL EVALUATION.—From the amounts appropriated under section 5200, the Secretary shall conduct an independent, comprehensive, and scientifically sound evaluation, by grant or contract and using the highest quality research design available, of the impact of the activities carried out under this section on—

''(A) student achievement, including State standardized assessment scores and, if available, student academic longitudinal growth (as described in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i)) based on such assessments; and

''(B) other areas, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2013, and biannually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation described in paragraph (1).

''(i) REPORTS.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall prepare and submit to the Secretary the following:

''(1) REPORT.—A report that contains such information as the Secretary may require concerning use of the grant funds by the eligible entity, including the academic achievement of the students attending eligible public charter schools as a result of the grant. Such report shall be submitted before the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2013 and every 2 years thereafter.

''(2) PERFORMANCE INFORMATION.—Such performance information as the Secretary may require for the national evaluation conducted under subsection (h)(1).

''(j) INAPPLICABILITY.—The provisions of sections 5201 through 5209 shall not apply to the program under this section.

''(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS.—The term 'adequate yearly progress' has the meaning given such term in a State's plan in accordance with section 1111(b)(2)(C).

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS, DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES, AND OUTREACH.—The term 'administrative tasks, dissemination activities, and outreach' includes costs and activities associated with—

''(A) recruiting and selecting students to attend eligible public charter schools;

''(B) outreach to parents of students enrolled in identified schools or schools with low graduation rates;

''(C) providing information to such parents and school officials at such schools regarding eligible public charter schools receiving subgrants under subsection (e);

''(D) necessary oversight of the grant program under this section; and

''(E) initiatives and activities to disseminate the best practices, programs, or strategies learned in eligible public charter schools to other public schools operating in the State where the eligible entity intends to award subgrants under this section.

''(3) CHARTER SCHOOL.—The term 'charter school' means—

''(A) a charter school, as defined in section 5211(1); or

''(B) a school that meets the requirements of such section, except for subparagraph (D) of the section, and provides prekindergarten or adult education services.

''(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means—

''(A) a State educational agency;

''(B) an authorized public chartering agency;

''(C) a local educational agency that has authorized or is planning to authorize a public charter school;

''(D) an organization (including a nonprofit charter management organization) that has an organizational mission and record of success supporting the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools and is—

''(i) described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)); and

''(ii) exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 501(a)); or

''(E) a consortium of organizations described in subparagraph (D).

''(5) ELIGIBLE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL.—The term 'eligible public charter school' means a charter school that has no significant compliance issue and shows evidence of strong academic results for the past three years (or over the life of the school if the school has been open for fewer than three years), based on—

''(A) increased student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school;

''(B)(i) demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) at the charter school or, in the case of a school in a State for which the Secretary has granted a waiver under section 9401, demonstrated success in closing achievement gaps among groups of students, as determined by the Secretary in accordance with any accountability standards that the Secretary has authorized through such waiver; or

''(ii) no significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) (or as determined by the Secretary in accordance with any accountability standards authorized through a waiver under section 9401) and significant gains in student achievement with all populations of students served by the charter school; and

''(C) results (including, where applicable and available, performance on statewide tests, attendance and retention rates, secondary school graduation rates, and attendance and persistence rates at institutions of higher education) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school that are above the average achievement results for such students in the State.

''(6) GRADUATION RATE.—The term 'graduation rate' has the meaning given the term in

section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi), as clarified in section 200.19(b)(1) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(7) IDENTIFIED SCHOOL.—The term 'identified school' means a school—

''(A) identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under paragraph (1), (7), or (8) of section 1116(b); or

''(B) in the case of a school for which the Secretary has waived the applicability of such paragraphs pursuant to section 9401, identified as a priority school, a focus school, or a school otherwise in need of significant assistance, as determined by the accountability standards authorized by such waiver

''(8) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'local educational agency' includes any charter school that is a local educational agency, as determined by State law.

''(9) LOW-INCOME STUDENT.—The term 'low-income student' means a student eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

''(10) SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITY.—The term 'school food authority' has the meaning given the term in section 250.3 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

''(11) SCHOOL YEAR.—The term 'school year' has the meaning given such term in section 12(d) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(d)).

''(12) TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOL.—The term 'traditional public school' does not include any charter school, as defined in section 5211.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7221 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 5231; and

(2) by inserting before subpart 1 the following:

''SEC. 5200. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUBPARTS 1 AND 2.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subparts 1 and 2, $700,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

''(b) ALLOCATION.—In allocating funds appropriated under this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall consider—

''(1) the relative need among the programs carried out under sections 5202, 5205, 5210, and subpart 2; and

''(2) the quality of the applications submitted for such programs.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2102(2) (20 U.S.C. 6602(2)), by striking ''5210'' and inserting ''5211'';

(2) in section 5204(e) (20 U.S.C. 7221c(e)), by striking ''5210(1)'' and inserting ''5211(1)'';

(3) in section 5211(1) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)) (20 U.S.C. 7221i(1)), by striking ''The term'' and inserting ''Except as otherwise provided, the term'';

(4) in section 5230(1) (20 U.S.C. 7223i(1)), by striking ''5210'' and inserting ''5211''; and

(5) in section 5247(1) (20 U.S.C. 7225f(1)), by striking ''5210'' and inserting ''5211''.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by inserting before the item relating to subpart 1 of part B of title V the following:

''Sec. 5200. Authorization of appropriations for subparts 1 and 2.'';

(2) by striking the items relating to sections 5210 and 5211;

(3) by inserting after the item relating to section 5209 the following:

''Sec. 5210. Charter school expansion and replication.

''Sec. 5211. Definitions.'';

and

(4) by striking the item relating to section 5231.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 153—RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. TOOMEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES.153

Whereas the 9 vessels in the United States naval fleet on the Great Lake of Erie during the War of 1812 were assembled and stationed at Presque Isle Bay, Pennsylvania;

Whereas the American forces, under the command of 28-year-old Rhode Island native Oliver Hazard Perry, were tasked to subdue the enemy fleet on the lake and sever its vital supply lines to the northwestern front;

Whereas the United States fleet met its adversaries a short distance from Put-in-Bay, Ohio on September 10, 1813;

Whereas during the intense fight that ensued, the flagship of Commodore Perry, the U.S. Brig Lawrence, was disabled and its crew suffered over an 80 percent casualty rate;

Whereas Commodore Perry refused to surrender, courageously boarded a small rowboat, traversed a half-mile through hostile waters, and transferred his command to the U.S. Brig Niagara;

Whereas the U.S. Brig Niagara steered back into the heart of the battle, outmaneuvered its foes, and forced the subsequent surrender of the entire British fleet on Lake Erie;

Whereas 100 sharpshooters from the Kentucky militia stationed on board the flotilla provided devastating covering fire throughout the encounter;

Whereas to communicate the conclusion of the engagement to Major General William Henry Harrison, Commodore Perry provided the historic and succinct battle summary: ''We have met the enemy, and they are ours—two ships, two brigs one schooner & one sloop.'';

Whereas the victory solidified American control of Lake Erie for the duration of the conflict, enabling United States forces to retake Detroit and win further battles in the Old Northwest and the Niagara Valley;

Whereas the state of Pennsylvania to this day maintains the U.S. Brig Niagara as its State ship;

Whereas the battle flag of Commodore Perry, ''Dont Give Up the Ship'', is preserved in the United States Naval Academy Museum in Annapolis, Maryland; and

Whereas the battle is immortalized in the United States Senate by the masterpiece painted by William Henry Powell in 1873: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 200th anniversary the Battle of Lake Erie;

(2) remembers with great pride this significant victory in the ''Second War of Independence'' of the United States;

(3) commends the city of Erie, Pennsylvania and the Perry 200 Commemoration Commission for their efforts to ensure the appropriate recognition of this historic event; and

(4) expresses its deepest gratitude to all the sailors and marines who gave their lives in honorable service to the United States of America on the Great Lake of Erie 200 years ago.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

In the history of United States, the War of 1812 is often an overlooked chapter. However, for any visitor intrepid enough to forego the elevators in the Senate side of the Capitol, it is impossible not to notice one important day within those years of turmoil and war. Dominating the staircase is a massive rendition of the Battle of Lake Erie, painted by William Henry Powell in 1873.

The Battle of Lake Erie was one of the few unquestioned American triumphs in the war. In the center of Powell's painting is the young and courageous Oliver Hazard Perry. On September 10, 1813, after two hours of intense fighting, defeat stared Commodore Perry dead in the face, yet he refused to succumb. The painting depicts the famous point in the battle when Perry transfers his command from his disabled flagship to the U.S. Brig *Niagara* to begin the fight anew. His determination would pay off as the confused and battered enemy fleet would be unable to sustain the ongoing punishment from the *Niagara*'s cannonade. One by one each enemy vessel would strike their colors as they were forced to relinquish control of the Great Lake of Erie.

The dramatic encounter breathed new life into a damaged American war effort and captured the imagination of our young nation. Contributing in no small way to this victory was Pennsylvania's own city on the lake, Erie, that provided the safe locale, supplies, and muscle necessary to build the victorious fleet in limited time.

Just as the Battle of Lake Erie would test the resolve of the young commander Perry and his fleet, the overall war would test the resolve of our young nation. For those who think that partisan division is something unique to our country's current condition, I encourage you to look back to the bitter struggles between the Republicans and Federalists at the beginning of the 19th century. Those years would produce not only disagreement on the direction of our nascent union but also uncertainty of the ultimate success of this great experiment in representative government and the war very nearly tore us apart.

This upcoming bicentennial affords us the opportunity to reflect on the challenges overcome by our forefathers to shape and preserve this great nation that we have inherited. My friends in Erie and the Perry 200 Commemoration Commission will spend this summer paying tribute to this great battle and its participants, and I thank them for their hard work and dedication to ensure their appropriate recognition. I am hopeful this resolution can help bring attention to this remarkable event that so moved our Nation 200 years ago.

SENATE RESOLUTION 154—SUPPORTING POLITICAL REFORM IN IRAN AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 154

Whereas democracy, human rights, and civil liberties are universal values and fundamental principles of the foreign policy of the United States;

Whereas an essential element of democratic self-government is for leaders to be chosen and regularly held accountable through elections that are organized and conducted in a manner that is free, fair, inclusive, and consistent with international standards;

Whereas governments in which power does not derive from free and fair elections lack democratic legitimacy;

Whereas the Supreme Leader of Iran is unelected, has the power to veto any decision made by the president or parliament of Iran, and controls the foreign and defense policy of Iran;

Whereas the current Supreme Leader of Iran has been in power since 1989 and has never been subject to a popular referendum of any kind;

Whereas elections in Iran are marred by the disqualification of candidates based on their political views, the absence of credible international observers, widespread intimidation and repression of candidates, political parties, and citizens, and systemic electoral fraud and manipulation;

Whereas elections in Iran consistently involve severe restrictions on freedom of expression, assembly, and association, including censorship, surveillance, disruptions in telecommunications, and the absence of a free media;

Whereas the current president of Iran came to office through an election on June 12, 2009, that was widely condemned in Iran and throughout the world as neither free nor fair and provoked large-scale peaceful protests throughout Iran;

Whereas authorities in Iran continue to hold several candidates from the 2009 election in indefinite detention;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran banned more than 2,200 candidates from participating in the March 2, 2012, parliamentary elections and refused to allow domestic or international election observers to oversee those elections;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to prevent the people of Iran from accessing news and information by disrupting access to the Internet, including blocking e-mail and social networking sites, limiting access to foreign news and websites, and developing a national Internet that will facilitate government censorship of news and information, and by jamming international broadcasts such as the Voice of America Persian News Network and Radio Farda, a Persian language broadcast of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty;

Whereas authorities in Iran have announced that a presidential election will be held on June 14, 2013; and

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has banned numerous candidates from participating in the June 14, 2013, presidential election: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recalls Senate Resolution 386, 112th Congress, agreed to March 5, 2012, which called for free and fair elections in Iran;

(2) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to democracy, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law, including the universal rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of association;

(3) expresses support for freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and rule of law in Iran, and for elections that are free and fair;

(4) expresses strong support for the people of Iran in their peaceful calls for a representative and responsive democratic government that respects human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law;

(5) condemns the widespread human rights violations of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran;

(6) calls on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to respect freedom of expression and association in Iran by—

(A) holding elections that are free, fair, and responsive to the people of Iran, including by refraining from disqualifying candidates for political reasons;

(B) making the highest level of executive power in the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran accountable to the people of Iran through free and fair elections;

(C) ending arbitrary detention, torture, and other forms of harassment against media professionals, human rights defenders and activists, and opposition figures, and releasing all individuals detained for exercising universally recognized human rights;

(D) lifting legislative restrictions on freedom of assembly, association, and expression; and

(E) allowing the Internet to remain free and open and allowing domestic and international media to operate freely;

(7) calls on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to allow international election monitors to be present for the June 14, 2013, election;

(8) notes that the legitimacy of the June 14, 2013, election will be further called into question if—

(A) candidates are disqualified for political reasons;

(B) international election monitors are not present; and

(C) following the election, the highest level of executive power in Iran remains unaccountable to the people of Iran; and

(9) urges the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and other world leaders—

(A) to express support for the universal rights and freedoms of the people of Iran, including to democratic self-government and fully accountable elected leaders;

(B) to engage with the people of Iran and support their efforts to promote human rights and democratic reform, including supporting civil society organizations that promote democracy and governance;

(C) to support policies and programs that preserve free and open access to the Internet in Iran; and

(D) to condemn elections that are not free and fair and that do not meet international standards.

SENATE RESOLUTION 155—RECOGNIZING THE CITY OF ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA, FOR ITS CRITICAL ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE FLEET OF COMMODORE OLIVER HAZARD PERRY DURING THE WAR OF 1812

Mr. CASEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 155

Whereas the City of Erie, Pennsylvania, due to its abundant resources and strategic positioning, was recommended by shipbuilder Daniel Dobbins to the United States Department of the Navy as an ideal location for the construction of a naval fleet;

Whereas the victory by the United States over Great Britain in the Battle of Lake Erie on September 10, 1813 was a crucial victory for the United States during the War of 1812, and ensured that the United States maintained control over Lake Erie for the duration of the war;

Whereas the success of the fleet of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry in the Battle of Lake Erie helped to facilitate the important victory of General William Henry Harrison at the Battle of the Thames, as well as other military actions of the United States throughout the War of 1812;

Whereas the USS *Lawrence* and the USS *Niagara*, 2 flagships of the fleet of Commodore Perry, were returned to Presque Isle Bay, off the coast of the City of Erie, after completion of their service;

Whereas the City of Erie is home to the USS *Niagara*, which continues to sail in memory of the heroism of the United States forces in the Battle of Lake Erie;

Whereas the City of Erie honors the legacy of Commodore Perry through the Perry Monument at Presque Isle State Park; and

Whereas the City of Erie this year is recognizing the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the City of Erie, Pennsylvania, for its role in the development and construction of the fleet of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry during the War of 1812; and

(2) recognizes the historical significance of the construction of the fleet of Commodore Perry and the consequent victory of the United States in the Battle of Lake Erie.

SENATE RESOLUTION 156—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF NATO ALLIED COMMAND TRANSFORMATION

Mr. WARNER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 156

Whereas, on June 19, 2003, NATO's Allied Command Transformation (ACT), was formally established to increase military effectiveness and prepare the Alliance for future security challenges;

Whereas, on June 19, 2013, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will celebrate the 10-year anniversary of the establishment of NATO ACT;

Whereas the security of the United States and its NATO allies have been enhanced by the establishment and continued work of NATO ACT;

Whereas, for the past 10 years, ACT has been leading the charge for NATO military transformation, and providing relevant and timely support to NATO operations, and developing partnerships around the globe to adapt to the changing global security environment;

Whereas ACT is the only NATO headquarters in the United States, and the only permanent NATO headquarters outside of Europe;

Whereas ACT provides state of the art education, training, and application of best practices and lessons learned from past operations, and equips Alliance troops with the tools they need to win today's wars;

Whereas ACT improves NATO's defense planning and develops compatible equipment and common standards necessary to keep Alliance capabilities aligned;

Whereas NATO ACT has been integral to a NATO mission of promoting a Europe that is whole, undivided, free, and at peace;

Whereas NATO ACT strengthened the ability of NATO to perform a full range of missions throughout the world;

Whereas NATO ACT has provided crucial support and participation in the NATO International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, as NATO endeavors to help the people of Afghanistan create the conditions necessary for security and successful development and reconstruction;

Whereas ACT employs personnel from 26 NATO member nations and 6 NATO Partner nations and contributes more than $100,000,000 annually to the local economy;

Whereas NATO has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and throughout the world for over 60 years, representing the vital transatlantic bond of solidarity between the United States and Europe, as NATO nations share similar values and interests and are committed to the maintenance of democratic principles;

Whereas the Chicago Summit Communique affirms that all NATO members ''are determined that NATO will continue to play its unique and essential role in ensuring our common defense and security'' and that NATO ''continues to be effective in a changing world, against new threats, with new capabilities and new partners'';

Whereas, through the Alliance, the United States and Europe are effective and steadfast partners in security, and ACT is well positioned to contribute to the strength of the Alliance on both continents;

Whereas NATO ACT has done much to help NATO meet the global challenges of the 21st century, including the threat of terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, instability caused by failed states, and threats to global energy security; and

Whereas the 10th anniversary of NATO ACT is an opportunity to enhance and more deeply entrench those principles, which continue to bind the alliance together and guide our efforts today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 10th anniversary of the establishment of NATO Allied Command Transformation (NATO ACT);

(2) recognizes NATO ACT's leading role to continue to transform alliance forces and capabilities, using new concepts such as the NATO Response Force and new doctrines in order to improve the alliance's military effectiveness;

(3) expresses appreciation for the continuing and close partnership between the United States Government and NATO to transform the alliance;

(4) remembers the 65 years NATO has served to ensure peace, security, and stability in Europe throughout the world, and urges the United States Government to continue to seek new ways to deepen and expand its important relationships with NATO;

(5) recognizes the service of the brave men and women who have served to safeguard the freedom and security of the United States and the whole of the transatlantic alliance;

(6) honors the sacrifices of United States personnel, allies of the North American Treaty Organization (referred to in this resolution as ''NATO''), and partners in Afghanistan;

(7) Recognizes the outstanding partnership between the local community in Norfolk, Virginia and NATO personnel assigned to ACT;

(8) reaffirms that NATO, through the new Strategic Concept, is oriented toward the changing international security environment and the challenges of the future;

(9) urges all NATO members to take concrete steps to implement the Strategic Concept and to utilize the taskings from the 2012 NATO summit in Chicago, Illinois, to address current NATO operations, future capabilities and burden-sharing issues, and strengthen the relationship between NATO and partners around the world; and

(10) conveys appreciation for the steadfast partnership between NATO and the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 157—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT TELEPHONE SERVICE MUST BE IMPROVED IN RURAL AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THAT NO ENTITY MAY UNREASONABLY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST TELEPHONE USERS IN THOSE AREAS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 157

Whereas all people in the United States rely on quality, efficient, and dependable telephone service in many aspects of life, including conducting business, securing the safety of the public, and connecting families;

Whereas multiple surveys conducted by the National Exchange Carrier Association revealed that complaints of uncompleted telephone calls persist, with the most recent survey in October 2012 indicating a 41 percent increase in uncompleted calls between March and September of the same year;

Whereas the National Exchange Carrier Association and rural telecommunications carriers in April 2012 supplied information that—

(1) 6.4 percent of calls to rural areas failed, but only 0.5 percent of calls to urban areas failed; and

(2) 11 percent of calls to rural areas were either poor quality or were delayed, compared to only 5 percent in urban areas;

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission was made aware of an issue regarding telephone service connection in rural areas in November 2010 and has since issued a declaratory ruling and a notice of proposed rulemaking with respect to the issue and has reached a settlement with one telecommunications carrier;

Whereas, in a declaratory ruling in February 2012, the Federal Communications Commission made it clear that blocking or otherwise restricting telephone service is a violation of section 201(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201(b)), which prohibits unjust or unreasonable practices, and section 202(a) of that Act (47 U.S.C. 202(a)), which outlines the duty of a telecommunications carrier to refrain from discrimination;

Whereas actions by the Federal Communications Commission have not significantly decreased the prevalence of telephone calls being rerouted by telecommunications carriers and some States are seeing an increase in complaints as of April 2013;

Whereas telephone communications are vital to keeping rural areas of the United States competitive in the economy, and a low rate of telephone call completion results in economic injury to rural businesses, including farmers, trucking companies, and suppliers who have seen thousands of dollars in business lost when telephone calls are not completed;

Whereas the safety of the public is at risk from a lack of quality telephone communications, including 911 services;

Whereas schools depend on telephone calls to notify students and parents of emergencies, and health care centers depend on telecommunications services to save lives and to communicate with rural patients;

Whereas small, local telecommunications carriers are losing valuable, multi-line business subscribers because of a lack of quality telecommunications services, which is financially detrimental to those carriers and adversely affects the rural communities served by those carriers; and

Whereas it may cost a telecommunications carrier serving a rural area hundreds of dollars to investigate each complaint of an uncompleted telephone call: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) all providers must appropriately complete calls to all areas of the United States regardless of the technology used by the providers;

(2) no entity may unreasonably discriminate against telephone users in rural areas of the United States; and

(3) the Federal Communications Commission should—

(A) aggressively pursue those that violate the rules of the Federal Communications Commission and create these problems, and impose swift and meaningful enforcement actions to discourage—

(i) practices leading to telephone calls not being completed in rural areas of the United States; and

(ii) unreasonable discrimination against telephone users in rural areas of the United States; and

(B) move forward with clear, comprehensive, and enforceable actions in order to establish a robust and definitive solution to discrimination against telephone users in rural areas of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 158—TO AUTHORIZE THE PRODUCTION OF RECORDS BY THE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REID of Nevada (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 158

Whereas, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs conducted a review of the expenditures of U.S. funds related to U.S. efforts in Afghanistan;

Whereas, the Subcommittee has received a request from a federal agency for access to records of the Subcommittee's review;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the

Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, acting jointly, are authorized to provide to law enforcement officials, regulatory agencies, and other entities or individuals duly authorized by federal, state, or foreign governments, records of the Subcommittee's review of the expenditures of U.S. funds related to U.S. efforts in Afghanistan.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID of Nevada (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 17

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, May 23, 2013, through Friday, May 31, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, June 3, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, May 23, 2013, through Friday, May 31, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, June 3, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1116. Mr. COWAN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1117. Mr. JOHNSON, of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1118. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COWAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1119. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1120. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1121. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1122. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COATS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1123. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1124. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1125. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1126. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1127. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. COATS, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1128. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1129. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1130. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COATS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1131. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1132. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1133. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1134. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1135. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1136. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1137. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1138. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1139. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1140. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1141. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1142. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1143. Mr. REID (for Ms. HIRONO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 129, recognizing the significance of May 2013 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1116. Mr. COWAN (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 396, strike lines 8 through 12, and insert the following:

SEC. 4202. SENIOR FARMERS' MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 4402(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Of the funds'' and inserting the following:

''(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds'';

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated by paragraph (1)), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SA 1117. Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle D—National Flood Insurance Program

SEC. 12301. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the National Flood Insurance program is $24,000,000,000 in debt to the United States Treasury, with additional claims from Superstorm Sandy and other disasters still pending;

(2) in the absence of adequate, risk-based premiums, the National Flood Insurance Program is at risk of being unable to pay claims to policyholders or borrow additional funds from the United States Treasury;

(3) actions must be taken to balance the need for affordability in the National Flood Insurance Program with the need to pay claims to policyholders;

(4) the Federal Emergency Management Agency should expedite its study into methods to encourage and maintain participation in the National Flood Insurance Program and methods to educate consumers about the National Flood Insurance Program and the flood risk associated with their property;

(5) the Federal Emergency Management Agency should report promptly on methods

for establishing an affordability framework for the National Flood Insurance Program, including methods to aid individuals to afford risk-based premiums under the National Flood Insurance Program through targeted assistance, including means-tested vouchers, rather than generally subsidized rates; and

(6) Congress must work to—

(A) ensure that flood insurance rates are affordable; and

(B) strengthen the National Flood Insurance Program to ensure that it can pay future claims.

SEC. 12302. STUDIES OF VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY-BASED FLOOD INSURANCE OPTIONS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'') shall conduct a study to assess options, methods, and strategies for making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies through the National Flood Insurance Program.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take into consideration and analyze how voluntary community-based flood insurance policies—

(i) would affect communities having varying economic bases, geographic locations, flood hazard characteristics or classifications, and flood management approaches; and

(ii) could satisfy the applicable requirements under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a); and

(B) evaluate the advisability of making available voluntary community-based flood insurance policies to communities, subdivisions of communities, and areas of residual risk.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Administrator may consult with the Comptroller General of the United States, as the Administrator determines is appropriate.

(b) REPORT BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains the results and conclusions of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations for—

(A) the best manner to incorporate voluntary community-based flood insurance policies into the National Flood Insurance Program; and

(B) a strategy to implement voluntary community-based flood insurance policies that would encourage communities to undertake flood mitigation activities, including the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of levees, dams, or other flood control structures.

(c) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Administrator submits the report required under subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) review the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

(A) an analysis of the report submitted by the Administrator;

(B) any comments or recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to the report submitted by the Administrator; and

(C) any other recommendations of the Comptroller General relating to community-based flood insurance policies.

SEC. 12303. AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968.

(a) ADEQUATE PROGRESS ON CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS.—Section 1307(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(e)) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in determining whether a community has made adequate progress on the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a flood protection system, the Administrator shall consider all sources of funding for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, including Federal, State, and local funds.''.

(b) COMMUNITIES RESTORING DISACCREDITED FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEMS.—Section 1307(f) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4014(f)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''no longer does so.'' and inserting the following: ''no longer does so, and shall apply without regard to the level of Federal funding of or participation in the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the flood protection system.''.

SEC. 12304. AFFORDABILITY STUDY.

Section 100236 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 957) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''Not'' and inserting the following: ''Subject to subsection (e), not'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following:

''(1) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND.—Notwithstanding''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) OTHER FUNDING SOURCES.—To carry out this section, in addition to the amount made available under paragraph (1), the Administrator may use any other amounts that are available to the Administrator.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ALTERNATIVE.—If the Administrator determines that the report required under subsection (c) cannot be submitted by the date specified under subsection (c)—

''(1) the Administrator shall notify, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives of an alternative method of gathering the information required under this section;

''(2) the Administrator shall submit, not later than 180 days after the Administrator submits the notification required under paragraph (1), to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives the information gathered using the alternative method described in paragraph (1); and

''(3) upon the submission of information required under paragraph (2), the requirement under subsection (c) shall be deemed satisfied.''.

SA 1118. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COWAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 380, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 381, line 13, and insert the following:

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking subclause (I) and inserting the following:

''(I) to create or implement a coordinated community plan to meet the food security needs of low-income individuals;'';

(II) in subclause (II), by inserting ''and effectiveness'' after ''self-reliance'';

(III) in subclause (III), by inserting ''food access,'' after ''food,''; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking subclause (I) and inserting the following:

''(I) infrastructure improvement and development;''; and

On page 381, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$10,000,000'';

On page 381, line 21, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

On page 381, strike lines 22 through 24 and insert the following:

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or a nonprofit entity working in partnership with a State, local, or tribal government agency or community health organization'' after ''nonprofit entity'';

On page 382, strike lines 7 through 10 and insert the following:

''(C) efforts to reduce food insecurity in the community, including increasing access to food services or improving coordination of services and programs;'';

Beginning on page 382, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 383, line 12, and insert the following:

(4) in subsection (d), by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

''(3) develop innovative linkages between the for-profit, nonprofit, and public sectors;

''(4) encourage long-term planning activities and multisystem interagency approaches with multistakeholder collaborations (such as food policy councils, food planning associations, and hunger-free community coalitions) that build the long-term capacity of communities to address the food, food security, and agricultural problems of the communities;

''(5) develop new resources and strategies to help reduce food insecurity in the community and prevent food insecurity in the future; or

''(6) achieve goal 2 or 3 of the hunger-free communities goals.'';

On page 383, strike lines 13 through 16 and insert the following:

(5) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''3 years'' and inserting ''5 years'';

(6) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

On page 384, line 2, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

On page 384, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(7) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''and recommend to the targeted entities'' and inserting ''create a nationally accessible web-based clearinghouse of regulations, zoning provisions, and best practices by government and the private and nonprofit sectors that have been shown to improve community food security, and provide to targeted entities training, technical assistance, and''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D) and inserting the following:

''(C) health disparities;

''(D) food insecurity;''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''$200,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

On page 396, strike lines 8 through 12 and insert the following:

SEC. 4202. SENIORS FARMERS' MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use to carry out and expand the seniors farmers' market nutrition program—

''(1) $23,100,000 for fiscal year 2014; and

''(2) $25,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018.''.

On page 420, strike lines 13 through 16 and insert the following:

''(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section—

''(A) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

''(B) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(C) $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(D) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2017; and

''(E) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.

Beginning on page 636, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 639, line 2, and insert the following:

''(A) FAMILY FARM.—The term 'family' farm has the meaning given the term in section 761.2 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on December 30, 2007).

''(B) MID-TIER VALUE CHAIN.—The term 'mid-tier value chain' means a local and regional supply network (including a network that operates through food distribution centers that coordinate agricultural production and the aggregation, storage, processing, distribution, and marketing of locally or regionally produced agricultural products) that links independent producers with businesses and cooperatives that market value-added agricultural products in a manner that—

''(i) targets and strengthens the profitability and competitiveness of small- and medium-sized farms that are structured as family farms; and

''(ii) obtains agreement from an eligible agricultural producer group, farmer cooperative, or majority-controlled producer-based business venture that is engaged in the value chain on a marketing strategy.

''(C) VALUE-ADDED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.—The term 'value-added agricultural product' means any agricultural commodity or product—

''(i) that—

''(I) has undergone a change in physical state;

''(II) was produced in a manner that enhances the value of the agricultural commodity or product, as demonstrated through a business plan that shows the enhanced value, as determined by the Secretary;

''(III) is physically segregated in a manner that results in the enhancement of the value of the agricultural commodity or product;

''(IV) is a source of farm-based renewable energy, including E–85 fuel; or

''(V) is aggregated and marketed as a locally produced agricultural food product or as part of a mid-tier value chain; and

''(ii) for which, as a result of the change in physical state or the manner in which the agricultural commodity or product was produced, marketed, or segregated—

''(I) the customer base for the agricultural commodity or product is expanded; and

''(II) a greater portion of the revenue derived from the marketing, processing, or physical segregation of the agricultural commodity or product is available to the producer of the commodity or product.

On page 639, line 5, insert ''on a competitive basis'' after grants.

On page 640, strike lines 12 through 21 and insert the following:

''(i) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

''(I) in the case of a grant under subparagraph (A)(i), give priority to—

''(aa) operators of small- and medium-sized farms and ranches that are structured as family farms; or

''(bb) beginning farmers and ranchers or socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers; and

''(II) in the case of a grant under subparagraph (A)(ii), give priority to projects (including farmer cooperative projects) that best contribute to—

''(aa) increasing opportunities for operators of small- and medium-sized farms and ranches that are structured as family farms; or

''(bb) creating opportunities for beginning farmers and ranchers or socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.

On page 642, line 21, strike ''June 30 of'' and insert ''the date on which the Secretary completes the review process for applications submitted under this section for''.

On page 643, line 4, strike ''$12,500,000'' and insert ''$20,000,000''.

On page 663, strike lines 8 through 23 and insert the following:

''(ii) PRIORITY.—In making or guaranteeing a loan under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to projects that would—

''(I) result in increased access to locally or regionally grown food in underserved communities;

''(II) create new market opportunities for agricultural producers; or

''(III) support strategic economic and community development regional economic development plans on a multijurisdictional basis.

''(iii) GUARANTEE LOAN FEE AND PERCENTAGE.—In making or guaranteeing a loan under clause (i) the Secretary may waive, incorporate into the loan, or reduce the guarantee loan fee that would otherwise be imposed under this paragraph.

On page 1025, line 8, strike ''$20,000,000'' and insert ''$30,000,000''.

SA 1119. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES FARM POLICIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) farming is a uniquely high-risk undertaking that is vital to the United States economy and well-being, as well as to the ability to feed a growing and hungry world;

(2) commodity prices are inherently linked to the laws of supply and demand;

(3) Congress has never demonstrated that Congress knows better than the market regarding what the proper price for a commodity should be in any given year and, especially, over the course of multiple years in the future;

(4) historically, when Congress has set fixed floor prices for commodities at artificially high levels to address low prices and depressed markets, the policies have created market-distorting cycles under which farmers have planted excessive acres of an oversupplied commodity in order to capture Government assistance, which significantly increased Federal outlays at taxpayer expense as prices continued to decline;

(5)(A) commodities are traded worldwide, and the United States is the leading producer of many of the basic commodities in the world; and

(B) therefore, the planting decisions American farmers make can impact prices farmers receive around the world;

(6) Federal assistance provided when Congress has set fixed floor prices for commodities at artificially high levels linked to planting decisions creates oversupplied and depressed markets affecting farmers in the United States and overseas and raises concerns regarding—

(A) United States commitments to international trading partners, as agreed to in the World Trade Organization Uruguay Round; and

(B) whether such policies could lead to disputes before the World Trade Organization;

(7) the United States recently lost a dispute before the World Trade Organization, costing United States taxpayers millions of dollars to maintain current farm policy and avoid retaliation;

(8) recent crop prices have reached record highs, but market demands are signaling a trend for lower price levels;

(9) future Federal farm policies that create artificially high crop price floors, especially if the price floors are linked to planting decisions, may result in a new era of taxpayer-funded Federal farm program outlays rather than a market-driven farm economy; and

(10) addressing market-based risks, such as declining or depressed prices, is difficult because providing assistance in a declining or depressed market can make the situation worse and cause significant unintended consequences for the farmer, the Federal taxpayer, the land, and markets in the United States and around the world.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that—

(1) it is critical to reform Federal farm policy to make that policy—

(A) more market-oriented; and

(B) an effective risk management tool for United States farmers;

(2) Congress should develop market-oriented programs that—

(A) assist with price or market risks only when needed;

(B) treat crops equitably; and

(C) limit the potential risk for market distortion that may make disputes before the World Trade Organization more difficult to defend;

(3) Congress should not establish any farm assistance program that includes high fixed target prices or planting requirements, especially in combination, due to the risk that such a program will—

(A) distort markets;

(B) influence planting decisions; or

(C) jeopardize vital natural resources, such as soil and water, particularly in sensitive areas prone to natural disasters or with fragile ecosystems; and

(4) Congress should not require farmers to choose between assistance programs that cover fundamentally different risks as it forces farmers to make choices based on an unforeseeable future.

SA 1120. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1111, after line 20, add the following:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON FARM RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 1, 2014, and each December 1 thereafter until December 1, 2017, the Secretary, acting through the Chief Economist, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that analyzes—

(1) the impact of the agriculture risk coverage program under section 1108;

(2) the interaction of that program with—

(A) the adverse market payment program under section 1107;

(B) the marketing loan program under subtitle B of title I;

(C) the supplemental coverage option under section 508(c)(3)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(c)(3)(B)) (as added by section 11001); and

(D) other Federal crop insurance programs;

(3) any distortion caused by the programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2), and any other farm programs as determined by the Chief Economist, on planting and production decisions; and

(4) any overlap or substitution caused by the programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) with Federal crop insurance.

(b) SUMMARY.—Not later than June 1, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a summary report that analyzes the issues described in subsection (a) over the period of crop years 2014 through 2017.

(c) NEW PRODUCTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Risk Management Agency, shall investigate the establishment of new crop insurance products to address the multi-year crop revenue risks of agricultural producers.

SA 1121. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1024, strike lines 15 and 16 and insert the following:

mid-sized farm and ranch operations;

''(3) procure mobile payment solutions in the form of attachments, accessories, software, or technical assistance to vendors, subject to the condition that such a grant shall not be used to procure cellular or mobile devices and shall be used to enable technology to increase the availability of wireless points-of-sale for electronic benefit transfer transactions; and

''(4) include a strategic plan to maximize the

On page 1026, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

''(C) ALLOWABLE EXPENSES.—The Secretary shall determine a percentage of the grants awarded under subsection (b)(1)(B) that may be used for transaction and operational costs associated with providing the use of benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), with preference given to projects that collaborate with appropriate State agencies on a plan to make their operations sustainable and replicable in the State and outside of the State without outside support over a period of not more than 3 years.

SA 1122. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COATS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 122___. EXCLUSION OF FLUORIDE FROM AGGREGATE EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall exclude naturally occurring fluoride in drinking water and fluoride in dental health products from any determination required under section 408(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(b)(2)) regarding the aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue of sulfuryl fluoride.

SA 1123. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 861, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 61_____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS UNDER THE RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, including amendments made by this Act, any amounts used to carry out the rural utilities service program, including amounts for grants and loans, shall be used to provide services to communities that do not already have access to broadband services.

SA 1124. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 433, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 434, line 5, and insert the following:

''(3) JOINT FINANCING ARRANGEMENT.—If a direct farm ownership loan is made under this chapter as part of a joint financing arrangement and the amount of the direct farm ownership loan does not exceed 50 percent of the total principal amount financed under the arrangement, the interest rate on the direct farm ownership loan shall be a rate equal to the greater of—

''(A) the difference between—

''(i) 2 percent; and

''(ii) the interest rate for farm ownership loans under this chapter; or

''(B) 2.5 percent.

SA 1125. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 573, line 25, strike ''$4,226,000,000'' and insert ''$5,726,000,000''.

On page 574, line 9, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$2,500,000,000''.

SA 1126. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XI, insert the following:

SEC. 11___. LIVESTOCK GROSS MARGIN.

Section 523(b)(10) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1523(b)(10)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''fiscal year 2004 and each subsequent fiscal year'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2004 through 2013''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(E) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year.''.

SA 1127. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. COATS, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION AND CAP RELATING TO LIFELINE PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''commercial mobile service'' has the meaning given the term in section 332(d)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(d)(1));

(2) the term ''eligible telecommunications carrier'' has the meaning given the term in section 214(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e)); and

(3) the term ''Lifeline program'' means the Lifeline program of the Federal Communications Commission set forth under sections 54.400 through 54.417 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) PROHIBITION ON UNIVERSAL SERVICE SUPPORT OF COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE THROUGH LIFELINE PROGRAM.—A provider of commercial mobile service may not receive universal service support under sections 214(e) and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 254) for the provision of such service through the Lifeline program.

(c) LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR LIFELINE PROGRAM.—Beginning in fiscal year 2014, and each fiscal year thereafter, eligible telecommunications carriers shall receive, in the aggregate, in universal service support under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) for the provision of service through the Lifeline program, an amount that is not more than the amount that eligible telecommunications carriers received in universal service support under such section for the provision of service through the Lifeline program during fiscal year 2008.

SA 1128. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 309, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 26___. WETLANDS CERTIFICATION AND DELINEATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall revise and promulgate regulations to implement section 1222(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3822(a)).

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In promulgating the regulations described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) any wetland delineated on a map by the Secretary during the period beginning November 29, 1990, and ending on December 3, 1996;

(2) any revision to the delineation described in paragraph (1) that was made as a

result of a final decision (including any subsequent appeal) and certified accordingly; and

(3) any revision to applicable procedures needed to ensure the use of the calculated average of annual levels of precipitation recorded on a farm during the period beginning on January 1, 1971, and ending on December 31, 2000.

SA 1129. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 308, after line 25, add the following:

(c) PROHIBITION ON EXCESSIVE PENALTIES.—Section 1221 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3821) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) PROHIBITION ON EXCESSIVE PENALTIES.—The maximum penalty assessed against a person determined to have committed a violation under subsection (a) or ineligible under subsection (c) shall be an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

''(1) the net quantity of acres of the specific wetland determined to be subject to noncompliance;

''(2) the average land rent for the applicable county for each relevant crop year, as determined by the National Agricultural Statistics Service; and

''(3) the number of crop years of determined noncompliance, not to exceed 3 crop years.''.

SA 1130. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COATS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. AGRICULTURAL DISCHARGES.

Section 402(l) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL DISCHARGES.—A permit shall not be required by the Administrator nor shall the Administrator require a State to require a permit under this Act for a routine agricultural discharge caused by runoff from any agricultural area that is not used for the concentrated confinement of animals or the storage or application of animal manure.''.

SA 1131. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12 ____. STUDY ON THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF EXTREME WEATHER EVENTS AND CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct regional studies of the economic and other risks and vulnerabilities due to extreme weather events and climate change on agriculture in the United States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The studies under subsection (a) shall—

(1) build and expand on previous USDA studies, and updating those analyses based on the most current climate change modeling;

(2) characterize the economic and other risks due to changes in extreme weather events and climate change over the short-term and long-term, such periods defined as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(3) assess risks and vulnerabilities and the potential economic impacts of climate change and extreme weather on, a range of agricultural sectors important within each region, including for example, dairy, grain, meat and poultry, specialty crops (such as fruits, vegetables, wine, and maple syrup), forestry and forest products, and other agricultural products; and

(4) consider factors such as changes in the cost of feedstock, changes in fertility and productivity, vulnerability to disease, environmental degradation, and other relevant factors; and

(5) consider the potential economic impacts to rural economies resulting from direct impacts to agriculture, tourism, and other economic sectors on which rural, agricultural communities depend heavily;

(6) use a range of sources for purposes of analyzing the economic impacts, including observations from, and the experience of, agriculture producers.

(7) cooperate with Public and Land Grant Institutions within each region in carrying out these studies.

SA 1132. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1111, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. 11_____. NATIONAL DROUGHT COUNCIL AND DROUGHT PREPAREDNESS PLANS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the National Drought Council established by this section.

(2) CRITICAL SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''critical service provider'' means an entity that provides—

(A) power;

(B) water, including water provided by an irrigation organization or facility;

(C) sewer services; or

(D) wastewater treatment.

(3) DROUGHT.—The term ''drought'' means a natural disaster that is caused by a deficiency in precipitation—

(A) that may lead to a deficiency in surface and subsurface water supplies, including rivers, streams, wetlands, ground water, soil moisture, reservoir supplies, lake levels, and snow pack; and

(B) that causes or may cause—

(i) substantial economic or social impacts; or

(ii) physical damage or injury to individuals, property, or the environment.

(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(5) INTERSTATE WATERSHED.—The term ''interstate watershed'' means a watershed that transcends State or tribal boundaries, or both.

(6) MEMBER.—The term ''member'', with respect to the National Drought Council, means—

(A) a member of the Council specified or appointed under this section; or

(B) the designee of a member of the Council.

(7) MITIGATION.—The term ''mitigation'' means a short- or long-term action, program, or policy that is implemented in advance of or during a drought to minimize any risks and impacts of drought.

(8) NEIGHBORING COUNTRY.—The term ''neighboring country'' means Canada and Mexico.

(9) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) the several States;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) American Samoa;

(D) Guam;

(E) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(F) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(G) the United States Virgin Islands.

(10) TRIGGER.—The term ''trigger'' means the thresholds or criteria that must be satisfied before mitigation or emergency assistance may be provided to an area—

(A) in which drought is emerging; or

(B) that is experiencing a drought.

(11) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ''Under Secretary'' means the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

(12) WATERSHED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''watershed'' means—

(i) a region or area with common hydrology;

(ii) an area drained by a waterway that drains into a lake or reservoir;

(iii) the total area above a given point on a stream that contributes water to the flow at that point; or

(iv) the topographic dividing line from which surface streams flow in 2 different directions.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''watershed'' does not include an area or region that is larger than a river basin.

(13) WATERSHED GROUP.—The term ''watershed group'' means a group of individuals, formally recognized by the appropriate State or States, who represent the broad scope of relevant interests within a watershed and who work together in a collaborative manner to jointly plan the management of the natural resources contained within the watershed.

(b) NATIONAL DROUGHT COUNCIL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture a council to be known as the ''National Drought Council''.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of—

(i) the Secretary (or the designee of the Secretary);

(ii) the Secretary of Commerce (or the designee of the Secretary of Commerce);

(iii) the Secretary of the Army (or the designee of the Secretary of the Army);

(iv) the Secretary of the Interior (or the designee of the Secretary of the Interior);

(v) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or the designee of the Director);

(vi) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (or the designee of the Administrator);

(vii) 4 members appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Governors Association, each of whom shall be the Governor of a State (or the designee of the Governor) and who collectively shall represent the geographic diversity of the United States;

(viii) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Association of Counties;

(ix) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the United States Conference of Mayors;

(x) 1 member appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with Indian tribes, to represent the interests of tribal governments; and

(xi) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Association of Conservation Districts, to represent local soil and water conservation districts.

(B) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of each member of the Council shall be made not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) TERM; VACANCIES.—

(A) TERM.—A non-Federal member of the Council appointed under paragraph (2) shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

(B) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Council—

(i) shall not affect the powers of the Council; and

(ii) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(C) TERMS OF MEMBERS FILLING VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term of a member shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

(4) MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall meet at the call of the co-chairs.

(B) FREQUENCY.—The Council shall meet at least semiannually.

(5) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Council shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings or conduct other business.

(6) COUNCIL LEADERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Federal co-chair and non-Federal co-chair of the Council.

(B) APPOINTMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL CO-CHAIR.—The Secretary shall be Federal co-chair.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL CO-CHAIR.—The non-Federal members of the Council shall select, on a biannual basis, a non-Federal co-chair of the Council from among the members appointed under paragraph (2).

(7) DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office shall serve as Secretary of the Council.

(B) DUTIES.—The Director of the Office shall serve the interests of all members of the Council.

(c) DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of the first meeting of the Council, develop a comprehensive National Drought Policy Action Plan that—

(i)(I) delineates and integrates responsibilities for activities relating to drought (including drought preparedness, mitigation, research, risk management, training, and emergency relief) among Federal agencies; and

(II) ensures that those activities are coordinated with the activities of the States, local governments, Indian tribes, and neighboring countries;

(ii) is consistent with—

(I) this Act and other applicable Federal laws; and

(II) the laws and policies of the States for water management;

(iii) is integrated with drought management programs of the States, Indian tribes, local governments, watershed groups, and private entities; and

(iv) avoids duplicating Federal, State, tribal, local, watershed, and private drought preparedness and monitoring programs in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) evaluate Federal drought-related programs in existence on the date of enactment of this Act and make recommendations to Congress and the President on means of eliminating—

(i) discrepancies between the goals of the programs and actual service delivery;

(ii) duplication among programs; and

(iii) any other circumstances that interfere with the effective operation of the programs;

(C) make recommendations to the President, Congress, and appropriate Federal agencies on—

(i) the establishment of common interagency triggers for authorizing Federal drought mitigation programs; and

(ii) improving the consistency and fairness of assistance among Federal drought relief programs;

(D) encourage and facilitate the development of drought preparedness plans under this Act, including establishing the guidelines under this section;

(E) based on a review of drought preparedness plans, develop and make available to the public drought planning models to reduce water resource conflicts relating to water conservation and droughts;

(F) develop and coordinate public awareness activities to provide the public with access to understandable and informative materials on drought, including—

(i) explanations of the causes of drought, the impacts of drought, and the damages from drought;

(ii) descriptions of the value and benefits of land stewardship to reduce the impacts of drought and to protect the environment;

(iii) clear instructions for appropriate responses to drought, including water conservation, water reuse, and detection and elimination of water leaks;

(iv) information on State and local laws applicable to drought; and

(v) opportunities for assistance to resource-dependent businesses and industries in times of drought; and

(G) establish operating procedures for the Council.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Council shall consult with groups affected by drought emergencies.

(3) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the first meeting of the Council, and annually thereafter, the Council shall submit to Congress a report on the activities carried out under this section.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The annual report shall include a summary of drought preparedness plans.

(II) INITIAL REPORT.—The initial report submitted under clause (i) shall include any recommendations of the Council.

(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Council shall submit to Congress a report that recommends—

(i) amendments to this section; and

(ii) whether the Council should continue.

(d) POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Council may—

(A) hold hearings;

(B) meet and act at any time and place; and

(C) take any testimony and receive any evidence that the Council considers advisable to carry out this section.

(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Council may obtain directly from any Federal agency any information that the Council considers necessary to carry out this section.

(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), on request of the Secretary or the non-Federal co-chair of the Council, the head of a Federal agency may provide information to the Council.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The head of a Federal agency shall not provide any information to the Council that the Federal agency head determines the disclosure of which may cause harm to national security interests.

(3) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Council may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(4) GIFTS.—The Council may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(e) COUNCIL PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(A) NON-FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—A member of the Council who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation.

(B) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—A member of the Council who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to the compensation received for services of the member as an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Council.

(f) TERMINATION OF COUNCIL.—The Council shall terminate on September 30 of the eighth fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) EFFECT OF SECTION.—This section does not affect—

(1) the authority of a State to allocate quantities of water under the jurisdiction of the State; or

(2) any State water rights established as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the activities of the Council $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2021.

SA 1133. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 986, strike lines 21 through 23 and insert the following:

forest materials.''';

(3) in paragraph (13) (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''to be used for the generation of renewable heat or electricity'' after ''materials''; and

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) in subclause (II), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(II) in subclause (III), by inserting ''or'' at the end; and

(III) by inserting after subclause (III) the following:

''(IV) to generate usable heat or electricity;'';

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking ''in accordance with—'' and all that follows through the end of subitem (bb) and inserting ''in accordance with applicable law and land management plans; or''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(i) in subclause (III), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subclause (IV), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(V) byproducts of the manufacture of pulp and paper.''; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (13) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

SA 1134. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 174, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 16___. PROHIBITION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a producer on a farm that sells corn to an ethanol production facility shall not be eligible to receive any payment or benefit described in section 1001D(b)(1)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)(1)(B)) for that corn.

SA 1135. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122___. REPEAL OF RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

Section 211 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545) is amended by striking subsection (o).

SA 1136. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 168, strike line 8 and insert the following:

Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333).

''(v) A benefit from the renewable fuel program established under section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) or any similar biofuel program, as determined by the Secretary.''.

SA 1137. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122___. REFORM OF RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

(a) REVISED DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE FUEL.—Section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (J) and inserting the following:

''(J) RENEWABLE FUEL.—The term 'renewable fuel' means fuel that—

''(i) is produced from renewable biomass;

''(ii) is used to replace or reduce the quantity of fossil fuel present in a transportation fuel; and

''(iii) beginning on January 1, 2016, is advanced biofuel.''.

(b) APPLICABLE VOLUMES.—Section 211(o)(2)(B)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in the table in subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''16.55'' and inserting ''11.95'';

(B) by striking ''18.15'' and inserting ''8.55'';

(C) by striking ''20.5'' and inserting ''5.5'';

(D) by striking ''22.25'' and inserting ''7.25'';

(E) by striking ''24.0'' and inserting ''9.0'';

(F) by striking ''26.0'' and inserting ''11.0'';

(G) by striking ''28.0'' and inserting ''13.0'';

(H) by striking ''30.0'' and inserting ''15.0'';

(I) by striking ''33.0'' and inserting ''18.0''; and

(J) by striking ''36.0'' and inserting ''21.0'';

(2) in subclause (II)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''2022'' and inserting ''2015''; and

(B) in the table, by striking the items relating to calendars years 2016 through 2022;

(3) in subclause (III), in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)'' and inserting ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required for calendar years 2010 through 2015 under subclause (II), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, and of the volume of renewable fuel required for calendar years 2016 through 2022 under the subclause (I)''; and

(4) in subclause (IV), by inserting '', as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013'' after ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) OTHER CALENDAR YEARS.—Section 211(o)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii)(III), by striking ''advanced biofuels in each category (cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel)'' and inserting ''cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel'';

(B) by striking clause (iii); and

(C) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively.

(2) MODIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION PERCENTAGES.—Section 211(o)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(4)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), in the second sentence, by striking ''20, 50, or 60 percent reduction levels'' and inserting ''applicable percent reduction level''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by inserting ''(if applicable)'' after ''(2)(A)(i)''.

(3) WAIVERS.—Section 211(o)(7) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2016,'' before ''advanced biofuels''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2016,'' before ''advanced biofuels''.

(d) APPLICABILITY AND REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section to section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) shall apply only with respect to calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations to carry out the amendments described in paragraph (1), including by amending existing regulations; and

(B) take any steps necessary to ensure those amendments are carried out for calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

SA 1138. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122___. REFORM OF RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

(a) REVISED DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE FUEL.—Section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (J) and inserting the following:

''(J) RENEWABLE FUEL.—The term 'renewable fuel' means fuel that—

''(i) is produced from renewable biomass;

''(ii) is used to replace or reduce the quantity of fossil fuel present in a transportation fuel; and

''(iii) beginning on January 1, 2022, is advanced biofuel.''.

(b) APPLICABLE VOLUMES.—Section 211(o)(2)(B)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in the table in subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''16.55'' and inserting ''15.17'';

(B) by striking ''18.15'' and inserting ''15.27'';

(C) by striking ''20.5'' and inserting ''16.0'';

(D) by striking ''22.25'' and inserting ''16.25'';

(E) by striking ''24.0'' and inserting ''16.5'';

(F) by striking ''26.0'' and inserting ''17.0'';

(G) by striking ''28.0'' and inserting ''17.5'';

(H) by striking ''30.0'' and inserting ''18.0'';

(I) by striking ''33.0'' and inserting ''19.5''; and

(J) by striking ''36.0'' and inserting ''21.0'';

(2) in subclause (II)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''2022'' and inserting ''2021''; and

(B) in the table, by striking the item relating to calendar year 2022;

(3) in subclause (III), in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)'' and inserting ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required for calendar years 2010 through 2021 under subclause (II), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, and of the volume of renewable fuel required for calendar year 2022 under subclause (I)''; and

(4) in subclause (IV), by inserting '', as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013'' after ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) OTHER CALENDAR YEARS.—Section 211(o)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii)(III), by striking ''advanced biofuels in each category (cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel)'' and inserting ''cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel'';

(B) by striking clause (iii); and

(C) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively.

(2) MODIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION PERCENTAGES.—Section 211(o)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(4)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), in the second sentence, by striking ''20, 50, or 60 percent reduction levels'' and inserting ''applicable percent reduction level''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by inserting ''(if applicable)'' after ''(2)(A)(i)''.

(3) WAIVERS.—Section 211(o)(7) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2022,'' before ''advanced biofuels''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2022,'' before ''advanced biofuels''.

(d) APPLICABILITY AND REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section to section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) shall apply only with respect to calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations to carry out the amendments described in paragraph (1), including by amending existing regulations; and

(B) take any steps necessary to ensure those amendments are carried out for calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

SA 1139. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122___. REFORM OF RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

(a) REVISED DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE FUEL.—Section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (J) and inserting the following:

''(J) RENEWABLE FUEL.—The term 'renewable fuel' means fuel that—

''(i) is produced from renewable biomass;

''(ii) is used to replace or reduce the quantity of fossil fuel present in a transportation fuel; and

''(iii) beginning on January 1, 2014, is advanced biofuel.''.

(b) APPLICABLE VOLUMES.—Section 211(o)(2)(B)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in the table in subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''18.15'' and inserting ''3.75'';

(B) by striking ''20.5'' and inserting ''5.5'';

(C) by striking ''22.25'' and inserting ''7.25'';

(D) by striking ''24.0'' and inserting ''9.0'';

(E) by striking ''26.0'' and inserting ''11.0'';

(F) by striking ''28.0'' and inserting ''13.0'';

(G) by striking ''30.0'' and inserting ''15.0'';

(H) by striking ''33.0'' and inserting ''18.0''; and

(I) by striking ''36.0'' and inserting ''21.0'';

(2) in subclause (II)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''2022'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(B) in the table, by striking the items relating to calendars years 2014 through 2022;

(3) in subclause (III), in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)'' and inserting ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required for calendar years 2010 through 2013 under subclause (II), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 , and of the volume of renewable fuel required for calendar years 2014 through 2022 under the subclause (I)''; and

(4) in subclause (IV), by inserting '', as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013'' after ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) OTHER CALENDAR YEARS.—Section 211(o)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii)(III), by striking ''advanced biofuels in each category (cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel)'' and inserting ''cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel'';

(B) by striking clause (iii); and

(C) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively.

(2) MODIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION PERCENTAGES.—Section 211(o)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(4)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), in the second sentence, by striking ''20, 50, or 60 percent reduction levels'' and inserting ''applicable percent reduction level''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by inserting ''(if applicable)'' after ''(2)(A)(i)''.

(3) WAIVERS.—Section 211(o)(7) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2014,'' before ''advanced biofuels''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2014,'' before ''advanced biofuels''.

(d) APPLICABILITY AND REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section to section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) shall apply only with respect to calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations to carry out the amendments described in paragraph (1); and

(B) take any steps necessary to ensure those amendments are carried out for calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

SA 1140. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Renewable Fuel Standard Reform

SEC. 12301. DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE FUEL.

(a) DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE FUEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (J) and inserting the following:

''(J) RENEWABLE FUEL.—The term 'renewable fuel' means fuel that—

''(i) is produced from renewable biomass;

''(ii) is used to replace or reduce the quantity of fossil fuel present in a transportation fuel; and

''(iii) beginning on January 1, 2014, is advanced biofuel.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 211(o)(1)(B)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''renewable fuel'' and inserting ''fuel described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (J)''.

(b) APPLICABLE VOLUMES.—Section 211(o)(2)(B)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in the table in subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''18.15'' and inserting ''3.75'';

(B) by striking ''20.5'' and inserting ''5.5'';

(C) by striking ''22.25'' and inserting ''7.25'';

(D) by striking ''24.0'' and inserting ''9.0'';

(E) by striking ''26.0'' and inserting ''11.0'';

(F) by striking ''28.0'' and inserting ''13.0'';

(G) by striking ''30.0'' and inserting ''15.0'';

(H) by striking ''33.0'' and inserting ''18.0''; and

(I) by striking ''36.0'' and inserting ''21.0'';

(2) in subclause (II)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''2022'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(B) in the table, by striking the items relating to calendars years 2014 through 2022;

(3) in subclause (III), in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)'' and inserting ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required for calendar years 2010 through 2013 under subclause (II), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, and of the volume of renewable fuel required for calendar years 2014 through 2022 under the subclause (I)''; and

(4) in subclause (IV), by inserting '', as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013'' after ''of the volume of advanced biofuel required under subclause (II)''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) OTHER CALENDAR YEARS.—Section 211(o)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii)(III), by striking ''advanced biofuels in each category (cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel)'' and inserting ''cellulosic biofuel and biomass-based diesel'';

(B) by striking clause (iii); and

(C) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively.

(2) APPLICABLE PERCENT REDUCTION LEVEL.—Section 211(o)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(4)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), in the second sentence, by striking ''20, 50, or 60 percent reduction levels'' and inserting ''applicable percent reduction level''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by inserting ''(if applicable)'' after ''(2)(A)(i)''.

(3) WAIVERS.—Section 211(o)(7) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2014,'' before ''advanced biofuels''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii), in the second sentence, by inserting '', if that year is before 2014,'' before ''advanced biofuels''.

SEC. 12302. CELLULOSIC BIOFUEL REQUIREMENT BASED ON ACTUAL PRODUCTION.

(a) PROVISION OF ESTIMATE OF VOLUMES OF CELLULOSIC BIOFUEL.—Section 211(o)(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''Not later than'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In determining any estimate under clause (i), with respect to the following calendar year, of the projected volume of cellulosic biofuel production (as described in paragraph (7)(D)(i)), the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall—

''(aa) for each cellulosic biofuel production facility that is producing (and continues to produce) cellulosic biofuel during the period of January 1 through October 31 of the calendar year in which the estimate is made (in this clause referred to as the 'current calendar year')—

''(AA) determine the average monthly volume of cellulosic biofuel produced by the facility, based on the actual volume produced by such facility during the period; and

''(BB) based on that average monthly volume of production, determine the estimated annualized volume of cellulosic biofuel production for the facility for the current calendar year; and

''(bb) for each cellulosic biofuel production facility that begins initial production of (and continues to produce) cellulosic biofuel after January 1 of the current calendar year—

''(AA) determine the average monthly volume of cellulosic biofuel produced by the facility, based on the actual volume produced by the facility during the period beginning on the date of initial production of cellulosic biofuel by the facility and ending on October 31 of the current calendar year; and

''(BB) based on that average monthly volume of production, determine the estimated

annualized volume of cellulosic biofuel production for the facility for the current calendar year.

''(II) CALCULATION.—An estimate under clause (i) with respect to the following calendar year of the projected volume of cellulosic biofuel production (as described in paragraph (7)(D)(i)), shall be equal to the total of the estimated annual volumes of cellulosic biofuel production for all cellulosic biofuel production facilities described in subclause (I) for the current calendar year.''.

(b) REDUCTION IN APPLICABLE VOLUME.—Section 211(o)(7)(D)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)(D)(i)) (as amended by section 12301(c)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''based on the'' and inserting ''using the exact''; and

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''may also reduce'' and inserting ''shall also reduce''; and

(B) by striking ''by the same or a lesser volume'' and inserting ''by the same volume''.

SEC. 12303. REDUCTION IN APPLICABLE VOLUME OF RENEWABLE FUEL CORRESPONDING TO CERTAIN REDUCTIONS IN APPLICABLE VOLUME OF BIOMASS-BASED DIESEL.

Section 211(o)(7)(E)(ii) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)(E)(ii)) (as amended by section 12301(c)(3)(B)) is amended in the second sentence by striking ''may also reduce'' and inserting ''shall reduce''.

SEC. 12304. APPLICABILITY AND REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by sections 12301 through 12303 to section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)) shall apply only with respect to calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations to carry out the amendments described in subsection (a); and

(2) take any steps necessary to ensure those amendments are carried out for calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter.

SEC. 12305. PROHIBITION OF GASOLINE BLENDS WITH GREATER THAN 10-VOLUME-PERCENT ETHANOL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not, including by granting a waiver under section 211(f)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(f)(4)), authorize or otherwise allow the introduction into commerce of gasoline containing greater than 10-volume-percent ethanol.

SEC. 12306. PROHIBITION OF WAIVERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any waiver granted under section 211(f)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(f)(4)) before the date of enactment of this Act that allows the introduction into commerce of gasoline containing greater than 10-volume-percent ethanol for use in motor vehicles shall have no force or effect.

(b) CERTAIN WAIVERS.—The waivers described in subsection (a) include the following:

(1) The waiver entitled, ''Partial Grant and Partial Denial of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent; Decision of the Administrator'', 75 Fed. Reg. 68094 (November 4, 2010).

(2) The waiver entitled, ''Partial Grant of Clean Air Act Waiver Application Submitted by Growth Energy To Increase the Allowable Ethanol Content of Gasoline to 15 Percent; Decision of the Administrator'', 76 Fed. Reg. 4662 (January 26, 2011).

SEC. 12307. MISFUELING RULE.

The portions of the rule entitled, ''Regulation to Mitigate the Misfueling of Vehicles and Engines with Gasoline Containing Greater Than Ten Volume Percent Ethanol and Modifications to the Reformulated and Conventional Gasoline Programs'', 76 Fed. Reg. 44406 (July 25, 2011) to mitigate misfueling shall have no force and effect beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1141. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12213. SMALL BUSINESS FAIRNESS AND REGULATORY TRANSPARENCY.

Section 609(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) the Department of Agriculture.''.

SA 1142. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 299, line 18, strike ''May 1, 2013'' and insert ''the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013''.

On page 306, strike lines 12 through 16 and insert the following:

''(A)(i) Subject to clause (ii), in the case of wetland that the Secretary determines was converted after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 and continues to be

Beginning on page 306, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 307, line 3.

On page 307, line 4, strike ''for'' and insert ''For''.

On page 307, strike lines 13 through 18, and insert the following:

''(B) In the case of a wetland that the Secretary determines was converted prior to the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, ineligibility under this subsection shall not apply.

On page 307, line 19, strike ''(C)'' and insert ''(D)''.

SA 1143. Mr. REID (for Ms. HIRONO) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 129, recognizing the significance of May 2013 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; as follows:

In the fifth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''nearly 6 percent'' and insert ''approximately 5.5 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. STABENOW. 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 May 23, 2013, at 11 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 23, 2013, at 9 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, ''United States-European Union Economic Relations: Crisis and Opportunity.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 23, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 23, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the

Federal Workforce of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 23, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Improving Federal Health Care in Rural America: Developing the Workforce and Building Partnerships.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider these nominations: Calendar Nos. 93, 94, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, with the exception of COL Joseph J. Heck, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, and 140, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy, that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate, that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations, any related statements be printed in the Record; and President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Deborah Kay Jones, of New Mexico, 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 Libya.

James Knight, of Alabama, 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 Republic of Chad.

THE JUDICIARY

Michael Kenny O'Keefe, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Robert D. Okun, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. James E. McClain

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. David L. Goldfein

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert C. Bolton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 9335:

To be brigadier general

Col. Andrew P. Armacost

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John F. Wharton

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Gabriel Troiano

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. Jeffrey B. Clark

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. James A. Adkins

To be brigadier general

Col. James D. Campbell

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Wayne L. Black
Colonel Michael K. Hanifan
Colonel Daniel M. Krumrei
Colonel Robert E. Windham, Jr.

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brigadier General Mark E. Anderson
Brigadier General Julie A. Bentz
Brigadier General Courtney P. Carr
Brigadier General Daniel R. Hokanson
Brigadier General Francis S. Laudano, III
Brigadier General Scott D. Legwold
Brigadier General Roger L. McClellan
Brigadier General Timothy M. McKeithen
Brigadier General Michael D. Navrkal
Brigadier General Bruce E. Oliveira
Brigadier General Charles E. Petrarca, Jr.
Brigadier General Kenneth C. Roberts
Brigadier General William F. Roy
Brigadier General William L. Smith

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Steven R. Beach
Colonel Kenneth A. Beard
Colonel Fred C. Bolton
Colonel Michael J. Bouchard
Colonel Gregory S. Bowen
Colonel Mark D. Brackney
Colonel John E. Burk
Colonel Christopher M. Burns
Colonel Sean M. Casey
Colonel Russell A. Crane
Colonel Richard H. Dahlman
Colonel Marc Ferraro
Colonel Robert A. Fode
Colonel Christopher J. Fowler
Colonel Paul F. Griffin
Colonel Gerald E. Hadley
Colonel Patrick M. Hamilton
Colonel William M. Hart
Colonel Robert T. Herbert
Colonel Marvin T. Hunt
Colonel Charles T. Jones
Colonel Hunt W. Kerrigan
Colonel John F. King
Colonel Dirk R. Kloss
Colonel Jeffrey P. Kramer
Colonel Gordon D. Kuntz
Colonel Masaki G. Kuwana, Jr.
Colonel Donald P. Laucirica
Colonel Mark S. Lovejoy
Colonel Mark A. Lumpkin
Colonel Robert K. Lytle
Colonel Tammy J. Maas
Colonel Francis B. Magurn, II
Colonel Mark G. Malanka
Colonel Thomas R. McCune
Colonel Francis M. McGinn
Colonel Michael D. Merritt
Colonel Richard J. Noriega
Colonel Robert D. Pasqualucci
Colonel Val L. Peterson
Colonel Christopher J. Petty
Colonel John M. Rhodes
Colonel Scott H. Schofield
Colonel Linda L. Singh
Colonel Danny K. Speigner
Colonel Bryan E. Suntheimer
Colonel Michael A. Sutton
Colonel Steven A. Tabor
Colonel Gregory A. Thingvold
Colonel Michael C. Thompson
Colonel Kirk E. Vanpelt
Colonel William A. Ward
Colonel Steven R. Watt
Colonel Ronald P. Welch
Colonel David B. Wiles
Colonel Giselle M. Wilz
Colonel James P. Wong
Colonel Jerry L. Wood
Colonel Gary S. Yaple

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brigadier General Louis H. Guernsey, Jr.
Brigadier General Kenneth L. Reiner

To be brigadier general

Colonel Stephen G. Kent
Colonel Juan A. Rivera

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard J. Torres

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael Dillard

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Donald E. Jackson, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William T. Grisoli

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. John M. Cho

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Brian E. Alvin

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brigadier General William F. Duffy
Brigadier General Ronald E. Dziedzicki
Brigadier General Mark T. McQueen
Brigadier General Lucas N. Polakowski
Brigadier General Ricky L. Waddell

To be brigadier general

Colonel Steven W. Ainsworth
Colonel Ronald A. Bassford
Colonel Jose R. Burgos
Colonel John E. Cardwell
Colonel Daniel J. Christian
Colonel John J. Elam
Colonel Bruce E. Hackett
Colonel Thomas J. Kallman
Colonel William B. Mason
Colonel Kenneth H. Moore
Colonel Thomas T. Murray
Colonel Michael C. O'Guinn
Colonel Miyako N. Schanely

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Read Adm. Terry J. Benedict

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Joseph W. Rixey

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Captain John W.V. Ailes
Captain Babette Bolivar
Captain Daryl L. Caudle
Captain Kyle J. Cozad
Captain Randy B. Crites
Captain Daniel H. Fillion
Captain Lisa M. Franchetti
Captain Marcus A. Hitchcock
Captain Thomas J. Kearney
Captain Roy J. Kelley
Captain James T. Loeblein
Captain Brian E. Luther
Captain William R. Merz
Captain Michael T. Moran
Captain Christopher J. Murray
Captain John B. Nowell, Jr.
Captain Timothy G. Szymanski
Captain Richard L. Williams, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Timothy J. White

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Nancy A. Norton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Robert D. Sharp

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Louis V. Cariello

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Mark I. Fox

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Michelle J. Howard

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Ted N. Branch

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Sean A. Pybus

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Paul A. Grosklags

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Scott H. Swift

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert R. Ruark

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Glenn M. Walters

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN349 AIR FORCE nomination of Matthew J. Gervais, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 23, 2013.

PN429 AIR FORCE nomination of Bradly A. Carlson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN430–1 AIR FORCE nominations (118) beginning MICHAEL LUCAS AHMANN, and ending BERNARD JOHN YOSTEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

PN226 ARMY nominations (556) beginning JAMES ACEVEDO, and ending D011666, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 19, 2013.

PN227 ARMY nominations (600) beginning GARLAND A. ADKINS, III, and ending G010188, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 19, 2013.

PN228 ARMY nominations (1007) beginning STEVEN J. ACKERSON, and ending G010128, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 19, 2013.

PN336 ARMY nomination of Michael B. Moore, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 18, 2013.

PN350 ARMY nominations (5) beginning THOMAS G. BEHLING, and ending RAYMOND G. STRAWBRIDGE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 23, 2013.

PN431 ARMY nomination of Shercoda G. Smaw, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN432 ARMY nomination of Carl N. Soffler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN433 ARMY nomination of Owen B. Mohn, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN434 ARMY nominations (2) beginning CARMELO N. OTEROSANTIAGO, and ending JOHN H. SEOK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN435 ARMY nominations (2) beginning Brent E. Harvey, and ending Joohyun A. Kim, which norninations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN436 ARMY nominations (9) beginning JERRY M. ANDERSON, and ending MAUREEN H. WEIGL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN437 ARMY nominations (16) beginning DENNIS R. BELL, and ending KENT J. VINCE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN438 ARMY nominations (26) beginning DAVID W. ADMIRE, and ending D006281, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN439 ARMY nominations (32) beginning CHRISTOPHER G. ARCHER, and ending D011779, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN440 ARMY nominations (86) beginning JAMES A. ADAMEC, and ending VANESSA

WORSHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN441 ARMY nominations (105) beginning EDWARD P.C. AGER, and ending JOHN P. ZOLL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN89 MARINE CORPS nomination of Darren M. Gallagher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 23, 2013.

PN90 MARINE CORPS nomination of Dusty C. Edwards, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 23, 2013.

PN95 MARINE CORPS nomination of Sal L. Leblanc, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 23, 2013.

PN96 MARINE CORPS nomination of Mauro Morales, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 23, 2013.

PN113 MARINE CORPS nominations (232) beginning JESSICA L. ACOSTA, and ending MATTHEW S. YOUNGBLOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 23, 2013.

PN114 MARINE CORPS nominations (281) beginning RICO ACOSTA, and ending ANDREW J. ZETTS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 23, 2013.

PN454 MARINE CORPS nomination of Randolph T. Page, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

PN231 NAVY nomination of Jeremy J. Aujero, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 19, 2013.

PN283 NAVY nomination of John P. Newton, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 9, 2013.

PN284 NAVY nomination of Daniel W. Testa, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 9, 2013.

PN315 NAVY nomination of Kevin J. Parker, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 11, 2013.

PN326 NAVY nomination of Maria V. Navarro, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 2013.

PN327 NAVY nomination of Shane G. Harris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 15, 2013.

PN351 NAVY nomination of Latanya A. Oneal, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 23, 2013.

PN400 NAVY nominations (3) beginning STEPHEN J. LEPP, and ending JOHN C. RUDD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 6, 2013.

PN401 NAVY nomination of Sarah E. Niles, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 6, 2013.

PN402 NAVY nomination of Richard Diaz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 6, 2013.

PN442 NAVY nomination of Tanya Wong, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN443 NAVY nomination of Karen R. Dallas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN444 NAVY nominations (2) beginning Ronald G. Oswald, and ending Nikita Tihonov, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

PN450 NAVY nominations (19) beginning CRAIG S. COLEMAN, and ending WILLIAM R. VOLK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 16, 2013.

NOMINATION OF MARK A. BARNETT TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

NOMINATION OF CLAIRE R. KELLY TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consider Calendar Nos. 11 and 12; that the Senate proceed to vote on the nominations listed with no intervening action or debate, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, and President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the nominations.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark A. Barnett, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, and the nomination of Claire R. Kelly, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as we vote today on two nominations to the Court of International Trade, I want to note that this week we reached a milestone. It is 5 months into President Obama's second term, and we have just now reached the same number of circuit and district confirmations that President George H.W. Bush achieved in his 4 years as President. Of course, we remain nearly 20 confirmations behind the pace we set when President George W. Bush was in office. While some have argued that this is because President Obama has not made enough nominations, the fact is that he has sent up more district nominees at this point in his presidency than President George W. Bush had at the same point. The reason the Senate confirmations are lagging behind is because Senate Republicans have engaged in unprecedented obstruction of district court nominees. At this point in 2005, over 97 percent of President Bush's district nominees had been confirmed, but just 86 percent of President Obama's have been confirmed.

Today's vote on Mark Barnett is also a milestone of a sort. He was one of the 11 judicial nominees who were stalled at the end of last year because Senate Republicans refused to allow him a vote. We are approaching the Memorial Day recess and the Senate is still working on nominations that could and should have been completed last year. These unnecessary delays on confirmations are bad for the Senate, bad for our Federal courts, and bad for the American people.

After today's votes, there will be another seven nominees pending on the Executive Calendar, and all but one were reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee. There is no reason to further delay action on these nominees: We should follow Senate tradition and vote on all of them before the recess. Nitza Quinones Alejandro, Luis Restrepo, Jeffrey Schmehl, Kenneth Gonzales, Gregory Phillips, Ray Chen, and Jennifer Dorsey are awaiting confirmation.

These nominees would fill important vacancies. For example, three of these nominees would fill vacancies in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, where there are seven current vacancies. These are vacancies we need to fill, and, since the nominees are supported by every Republican on the Judiciary Committee, as well as their home State Republican Senator, there is no reason not to vote on them today.

Mark Barnett is currently the Deputy Chief Counsel in the U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Chief Counsel for Import Administration, where he has worked since 1995. From 2008 to 2009, he was on detail to the U.S. House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade. Prior to his government service, Mr. Barnett was an associate in the Washington, DC office of Steptoe & Johnson.

Claire Kelly is a professor of law at Brooklyn Law School, where she teaches classes on international trade, international business law, and administrative law. Prior to entering academia, she spent 4 years as an associate and 3 years as a consultant specializing in customs and trade law at the law firm Coudert Brothers in New York City.

I congratulate both nominees. Nominations to the Court of International Trade have historically been noncontroversial and have been moved quickly by the full Senate. The most recent confirmation to that court came less than a month after the nominee had been reported, so it is unfortunate that Mark Barnett and Claire Kelly have been unnecessarily stalled for more than 3 months.

Earlier this week I placed in the RECORD a Wall Street Journal article titled ''Open Judgeships Show D.C. Dysfunction.'' I, again, urge Senate Republicans to work in a bipartisan way and show that the Senate can make real progress. All Senate Democrats are ready to vote on all these judicial nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the nomination, the question is, Will the Senate advise

and consent to the nomination of Mark A. Barnett, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the nomination, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Claire R. Kelly, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate resumes legislative session.

ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 129 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 129) recognizing the significance of May 2013 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the Hirono amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 129) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1143) was agreed to, as follows:

In the fifth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''nearly 6 percent'' and insert ''approximately 5.5 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively,''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 129

Whereas the United States joins together each May to pay tribute to the contributions of generations of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who have enriched the history of the United States;

Whereas the history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community is an inherently diverse population comprised of more than 45 distinct ethnicities and more than 100 language dialects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, the Asian-American population grew faster than any other racial or ethnic group in the United States during the last decade, surging nearly 46 percent between 2000 and 2010, which is a growth rate 4 times faster than that of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the 2010 decennial census estimated that there are approximately 17,300,000 residents of the United States who identify as Asian and approximately 1,200,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, making up approximately 5.5 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively, of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the month of May was selected for Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month because the first immigrants from Japan arrived in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869, with substantial contributions from immigrants from China;

Whereas 2013 marks 70 years since the repeal of the Act of May 5, 1892 (27 Stat. 25, chapter 60) (commonly known as the ''Geary Act'' or the ''Chinese Exclusion Act''), and 25 years since the passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 (50 U.S.C. App. 1989b et seq.) that granted reparations to Japanese Americans interned during World War II, both cases in which Congress acted to address discriminatory laws that targeted people of Asian descent;

Whereas section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and requests the President to issue an annual proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

Whereas, in 2013, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, a bicameral caucus of Members of Congress advocating on behalf of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, is composed of 40 Members, including 13 Members of Asian or Pacific Islander descent;

Whereas, in 2013, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are serving in State legislatures across the United States in record numbers, including in the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington;

Whereas the number of Federal judges who are Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders more than doubled between 2009 and 2013, reflecting a commitment to diversity in the Federal judiciary that has resulted in the confirmations of high caliber Asian-American and Pacific Islander judicial nominees;

Whereas there remains much to be done to ensure that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have access to resources and a voice in the Government of the United States and continue to advance in the political landscape of the United States; and

Whereas celebrating Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and to appreciate the challenges faced by Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of May 2013 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; and

(2) recognizes that the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community enhances the rich diversity of and strengthens the United States.

AUTHORIZING DOCUMENT PRODUCTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 158.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 158) to authorize the production of records by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has received a request from a Federal agency seeking access to records that the subcommittee obtained during its recent review of the expenditures of U.S. funds related to U.S. efforts in Afghanistan.

This resolution would authorize the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, acting jointly, to provide records, obtained by the Subcommittee in the course of its review, in response to this request and requests from other government entities and officials with a legitimate need for the records.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent 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. 158) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) providing for a conditional adjournment or the recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3 AND H.R. 271

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there are two bills at the desk. If that is the case, I ask for their first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3) to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL Pipeline, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 271) to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading and object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 93–415, as amended by Public Law 102–586, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: The Honorable Maura Corrigan of Michigan, vice Steven Jones.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that from Friday, May 24, through Monday, June 3, Senators LEVIN and ROCKEFELLER be authorized to sign any duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Tuesday, May 28, from 10 a.m. to noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 24, 2013 THROUGH MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, May 24, at 12:30 p.m.; Tuesday, May 28, at 12:00 p.m., and Friday, May 31, at 12 p.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, May 31, until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 3, 2013, unless the Senate receives a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 17, the adjournment resolution, and that if the Senate receives such a message, the Senate adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 3, 2013; that on Monday, following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the farm bill, S. 954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator STABENOW and Senator COCHRAN have arranged two votes that will begin on Monday, June 3, at 5:30.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, MAY 24, AT 12:30 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., conditionally adjourned until Friday, May 24, 2013, at 12:30 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

LANDYA B. MCCAFFERTY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, VICE STEVEN J. MCAULIFFE, RETIRED.

BRIAN MORRIS, OF MONTANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA, VICE SAM E. HADDON, RETIRED.

SUSAN P. WATTERS, OF MONTANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA, VICE RICHARD F. CEBULL, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ZACHARY THOMAS FARDON, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PATRICK J. FITZGERALD, TERM EXPIRED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MATTHEW D. LOWE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MELISSA JO GARZA, OF TEXAS

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CHRISTIAN CHARETTE, OF FLORIDA
CYNTHIA ANNE EHRLICH, OF CALIFORNIA
ROGER CHANCE SULLIVAN, OF WASHINGTON

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JUANITA LUCIA AGUIRRE, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL AHN, OF CALIFORNIA
REBEKAH DAVIS AHRENS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RYAN AIKEN, OF UTAH
R. ANDREW ALLEN, OF VIRGINIA
NAFEESAH ALLEN, OF NEW JERSEY
NATALIA ALMAGUER, OF FLORIDA
MAYRA ALEJANDRA ALVARADO TORRES, OF CALIFORNIA
MOLLY MCKNIGHT AMADOR, OF TENNESSEE
KRISTER BERNT ANDERSON, OF MARYLAND
REBECCA ARCHER–KNEPPER, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN S. ARMIGER, OF COLORADO
BRIAN P. ASMUS, OF FLORIDA
WILLIAM P. ASTILLERO, OF NEW JERSEY
KARA B. BABROWSKI, OF FLORIDA
ZACHARY BAILEY, OF MARYLAND
JUDITH E. BAKER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
TERESA SUSAN BALL, OF TENNESSEE
DAWN ELIZABETH BEAUPAIN, OF FLORIDA
ESTHER FALCON BELL, OF RHODE ISLAND
JESSICA ERIN BERLOW, OF FLORIDA
VIRGINIA ELEANOR BLAKEMAN, OF NEW YORK
CHELAN BLISS, OF WASHINGTON
AJA CITTRECE BONSU, OF TEXAS
ANTHONY JUNG BONVILLE, OF TEXAS
VIRGILE GEORGES BORDERIES, OF CALIFORNIA
ASHLEY CHANTÉL BORDNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
DAVID SEAN BOXER, OF CALIFORNIA
ANNE BRAGHETTA, OF CALIFORNIA
VIRGINIA CLAIRE BREEDLOVE, OF CALIFORNIA
BRIGETTE BUCHET, OF MARYLAND
RAVI FRANKLIN BUCK, OF MISSOURI
PETER BURBA, OF CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW A.BUSHELL, OF CONNECTICUT
WILLIAM A. CAMPBELL, OF WISCONSIN
CARINA R. CANAAN, OF FLORIDA
NATALIA DEL PILAR CAPEL, OF FLORIDA
ALYSSA M. CARALLA, OF GEORGIA
OMAR CARDENTEY, OF FLORIDA
MARCUS BLAIR CARPENTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DANIEL C. CARROLL, OF HAWAII
MELISSA ANN RHODES CARTER, OF ARKANSAS
ANDREW NICHOLAS CARUSO, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL PATRICK CASEY, OF VIRGINIA
BETH M. CHESTERMAN, OF TEXAS
JONATHAN B. CHESTNUT, OF GEORGIA
SARAH JANE CIACCIA, OF TENNESSEE
ERIN JORDAN CLANCY, OF CALIFORNIA
TRAVIS JOHN COBERLY, OF KANSAS
JACLYN ANNE COLE, OF MARYLAND
DESIREE MICHELLE CORMIER, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER A. CRAWFORD, OF UTAH
CHRISTOPHER B. CREAGHE, OF COLORADO
ROBIN SLOAN CROMER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JUAN C. CRUZ, OF FLORIDA
GAETAN WILLIAM DAMBERG–OTT, OF NEW YORK
JESSICA RENEE DANCEL, OF COLORADO
SCOTT B. DARGUS, OF WASHINGTON
PETER JOHN DAVIDIAN, OF OHIO
JUSTIN E. DAVIS, OF GEORGIA
NEIL MICHAEL DIBIASE, OF FLORIDA
TRENTON BROWN DOUTHETT, OF OHIO
SADIE ELEN DWORAK, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JASON DYER, OF NEW MEXICO
CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL ELMS, OF NEW YORK
STEPHEN J. ESTE, OF TEXAS
MARCUS GEORGE FALION, OF TENNESSEE
JOHANNA L. FERNANDO, OF TEXAS
JOSEPH ANTON FETTE, OF VIRGINIA
KYLE FIELDING, OF WASHINGTON
ERIK T. FINCH, OF TEXAS
JESSE KYLE FINKEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COLIN W. FISHWICK, OF WASHINGTON
JOAN H. FLYNN, OF VIRGINIA
PHILIP LOWELL FOLKEMER, OF MARYLAND
NICOLE LOKOMAIKA'I KIKUE PROBST FOX, OF HAWAII
MATTHEW A. FULLERTON, OF MARYLAND
AARON ELLIOTT GARFIELD, OF CALIFORNIA
GERALDINE B. GASSAM, OF LOUISIANA
JOSEPH GIORDONO–SCHOLZ, OF CALIFORNIA
ANGELA CARMEN GJERTSON, OF TENNESSEE
SARAH ELIZABETH GJORGJIJEVSKI, OF CALIFORNIA
CATHRYN MARGARET GLEASMAN, OF TEXAS
SAMUEL EVERETT GOFFMAN, OF ILLINOIS
HOLLYN J. GREEN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
CATHERINE PHYLLIS GRIFFITH, OF VIRGINIA
PRISCILLA GUZMAN, OF TEXAS
JAMES J. HAGENGRUBER, OF WASHINGTON

LAURA JANE HAMMOND, OF MINNESOTA
CHERYL HARRIS, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL ROSS HARRIS, OF CALIFORNIA
NICHOLAS R. HARRIS, OF VIRGINIA
JANEL MARGARET HEIRD, OF MICHIGAN
PEPIJN M. HELGERS, OF NEW YORK
PATRICIA ADRIENNE HILL, OF MASSACHUSETTS
LAUREN D. HOLMES, OF NORTH CAROLINA
WILLIAM N. HOLTON, JR., OF CALIFORNIA
VERONICA HONS–OLIVER, OF FLORIDA
KATHLEEN INGRID HOSIE, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
DONNA J. HUSS, OF INDIANA
MOUNIR E. IBRAHIM, OF NEW YORK
AMENAGHAMWON IYI–EWEKA, OF WISCONSIN
DANA MARIE JEA, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER JENSEN, OF CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW B. JONES, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN D. KARNES, OF WASHINGTON
JOANNA TRACY KATZMAN, OF NEW JERSEY
JENNIFER ANNE KELLEY, OF FLORIDA
CRAIG S. KENNEDY, OF WASHINGTON
JANET MARIE KENNEDY, OF FLORIDA
MORGAN WHITMIRE KENNEDY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WALTER ANTHONY KERR, OF CONNECTICUT
LAWRENCE J. KORB, JR., OF VIRGINIA
LORRAINE JEAN KRAMER, OF VIRGINIA
JACK C. LAMBERT, OF OREGON
BRENT JOSEPH LAROSA, OF MARYLAND
ELIZABETH E. A. LEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA
ALEXI LEFEVRE, OF FLORIDA
SCOTT HAMILTON LINTON, OF COLORADO
JONATHAN L. LOW, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
W. GARY LOWMAN, JR., OF FLORIDA
SCOTT C. LUEDERS, OF FLORIDA
AMANDA LUGO, OF TEXAS
IAN ROBERT MACKENZIE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIN RUTH MAI, OF VIRGINIA
NAVEED AHMED MALIK, OF TEXAS
MATTHEW R. MALOY, OF MONTANA
ARYANI ELISABETH MANRING, OF PENNSYLVANIA
NICHOLAS B. MANSKE, OF WISCONSIN
TARA L. MARIA, OF VIRGINIA
IZAAK MARTIN, OF WASHINGTON
JUAN D. MARTINEZ, OF NEW YORK
LAUREN D. MATACK, OF CALIFORNIA
TRISHITA MAULA, OF NEW YORK
KELLY JEAN MCANERNEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JAMES PATRICK MCCORMICK, OF ILLINOIS
JOHN B. MCDANIEL, OF TEXAS
GREGORY G. MCELWAIN, OF NEW MEXICO
KELLY A. MCGUIRE, OF TEXAS
RYAN EDWARD MCKEAN, OF WISCONSIN
GREGORY MEIER, OF MARYLAND
ROBERT E. MELVIN, OF TEXAS
MATAN MEYER, OF FLORIDA
AYSA MATTHEW MILLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEAU JUSTIN MILLER, OF MICHIGAN
BENJAMIN J. MILLS, OF NEW MEXICO
SEAN PATRICK MOFFATT, OF NEW YORK
JEREMY JASON MONKS, OF VIRGINIA
NAVARRO MOORE, OF FLORIDA
PATRICIA RENEE MORALES, OF TEXAS
ROBERT E. MORGAN, OF TEXAS
CHAD WILLIAM MORRIS, OF COLORADO
STEPHEN MRAZ, OF FLORIDA
MILESSA N. MUCHMORE–LOWRIE, OF TEXAS
CHARLES VINCENT MURPHY, OF CALIFORNIA
W. MARC MURRI, OF UTAH
KATHERINE MUSGROVE KETCHUM, OF KANSAS
MARK ROBERT NAYLOR, OF TEXAS
PATRICIA NEARY, OF VIRGINIA
LINDA A. NEILAN, OF NEW JERSEY
THOMAS ANDREW NIBLOCK, OF IOWA
JOHN DAVID NORDLANDER, OF COLORADO
ELIZABETH NORMAN, OF WASHINGTON
FREDERICK NICHOLAS NOYES, OF TEXAS
AUTUMN K. OAKLEY, OF WASHINGTON
ELIZABETH CURRAN O'ROURKE, OF ILLINOIS
ALEXANDER R. ORR, OF NEW YORK
MICHELLE R. OSADCZUK, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW J. PARTIN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
MARY LILLIAN PELLEGRINI, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
XIXALA SANDRA PEREZ, OF VIRGINIA
LISA MARIE PETZOLD, OF NEW YORK
JULIAN I. PHILLIPPI, OF OHIO
CAITLIN S. PIPER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
RICHARD JOHN POLNEY, OF NEVADA
MARIA DEL PILAR QUIGUA, OF MASSACHUSETTS
RYAN M. QUINN, OF FLORIDA
THOMAS LEE RADKE, JR., OF MISSOURI
SCOTT R. RASMUSSEN, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE O. RAY, OF OREGON
NANCY FARQUHAR RHODES, OF TEXAS
LEA PALABRICA RIVERA, OF NEW YORK
LAURA AYLWARD ROBINSON, OF WASHINGTON
TANYA ELAINE ROGERS, OF TEXAS
TYLER J. ROGSTAD, OF MINNESOTA
DOUGLAS B. ROSE, OF MINNESOTA
SUSAN ROSS, OF NEW YORK
TERESA ROTUNNO, OF NEVADA
CAREY HALE RUDELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LAUREN C. SANTA, OF NEW JERSEY
NADIA DINA SBEIH, OF CALIFORNIA
JANICE SCHILL, OF CALIFORNIA
KIMBERLY K. SCRIVNER, OF NEVADA
BEHRANG FARIAN SERAJ, OF CALIFORNIA
JAMES P. SHAK, OF ARIZONA
LAUREN C. SHELTON, OF VIRGINIA
LEVI W. SHEPHERD, OF VIRGINIA
AARON M. SINGLETERRY, OF WASHINGTON
MONICA AMELIA SLEDJESKI, OF NEW YORK
LAURENCE J. SOCHA, OF ILLINOIS
JEREMY DAVID SPECTOR, OF TEXAS
MATTHEW BOUTON STANNARD, OF CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW M. STEED, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID S. STIER, OF NEW YORK
ANNA STINCHCOMB, OF VIRGINIA
DANETTE I. SULLIVAN, OF TENNESSEE
SHANNA DIETZ SURENDRA, OF MICHIGAN
ETHAN KENT TABOR, OF MARYLAND
VIOLETA D. TALANDIS, OF FLORIDA
VANESSA ANNE TANTILLO, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL J. TARAPACKI, OF NEW YORK
JAY B. THOMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JULIE THOMPSON, OF FLORIDA
GRETCHEN L. TIETJE, OF TEXAS
PATRICK ALLARD TILLOU, OF VIRGINIA
NICOLE ANNE MARIE TOBIN, OF KANSAS
EMERITA F. TORRES, OF NEW YORK
MIRNA R. TORRES, OF NEW MEXICO
TIMOTHY TRANCHILLA, OF MISSOURI
MARY ELLEN TSEKOS–VELEZ, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY J. VENTRESCA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DANIEL VILLANUEVA, OF FLORIDA
DOMINGO J. VILLARONGA, OF NEW YORK
NICHOLAS VON MERTENS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DAMIAN GEORGE WAMPLER, OF NEW YORK
DARREN IBRAHIM WANG, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS CHARLES WEBER, OF TEXAS
BROOKE WEHRENBERG, OF TEXAS
JOE WELSH, OF CALIFORNIA
CHAD JACOB WESEN, OF WASHINGTON
JOHN NOEL WINSTEAD, OF WYOMING
SCOTT B. WINTON, OF MISSOURI
STACEY ELIZABETH–VERSIE WOOD, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS N. WOTKA, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTIAN S. YUN, OF CALIFORNIA
RUSSELL A. ZALIZNIAK, OF FLORIDA
WILBUR G. ZEHR, OF NEW YORK

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN L. HOOG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. BROOKS L. BASH

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS W. SPOEHR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN D. JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. IVAN E. DENTON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601; AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANK C. PANDOLFE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. NORA W. TYSON

IN THE ARMY

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

BRIAN K. ABNEY
RONALD L. BECKHAM
GEORGIA K. KROESE
ERIC J. OH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JASON T. STEPP

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAVID W. ABBA
BRIAN P. AFFLERBAUGH
LATHEEF N. AHMED
RICKY L. AINSWORTH
SUSAN M. AIROLA SKULLY
ANTHONY J. AJELLO, JR.
JENNIFER C. ALEXANDER
THADDEUS P. ALLEN
RAYMOND ALVES II
MARK C. ANARUMO
LEIGHTON T. ANDERSON, JR.
MICHAEL A. ANDERSON
MICHAEL S. ANGLE
CHRISTOPHER T. ANTHONY
REGINALD E. G. ASH III
SCOTT J. BABBITT
LESLIE P. BABICH
FRED P. BAIER
RICHARD J. BAILEY, JR.
WILLIAM C. BAILEY
BRANDON E. BAKER
JONATHAN P. BAKONYI
THOMAS C. BALLARD
DAVID BALLEW
MATTHEW A. BARKER
BRADLEY W. BARNHART
STEPHEN P. BARROWS
SAMUEL D. BASS
ROBERT G. BATTEMA
JOHN D. BEDINGFIELD
DEAN C. BELLAMY
DAVID M. BENSON
BRADLEY C. BIRD
PETER D. BLAKE
CHRISTOPHER J. BLANEY
THOMAS R. BLAZEK
CHARLES D. BOLTON
ROBERT P. BONGIOVI
DONALD J. BORCHELT
JAMES D. BOTTOMLEE
LORENZO C. BRADLEY
JAMES A. BRAUNSCHNEIDER
STEVEN J. BREEZE
LARA C. BRINSON
KERRY D. BRITT
LARRY R. BROADWELL, JR.
KEVIN W. BROOKS
MATTHEW R. BROOKS
ERIC D. BROWN
ROBERT G. BROWN
NEAL W. BRUEGGER
MICHAEL A. BRUZZINI
RICHARD K. BULLOCK
AMY S. BUMGARNER
JEFFREY S. BURDETT
JOSHUA C. BURGESS
AARON D. BURGSTEIN
TIMOTHY J. BURKE
LAUREL M. BURKEL
ANGELA J. BURTH
FREDERICK E. BUSH III
RICHARD D. BUTLER
CHRISTOPHER L. BYROM
DENNIS O. BYTHEWOOD
STEVEN R. CABOSKY
PHILIP M. CALI
KENNETH D. CALLAHAN
SHAWN W. CAMPBELL
JIMMY R. CANLAS
MICHAEL R. CARDOZA
BRIAN L. CARR
STEPHEN T. CARSON
EUGENE M. CAUGHEY
ROBERT L. CHARLESWORTH
ROBERT M. CHAVEZ
JULIAN C. CHEATER
SAMUEL J. CHESNUT IV
JASON J. E. CHILDS
VINCENT J. CHIOMA
ROBERT O. CIOPPA
ANNE L. CLARK
MICHAEL J. CLARK
PHILIP A. CLINTON
DONALD W. CLOUD
NILES M. COCANOUR
JED S. COHEN
DARREN R. COLE
JAMES E. COLEBANK
BRIAN D. COLLINS
ROY W. COLLINS
TODD A. COLLINS
REYES COLON
CHAD L. CONERLY
SIDNEY S. CONNER
COLIN J. CONNOR
JOEL O. COOK
ROBERT J. COOK
BRYAN S. COON
CHARLES J. COOPER
THOMAS M. COOPER
BRADLEY M. CRITES
ALBERTO E. CRUZ
WILLIAM C. CULVER
DONALD J. DAVIS
PATRICK W. DAVIS
CHRISTOPHER DE LOS SANTOS

MICHAEL J. DEAN
BRIAN J. DELAMATER
CHARLES J. DELAPP II
JAMES M. DELONG
ELIZABETH A. DEMMONS
THOMAS E. DEMPSEY III
JAMES L. DENTON
CHAD P. DERANGER
ABNER DEVALLON, JR.
DANIEL A. DEVOE
STEVEN N. DICKERSON
BRIAN C. DICKINSON
GEORGE T. M. DIETRICH III
TOR F. DIETRICHS
STEVE A. DINZART
JAMES E. DITTUS
MICHAEL P. DOMBROWSKI
THOMAS R. DORL
JOHN L. DORRIAN
CHARLES W. DOUGLASS
JAMES F. DOWNS
NORMAN A. DOZIER
ERIK A. DRAKE
DARIN C. DRIGGERS
RUSSELL D. DRIGGERS
MICHAEL R. DROWLEY
DARON J. DROWN
DAVID W. DYE
CHRISTOPHER A. EAGAN
KEVIN M. EASTLAND
DARREN A. EASTON
LEIF E. ECKHOLM
GILBERT B. EDDY
BRIAN J. EDE
JOHN R. EDWARDS
STEVEN G. EDWARDS
CLINTON W. EICHELBERGER
MARK R. ELY
TODD M. EMMONS
TROY L. ENDICOTT
ERIC A. ESPINO
DARREN E. EWING
JEFFREY K. FALLESEN
THOMAS G. FALZARANO
MICHAEL A. FELICE
MATTHEW C. FINNEGAN
PAUL R. FIORENZA
JACK D. FISCHER
ARMANDO E. FITERRE
FRANK A. FLORES
STEVEN J. FOLDS
MATTHEW J. FOLEY
KYLE C. FORRER
ERIC N. FORSYTH
BRADLEY D. FRAZIER
ANDREW B. FREEBORN
CHRISTOPHER A. FREEMAN
SCOTT A. GAAB
JOHN J. GALIK
DANIEL D. GARBER
JOHN M. GARVER
MICHAEL A. GEER
KEITH P. GIBSON
ROBIN L. GIBSON
JOHN W. GILES, JR.
CARMELO J. GIOVENCO, JR.
JOHN C. GLASS
JAIME GOMEZ, JR.
STEVEN M. GORSKI
DOUGLAS C. GOSNEY
GLEN L. GOSS
DANIEL F. GOTTRICH
RODNEY GRAY
GREGORY S. GREEN
NATHAN C. GREEN
MANUEL G. GRIEGO
MICHAEL A. GROGAN
TYRONE L. GROH
MICHAEL GRUNWALD, JR.
SCOTT D. GUNDLACH
MICHAEL D. HADDOCK
JOSEPH E. HALL
WILLIAM D. HALL
ERIC K. HALVERSON
ANDREW K. HAMANN
PAULA A. HAMILTON
JENNIFER HAMMERSTEDT
DARIEN J. HAMMETT
STEWART A. HAMMONS
TERRY J. HAMRICK, JR.
DAVID S. HANSON
CRAIG A. HARDING
MICHAEL S. HARPER
ALAN T. HART
STEVEN C. M. HASSTEDT
JEAN E. HAVENS
TIMREK C. HEISLER
LANDON L. HENDERSON
ERICH D. HERNANDEZBAQUERO
SHAUN R. HICK
JAMES P. HICKMAN
KEVIN D. HICKMAN
LAWRENCE C. HICKS
HAROLD T. HOANG
GEORGE K. HOBSON
STEPHEN G. HOFFMAN
JACOB J. HOLMGREN
MICHAEL K. HONMA
JEFFREY F. HUBER
JAMES P. HUGHES, JR.
ROMAN L. HUND
KARL D. INGEMAN
GEORGE W. IRVING IV
LYNN MARIE IRWIN
JASON M. JANAROS
GARY D. JENKINS II
JONATHAN A. JENSEN
MICHAEL W. JIRU, JR.
MICHAEL W. JOHANEK
CLARENCE A. JOHNSON, JR.
CRAIG P. JOHNSON
LAURA M. JOHNSON
PAUL M. JOHNSON
RAY A. JONES
TERRI A. JONES
WILLIAM R. JONES
ROSE M. JOURDAN
CHRISTOPHER L. JUAREZ
DARRELL F. JUDY
JAY L. JUNKINS
WILLIAM H. KALE
AMANDA G. KATO
MICHELLE L. KAUFMANN
BRYAN A. KEELING
DAVID D. KELLEY
CHARLES O. KELM
SCOTT M. KIEFFER
DAVID N. KINCAID, JR.
MICHAEL O. KINSLOW
KELLY M. KIRBY
LEA T. KIRKWOOD
DONALD A. KLECKNER
LEE E. KLOOS
THOMAS A. KONICKI
KURT D. KONOPATZKE
KEN W. KOPP
JAMES K. KOSSLER
DAVID D. KRETZ
GREGORY KREUDER
MOHAN S. KRISHNA
JOSEPH D. KUNKEL
DWAYNE A. LAHAYE
MICHAEL F. LAMB
DAWN C. LANCASTER
MICHAEL D. LAY
JAMES S. LEFFEL
CHAD E. LEMAIRE
SEAN P. LEROY
ANDREW J. LESHIKAR
ERIC L. LESHINSKY
JONATHAN M. LETSINGER
CHRISTOPHER P. LEVY
TARA A. LEWELING
ANDREW J. LEWIN
RICHARD J. LINEHAN III
CHRISTINE A. LOCKE
KEITH M. LOGEMAN
JILL A. LONG
PERRY M. LONG III
DEBRA A. LOVETTE
MATTHEW J. LUPONE
MARC A. LYNCH
WILLIAM J. MACLEAN
CHRISTOPHER V. MADDOX
STEPHEN W. MAGNAN
MATTHEW T. MAGNESS
LESLIE A. MAHER
RYAN D. MANTZ
DANIEL N. MARTICELLO, JR.
JOHN D. MARTIN
DAVID J. MARTINSON
SCOTT P. MASKERY
RICHARD S. MATHEWS
SCOTT B. MATTHEWS
SEAN M. MCCARTHY
BRADLEY W. MCDONALD
SEAN S. MCKENNA
ROBERT T. MEEKS III
THOMAS B. MEEKS
JAMES S. MEHTA
KELLY K. MENOZZI
JAMES S. MERCHANT
MICHAEL L. MERRITT
JACK W. MESSER
MICHAEL J. MEYER
JOSEPH K. MICHALEK
HANS H. MILLER
MICHAEL A. MILLER
RICKY L. MILLS
DAVID A. MINEAU
STEVEN J. MINKIN
DAVID K. MOELLER
VICTOR W. MONCRIEFFE II
JACQUELINE M. MONGEON
SEAN P. MONOGUE
SCOTT D. MOON
ERIC Y. MOORE
TODD R. MOORE
ERIC J. MORITZ
WILLIAM B. MOSLE
KENNETH E. MOSS
MICHAEL D. MOTE
STEPHEN R. MOYES
JAMES F. MUELLER
KEITH E. MUELLER
TODD A. MURPHEY
AMANDA S. MYERS
GEORGE R. NAGY
ARNOLD W. NASH III
ROBERT JAMES NEAL, JR.
JODI A. NEFF
TY W. NEUMAN
KARA KJ NEUSE
HARVEY F. NEWTON
THOMAS W. NICHOLSON
ROBERT T. NOONAN
WILLIAM J. NORTON
PAUL C. NOSEK
SCOTT R. NOWLIN
SHAN B. NUCKOLS
NEIL P. OAKDEN
JEFFERSON JAMES ODONNELL
BRIAN D. OELRICH
KENNETH W. OHLSON
PETER P. OHOTNICKY
RONNI M. OREZZOLI
CHARLES D. ORMSBY
BRIAN A. PAETH
JAMES C. PARSONS
LUDWIG K. PAULSEN
JEFFREY P. PEARSON
DAVID L. PEELER, JR.
LYNN P. PEITZ
DANA C. PELLETIER
DOUGLAS W. PENTECOST
KEITH A. PERKINS
LEON J. PERKOWSKI
KRISTOPHER E. PERRY
BRIAN C. PETERS
KENDALL D. PETERS
JAMES D. PETRICK
MICHAEL S. PETROCCO
GEORGE E. PETTY
JAMES W. PIEL
SAMMY T. PIERCE
RONALD L. PIERI
WILLIAM C. PLEASANTS
ALAIN D. POISSON
BRIAN H. PORTER
CHRISTOPHER T. PREJEAN
MICHAEL J. PRICE
SAMUEL T. PRICE
ARTHUR W. PRIMAS, JR.
DONALD D. PURDY
STEPHEN G. PURDY, JR.
MARK B. PYE
ROBERT J. QUIGG IV
ALESIA A. QUITON
BRIAN J. RAY
KEITH W. REEVES
BRAXTON D. REHM
CHRISTOPHER S. REIFEL
STEPHEN L. RENNER
NEIL R. RICHARDSON
ROBERT A. RICKER
ALLEN R. ROBERTS
DWAYNE M. ROBISON
SHELLEY A. RODRIGUEZ
MICHAEL K. ROKAW
RICHARD B. ROLLER
SCOTT A. ROMBERGER
ROBERT T. ROMER
MARGARET M. ROMERO
RICHARD M. ROSA
DOUGLAS W. ROTH
TARA K. ROUTSIS
LEERNEST M. B. RUFFIN
BRYAN T. RUNKLE
STEPHEN M. RUSSELL
ANDREW J. RYAN
PATRICK S. RYDER
JOHN D. RYE
JAY A. SABIA
FRANK D. SAMUELSON
DORAL E. SANDLIN
TIMOTHY A. SANDS
MATTHEW D. SANFORD
JOE H. SANTOS
JOSEPH C. SANTUCCI
TODD A. SAULS
DAVID R. SCANLON
JEFFREY A. SCHAVLAND
ANTHONY W. SCHENK
KEVIN E. SCHILLER
KARL C. SCHLOER
MICHAEL K. SCHNABEL
ADRIAN C. SCHUETTKE
THERESE A. SCHULER
GEORGE N. SCHWARTZ
PAUL J. SCOTT
TIMOTHY A. SEJBA
TRISHA M. SEXTON
ERIC K. SHAFA
SCOTT A. SHEPARD
THOMAS P. SHERMAN
RYAN C. SHERWOOD
JOHN W. SHIRLEY
JENNIFER M. SHORT
DAVID K. SIEVE
ERIK L. SIMONSEN
RAY L. SIMPSON
RODNEY SINGLETON
CHRISTOPHER M. SMITH
DAVID C. SMITH
KENNETH A. SMITH
KEVIN D. SMITH
MATTHEW D. SMITH
RICHARD L. SMITH
ROBERT D. SNODGRASS
MATTHEW O. SNYDER
JEFFREY A. SORRELL
MICHAEL J. SOWA
KENNETH S. SPEIDEL
RONALD D. STENGER
MARK A. STEPHENS
LISA Y. STEVENSON
EARL W. STOLZ II
WILLIAM M. STOWE III
SUZANNE M. STREETER
CHRISTOPHER R. STRICKLIN
BRIAN R. STUART
STEVE S. SUGIYAMA
JAMES M. SUHR
JASON K. SUTTON
THOMAS T. SWAIM
DOUGLAS H. SWIFT
RAYMUND MICHAEL TEMBREULL
MICHAEL P. TERNUS
ANTHONY L. THOMAS
JOHN J. THOMAS
SPENCER S. THOMAS

PAUL A. TOMBARGE
STEPHON J. TONKO
THOMAS D. TORKELSON
BRIAN E. TOTH
KELVIN J. TOWNSEND
ROBERT W. TRIPLETT
GEORGE E. TROMBA
ROBERT B. TRSEK
DAVID C. TRUCKSA
DONNA L. TURNER
ERIC S. TURNER
JAMES R. TWIFORD
MICHAEL D. TYYNISMAA
JEFFERY D. VALENZIA
RUSSELL S. VOCE
ROGER R. VROOMAN
WILLIAM E. WADE, JR.
RALPH J. WAITE IV
ALEXANDER W. WALFORD
CHARLES J. WALLACE II
MATTHEW V. WALLACE
HOWARD T. WALLER
KARL C. WALLI
WILLIAM B. WALPERT
SCOTT L. WARD
MICHAEL D. WEBB
CHRISTOPHER M. WEGNER
GEOFFREY F. WEISS
KEITH A. WELCH
SAMUEL G. WHITE III
TODD A. WHITE
DAVID P. WILDER
RICHARD WILGOS
SHANE C. WILKERSON
JON C. WILKINSON
KEVIN A. WILSON
MARK D. WITZEL
PATRICK F. WOLFE
BOBBY C. WOODS, JR.
PARKER H. WRIGHT
TINA M. WYANT
SCOTT D. YANCY
MATTHEW H. YETISHEFSKY
YOUNGKUN S. YU
KENNETH J. YUNEVICH
DUSTIN P. ZIEGLER
MATTHEW E. ZUBER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MARK R. ALEXANDER
SEAN J. BRANDES
ROBERT C. CADENA
JAMES C. DUDLEY, JR.
TRACY L. EMMERSEN
CHRISTOPHER D. ENG
KEVIN L. ERNEST
DAVID W. FILANOWICZ
MATTHEW W. GARRISON
JONATHAN M. GROENKE
BRIAN A. HARDING
BLAKE G. JACOBSON
CYNTHIA P. KEATING
PAUL D. LASHMET
DANYELLE M. LOW
ANDREA J. MCLEMORE
ANDREW T. NEWSOME
ROGER D. NISBETT
JOSEPH E. SISSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LANE C. ASKEW
ROBERT A. CLARADY
MATTHEW L. GHEN
TODD P. GLIDDEN
LOUIS M. GUTIERREZ
ROGER L. KOOPMAN
PATRICK E. LANCASTER
SYLVIA M. LAYNE
JAMES M. MAHER
ERIC N. MOYER
JASON T. NICHOLS
DAVID P. PERRY
PAUL M. SALEVSKI
DALE H. SHIGEKANE
JEFFREY S. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BERNARD BILLINGSLEY
BRADLEY D. BROWN, JR.
JEFFREY P. BUSCHMANN
JAMES L. CASTLEBERRY
DAVID M. CROWE
BRIAN M. FOSS
JOSEPH D. FRASER
TYLER L. GOAD
JAMIE L. HORNING
GRANT M. KOENIG
KRISTI A. LEHMKUHLER
GEORGE M. LOWE
JAMES T. MERCHANT
MARCELLE L. MOLETT
STEPHANY L. MOORE
KRISHNA C. PULGAR
DARREN E. RICE
KYLE P. RILEY
CHARLEESE R. SAMPA
LENSWORTH A. SAMUEL
RISA B. SIMON
CHAD E. SIMPSON
JOHN M. SMAHA, JR.
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH
BRADLEY J. STOREY
ROBERT J. TEAGUE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DARYL G. ADAMSON
CHARLES E. ARDINGER
MICHAEL J. BEAL
STEVEN G. BEALL
MATTHEW P. BEARE
KENNETH T. BELLOMY
JOHN M. CARMICHAEL
KEVIN P. CHILDRE
KENNETH C. COLLINS II
DONALD F. CRUMPACKER
MICHAEL T. CURRY
JAMES S. DANCER
DZUNG P. DAVIS
WILLIAM R. DONNELL, JR.
ARTHUR M. DUVALL
JAMES C. DYER
WILLIAM E. EDENBECK
DANIEL W. ELSASS
ALAN D. FEENSTRA
KARL G. GILES
CORY M. GROOM
RICHARD R. GROVE, JR.
PHILLIP A. GUTIERREZ
JAMES D. HAIR
AUBREY K. HAMLETT
DAVID A. HARRIS
KENNETH L. HOLLAND
DOUGLAS E. HOUSER
EDWARD G. JASO
CHARLES O. JONES
SANFORD L. KALLAL
DAVID D. LITTLE
ROBERT J. LOPEZ
RICHARD F. LOVE III
ANTHONY J. MATA
RODNEY H. MOSS
JOHN D. NAYLOR
SCOTT A. NOE
RODNEY J. NORTON
JOHN A. OMAN
RAYMOND A. PARHAM
ANTHONY M. PECORARO
GEORGE A. PORTER
REX N. PUENTESPINA
RONALD G. RANCOURT
SHAWN J. REAMS
KENNETH B. SANCHEZ
NICHOL M. SCHINE
JACKIE A. SCHWEITZER
SCOTT E. SHEA
JEFFREY R. SHIPMAN
PATRICK H. SUTTON
QUINTIN G. TAN
KENNETH C. TEASLEY
MICHAEL L. THOMPSON
KEITH A. TUKES
LAWRENCE W. UPCHURCH
GREGORY A. VERLINDE
ALEC C. VILLEGAS
WILBERT M. WAFFORD
DAVID L. WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ROBERT S. ALMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEFFREY J. ABBADINI
RYAN P. AHLER
DANIEL R. ALCORN
EVERETT M. ALCORN, JR.
STEPHEN W. ALDRIDGE
ERNESTO R. ALMONTE
GERVY J. ALOTA
JEFFREY A. ANDERSON
EDWARD A. ANGELINAS
CHRISTOPHER W. ARTIS
STEPHEN A. AUDELO
SPENCER P. AUSTIN
SHELBY Y. BAECKER
JOSEPH A. BAGGETT
CASEY B. BAKER
JEFFREY D. BAKER
ZATHAN S. BAKER
DWAYNE E. BARNETT
JONATHAN L. BARON
JOHN R. BARTAK
QUINCY E. BEASLEY
WILLIAM M. BEATY
LEOPOLDO L. BENITES
MANUEL A. BIASCOECHEA
CHRISTOPHER M. BIGGS
BRIAN A. BINDER
JAMES R. BIRD
NATHAN R. BITZ
BRIAN C. BLACK
R. W. BLIZZARD
THOMAS T. BODINE
TIMOTHY C. BOEHME
MICHAEL P. BORRELLI
SILAS L. BOUYER II
JOHN A. BOWMAN
HAROLD W. BOWMANTRAYFORD
COLIN K. BOYNTON
BRIAN A. BRADFORD
DEREK BRADY
JASON E. BRAGG
PAUL S. BRANTUAS
SAMUEL P. BRASFIELD III
JASON J. BRIANAS
DANIEL E. BROADHURST
JOSEPH M. BROMLEY
DAVID P. BROOKS
MARK J. BROPHY
ELAINE A. BRUNELLE
SCOTT P. BRUNSON
JASON A. BUCKLEY
TERRY L. BUCKMAN
DOUGLAS J. BURFIELD
MICHAEL J. BURKS
ROBERT S. BURNS
JASON G. BUTLER
MILTON BUTLER III
WILLIAM CALLAHAN
ROBERT A. CAMPBELL
BURT J. CANFIELD
JOEL M. CAPONIGRO
NICK A. CARDENAS
TED W. CARLSON
JAMES K. CARVER
DAVID J. CASTEEL
CAREY F. CASTELEIN
GABRIEL B. CAVAZOS
BLAKE L. CHANEY
DEWON M. CHANEY
JONATHAN S. CHANNELL
MATTHEW E. CHAPMAN
PETER J. CHAVERIAT
ADAM G. CHEATHAM
THOMAS G. CHEKOURAS
CHARLES M. CHOATE III
MATTHEW W. CIESLUKOWSKI
BENJAMIN J. CIPPERLEY
GILBERT E. CLARK, JR.
TIMOTHY M. CLARK
PAUL D. CLARKE
MARK A. CLOSE
MICHAEL S. CLOUD
DANIEL D. COCHRAN
DAVID J. COE
ERIC D. COLE
BENJAMIN D. CONE
BRIAN D. CONWAY
NAKIA M. COOPER
ALAN M. COPELAND
JOHN C. CORRELL
JOSEPH W. CORTOPASSI
BRENT J. COTTON
ADAN J. COVARRUBIAS
SHAWN M. COWAN
DAVID S. COX
BRADFORD P. CRAIN
CLARKE S. CRAMER
CURTIS W. CRUTHIRDS
SCOTT M. CULLEN
MATTHEW D. CULP
BRIAN G. CUNNINGHAM
CHARLES E. DALE III
CHRISTINA L. DALMAU
ROBERT B. DANBERG, JR.
TODD M. DANTONIO
MARC E. DAVIS
TIMOTHY P. DAVIS II
DANA A. DECOSTER
DANIELLE C. DEFANT
SARAH H. DEGROOT
WILLIAM G. DELMAR
MARC R. DELTETE
RAVI M. DESAI
JOHN A. DIGIOVACCHINO
CHRISTOPHER J. DOMENCIC
MARK D. DOMENICO
JARROD D. DONALDSON
CHRISTOPHER D. DOTSON
KENNETH S. DOUGLAS
CLINTON L. DOWNING
BRIAN M. DRECHSLER
DOUGLAS A. DREESE
JOSEPH M. DROLL
ROBERT E. DUCOTE
DERRICK A. DUDASH
ENNO J. DUDEN
DANIEL P. DUHAN
ROBERT A. DULIN
DAVID P. DURKIN
BRIAN C. EARP
GEORGE R. EBARB
DAVID L. EDGERTON
STEVEN D. ELIAS
BRIAN C. EMME
THEODORE E. ESSENFELD
ROY C. EVANS
LOUIS A. FAIELLA
WILLIAM P. FALLON
MICHEL C. FALZONE
JEFFREY A. FARMER
CHRISTOPHER M. FARRICKER
RYAN M. FARRIS
CHAD A. FELLA
PATRICE J. P. FERNANDES
JOSEPH M. FIKSMAN
MICHAEL B. FINN
PAULA A. FIRENZE

EDWARD K. FLOYD
JENNIFER L. FORBUS
TONREY M. FORD
MEGHAN B. FOREHAND
DAVID S. FORMAN
STEPHEN C. FORTMANN
VINCENT A. FORTSON
HANS A. FOSSER
WILLIAM D. FRANCIS, JR.
BRIAN D. FREMMING
JONAS FREY
KENNETH J. FROBERG
JOHN T. FRYE
JOHN D. GAINEY IV
BRYAN S. GALLO
RUBEN GALVAN
NEAL T. GARBETT
GILBERT D. GAY
ALBERT H. GEIS, JR.
ROBERT J. GELINAS
ANDREW D. GEPHART
ANDREW H. GILBERT
CHRISTOPHER S. GILMORE
CHRISTIAN P. GOODMAN
BRIAN W. GRAVES
DOUGLAS T. GRAY
WELLS W. GREEN
JASON P. GROWER
JASON M. GUSTIN
MARK A. HAAS
DAVID S. HAASE
AARON R. HAGER
BRIAN J. HAGGERTY
MICHAEL D. HALL
PETER F. HALVORSEN
JOSHUA A. HAMMOND
EDMUND J. HANDLEY
DAVID J. HANEY
MARK W. HANEY
MATTHEW T. HARDING
GARY A. HARRINGTON II
DAVID F. HARRIS
JUSTIN L. HARTS
MICHAEL P. HARVEY II
AMANDA A. M. HAWKINS
CHRISTOPHER N. HAYTER
GARETH J. HEALY
ROBERT A. HEELY, JR.
CRAIG W. HEMPECK
KEITH A. HENDERSON
OLIVER R. HERION
JASON B. HIGGINS
LISA B. HODGSON
BRIAN L. HOLMES
DAVID C. HOLMES
CHRISTOPHER T. HORGAN
MATTHEW G. HORR
MICHAEL W. HOSKINS
PATRICK W. HOURIGAN
MICHAEL P. HOWE
JAMES B. HOWELL
HOLLY A. HOXSIE
JOSEPH A. HUFFINE
CHRISTOPHER S. HULITT
DAVID P. HURN
FRANK T. INGARGIOLA
RICHARD J. ISAAK
QUINTIN L. JAMES
JAMES P. JEROME
WILLIAM A. JOHANSSON
JOHANNES E. JOLLY
HOWARD L. JONES
STEVEN C. JONES
MICHAEL D. KAMPFE
BRANDON S. KASER
DANIEL J. KEELER
PATRICK A. KELLER
JASON T. KETELSEN
ROBERT B. KIMNACH III
JASON D. KIPP
JEFFREY A. KJENAAS
KEN J. KLEINSCHNITTGER
WILLIAM C. KLUTTZ
SEAN P. KNIGHT
CHRISTOPHER J. KREIER
NICHOLAS A. KRISTOF
TIMOTHY D. LABENZ
TODD I. LADWIG
KELLY L. LAING
ROBERT T. LANANE II
WILLIAM G. LANE
SHANE A. LANSFORD
THOMAS E. LANSLEY
BRIAN LARMON
SCOTT W. LARSON
RYAN E. LAWRENZ
DOUGLAS W. LEAVENGOOD
CHRISTOPHER LEE
DUSTIN E. LEE
MICHAEL W. LEE
PAUL LEE
JEREMY L. LEIBY
DAVID C. LEIKER
JOSEPH L. LEPPO
ANDRE B. LESTER
JOSEPH M. LEVY
KENNETH R. LIEBERMAN
MATTHEW E. LIGON
RYAN J. LILLEY
CHRISTOPHER C. LINDBERG
ERIC D. LINDGREN
CHAD J. LIVINGSTON
JAMES P. LOMAX
TIMOTHY J. LONG
MARK R. LUKKEN
ERIC H. LULL
MICHAEL E. MADRID
GREGORY P. MALANDRINO
JAMES R. MALONE
DENNIS N. MALZACHER, JR.
SHANE T. MARCHESI
HARRY L. MARSH
MICHAEL J. MARTHALER
DARRYL B. MARTIN
MIGUEL R. MARTINEZ
JONATHAN A. MARVELL
WALTER B. MASSENBURG, JR.
TODD M. MASSOW
GABRIEL A. MAULDIN
MATTHEW M. MAZAT
DANIEL R. MCAULIFFE
MITCHELL S. MCCALLISTER
GILL H. MCCARTHY
GRADY S. MCDONALD
JAMES D. MCDONALD
KEVIN T. MCGEE
ROBERT A. MCGILL
JEFFREY M. MCGRADY
MATTHEW S. MCGRAW
BRIAN W. MCGUIRK
JAMES F. MCKENNA
SIMON C. MCKEON
ANDREW R. MCLEAN
MICAJAH T. MCLENDON III
BRANDY T. MCNABB
MICHAEL A. MCPHAIL
RALPH L. MCQUEEN III
DOUGLAS K. MEAGHER
JAVIER MEDINAMONTALVO
HOWARD V. MEEHAN
JOSHUA M. MENZEL
DENNIS METZ
KELLY R. MIDDLETON
STEVEN F. MILGAZO
GREGORY J. MILICIC
ALAN D. MILLER
MAX F. MILLER
STEPHEN J. MINIHANE
ANDREW B. MIROFF
DENNIS C. MONAGLE
KENNETH E. MONFORE III
DAVID P. MOORE
JAMES A. MORROW
STEVEN S. MOSS
CHRISTOPHER L. MOYLAN
MICHAEL G. MULLEN
DARRIN R. MULLINS
JOSEPH D. MURPHY III
PATRICK J. MURPHY
BRANDON L. MURRAY
ALAN A. NELSON
MICHAEL D. NORDEEN
MICHAEL C. OBERDORF
HEATHER L. ODONNELL
THOMAS M. OGDEN
MICHAEL P. ONEILL
BRETT R. OSTER
CHRISTOPHER J. PACENTRILLI
JUAN C. PALLARES
CHRISTOPHER A. PAPAIOANU
PHILIP L. PARMLEY
JOHN G. PARQUETTE
JASON P. PATTERSON
JOHN C. PATTERSON
JOHN E. PATTERSON
MICHAEL S. PAYNE
RICHARD D. PAYNE
JEREMY A. PELSTRING
KENNETH S. PICKARD
LEIGHTON J. PITRE
JASON C. PITTMAN
DMITRY POISIK
JASON R. POMPONIO
COREY A. POORMAN
JOHN D. PORADO
JOHN D. PORTER
MICHAEL M. POSEY
MARK E. POSTILL
CHARLES T. PRIM
DANIEL R. PROCHAZKA
ROBERT S. PUDNEY IV
MICHAEL T. PUFFER
ROBERT L. RADAK, JR.
VICTORIO A. RAMIREZ
DOUGLAS E. RAMSEY
DANIEL C. RAPHAEL
DONALD V. RAUCH
CHAD A. REDMER
ELIZABETH A. REGOLI
DANIEL J. REISS
JEFFREY M. REYNOLDS
BRIAN A. RIBOTA
KEVIN S. RICE
JOHN P. RICHERSON
JACK C. RIGGINS
DONOVAN C. RIVERA
KEVIN E. ROBB
DARYL ROBBIN
REMY P. ROBERT
JOEL RODRIGUEZ
DARREN C. ROE
HENRY M. ROENKE IV
JASON E. ROGERS
SCOTT D. ROSE
SCOTT A. ROSETTI
KENNETH R. RUSSELL
MATTHEW D. RUSSELL
GARY A. RYALS
ERIC M. SAGER
ROMMEL J. SALGADO
PETER J. SALVAGGIO, JR.
ALFREDO J. SANCHEZ
GREGG S. SANDERS
TODD A. SANTALA
JEFFERSON P. SARGENT
ROBERT W. SAVERING
MATTHEW D. SCARLETT
JOHN M. SCHILLER
RYAN C. SCHLEICHER
LUKE D. SCHMIDT
JAMES A. SCHROEDER
ADAM T. SCHULTZ
CHAD C. SCHUMACHER
WINSTON E. SCOTT II
PAUL A. SEITZ
SHAUN S. SERVAES
GENE G. SEVERTSON II
TERRENCE M. SHASHATY
COLBY W. SHERWOOD
AARON F. SHOEMAKER
PETER M. SHOEMAKER
ANDREW J. SHULMAN
RICHARD A. SILVA
DAVID W. SKAROSI
SHARN R. SKELTON
ANDRIA L. SLOUGH
CHRISTOPHER E. SMITH
KENT D. SMITH
SUSAN J. SMITH
WARREN D. SMITH
JOSEPH W. SMOTHERMAN
GUY M. SNODGRASS
LESLIE D. SOBOL
BRIAN J. SOLANO
KEVIN J. SPROGE
LANCE A. SRP
JASON R. STAHL
ROBERT STANSELL
MARK B. STEFANIK
NEIL J. STEINHAGEN
BRETT A. STEVENSON
MATTHEW A. STEVENSON
KELSEY P. STLOUIS
RYAN M. STODDARD
MICHAEL G. STOKES
KRISTOPHER W. STONAKER
ADAM H. STONE
GEOFFREY S. STOW
JOSEPH V. STRASSBERGER
MICHAEL L. STRONG
TEAGUE J. SUAREZ
JAMES E. SUCKART
MICHAEL B. SWEENEY
MATTHEW A. SZOKA
AARON M. TABOR
SHANE P. TANNER
TODD D. TAVOLAZZI
AARON J. TAYLOR
CORA C. TAYLOR
ERIC L. TAYLOR
PAUL J. TILL
WARREN W. TOMLINSON
MICHAEL H. TOTH
ROBERT M. TOTH
GERALD L. TRITZ
AUGUST J. TROTTMAN
BRADY W. TURNAGE
BRIAN T. TURNEY
BENJAMIN D. VANBUSKIRK
NICHOLAS A. VANDEGRIEND
ADRIAN F. VANDELLEN
JASON R. VANPIETERSOM
DAVID C. VEHON
JEREMY E. VELLON
JAMES T. WADDELL
DAVID B. WAIDELICH
SCOTT A. WALGREN
WILLIAM J. WALSH
FRANCIS J. WALTER III
JASON L. WARD
CHRISTOPHER J. WARDEN
BRANDON W. WARREN
GLENN K. WASHINGTON
STEVEN H. WASSON
SCOTT A. WASTAK
CURTIS E. WEBSTER
JASON E. WEED
STEPHEN R. WEEKS
CHAD E. WELBORN
EDDIE F. WHITLEY, JR.
ROBERT G. WICKMAN
ADAM D. WIEDER
TED W. WIEDERHOLT
DONALD J. WILLIAMS
ROBERT R. WILLIAMS IV
JASON J. WILLIAMSON
MICHAEL A. WILSON
WILLIAM C. WIRTZ
TERRY P. WISE, JR.
MICHAEL D. WISECUP
CHRISTOPHER J. WOOD
KEITH C. WOODLEY
MATTHEW A. WRIGHT
RAFE K. WYSHAM
JEFFREY M. YACKEREN
TIMOTHY J. YANIK
BRIAN A. YOUNG
MICHAEL J. ZAIKO
TODD D. ZENTNER
TRAVIS W. ZETTEL
DAVID M. ZIELINSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ALDRITH L. BAKER
CHRISTOPHER G. BRIANAS
JED R. ESPIRITU
HOWARD B. FABACHER II

VANESSA GIVENS
RICHARD A. HUTH
RICHARD D. JOHNSTON, JR.
RICHARD A. KNIGHT, JR.
YOLANDA K. MASON
KATHLEEN B. MILLIGAN
NINA M. NICASIO
SHANE D. RICE
ROBERT S. SMITH
DAVID C. WEBBER
ENNIS E. WILLIAMS
JOHN E. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MARK A. ANGELO
ANDREW J. BALLINGER
CHRISTOPHER L. CANNIFF
MATTHEW A. DENSING
DAVE S. EVANS
MATTHEW W. FARR
CHRISTOPHER W. GAVIN
KATHLEEN B. GILES
ROBERT D. MCCLURE
JUDITH A. MULLER
JOHN D. PETERSON
BRIAN J. SAWICKI
GREGORY E. SUTTON
THOMAS J. M. WEAVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ROBERT L. BURGESS
BERNARD F. CALAMUG
KENNETH D. CAMERON
JAMES S. CARMICHAEL
FRANCINI R. CLEMMONS
MARC K. FARNSWORTH
CHRISTOPHER J. HAAS
JON M. HERSEY
JOSEPH A. HIDALGO, JR.
VENCENT W. LOGAN
JOSE A. MARTINEZ
LOUIS V. SCOTT
KENTARO A. TACHIKAWA
JACINTO TORIBIO, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LASUMAR R. ARAGON
BRIAN T. BIALEK
REX A. BOONYOBHAS
THOMAS J. BRASHEAR
MICHAEL A. BURKHARD
PAUL J. COSTANZO
LUC D. DELANEY
KRISTINE M. DESOTO
CHRISTOPHER D. EPP
KEITH B. FAHLENKAMP
WILLIAM F. FALLIER
ERIC D. FELDER
JOHN W. GAMBLE
ROBERT A. GOLD
WESTON L. GRAY
CARLUS A. GREATHOUSE
TODD R. GREENE
WILLIAM L. HAGAN
AARON M. HAY
ANDREW J. HOFFMAN
WILLIAM E. KOSZAREK III
HANNAH A. KRIEWALDT
NATHAN E. LYON
KEITH G. MANNING II
LEE A. NICKEL
NICOLE K. NIGRO
CARL L. PARKS
WILLIAM P. PEMBERTON
MITCHELL R. PERRETT
THOMAS A. SEIGENTHALER
RANDOLPH E. SLAFF, JR.
SALVADOR M. SUAREZ
ZALDY M. VALENZUELA
TYRONE Y. VOUGHS
BENJAMIN A. WILDER
ROBERT E. WILLIAMS
SARAH E. ZARRO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DENVER L. APPLEHANS
COREY B. BARKER
PAMELA S. BOU
WILLIAM H. CLINTON
RONALD S. FLANDERS
JAMES T. KROHNE, JR.
DAVID R. MCKINNEY
ERIK J. REYNOLDS
SARAH T. SELFKYLER
CHRISTOPHER S. SERVELLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ENID S. BRACKETT
GEORGE M. DOLAN
MICHAEL L. FARMER
LUIS M. FIGUEROA
LUCAS B. GUNNELS
ROBERT A. HOCHSTEDLER
COREY S. JOHNSTON
MATTHEW J. LEDRIDGE
THOMAS S. PRICE
GERALDJAMES M. SANTIAGO
KARSTEN E. SPIES
EDWARD A. SYLVESTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

CHRISTINA N. GRIFFIN
PATRICIA K. MCCAFFERTY
MILAN MONCILOVICH
SCOTT A. OLIVOLO
RICK D. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

MONIQUE J. BOCOCK
TONY F. DEALICANTE
MATTHEW J. DORAN
SANDRA L. HODGKINSON
ERIC M. HURT
MONTE G. MILLER, JR.
CHARLES D. STIMSON
JORDAN A. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JOHN G. CLAY
DEBORAH A. CURRAN
CAROL C. GIBSON
MARY L. HIATT
STEPHEN K. KURIGER
PAMELA A. MCGLOTHLIN
MILDRED H. OWINGS
STEPHANIE A. REISDORF
PAUL R. RUSSO
STEPHANIE L. SANDERS
DEBRA D. SOTO
DONALD J. STAFFORD
VALERIE A. STANLEY
SUSAN L. WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

DANIEL C. ALMER
WALLACE A. BURNS, JR.
PATRICK S. HAYDEN
STEVEN J. LATHROP
ROBERT S. MARTIN
WILLIAM J. MAY, JR.
VALERIE F. PARKER
JEFFREY J. TRIBIANO
BRIAN D. WEISS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

STEVEN G. FUSELIER
EILEEN B. WERVE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

SEAN P. OBRIEN
CHARLES S. THOMPSON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

TIMOTHY M. COLE
REGINA G. MARENGO
ANTHONY B. SPINLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JOHN B. BACCUS III
CRAIG E. ROSS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

THOMAS A. J. OLIVERO
ROBERT A. STUDEBAKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ERIN E. O. ACOSTA
JOHN C. BLEIDORN
JILLENE M. BUSHNELL
HARTWELL F. COKE
JOHN P. GARSTKA
ELIZABETH M. S. HIGGINS
JOHN M. MARBURGER
DWIGHT E. SMITH, JR.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

KARA MARLENE STEIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2017, VICE ELISSE WALTER, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL SEAN PIWOWAR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2018, VICE TROY A. PAREDES, TERM EXPIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARK E. SCHAEFER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE, VICE LARRY ROBINSON.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

ANN MARIE BUERKLE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 2011, VICE ANNE M. NORTHUP, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAMES F. ENTWISTLE, OF VIRGINIA, 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 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.

DOUGLAS EDWARD LUTE, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

VICTORIA NULAND, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EUROPEAN AND EURASIAN AFFAIRS), VICE PHILIP H. GORDON, RESIGNED.

DANIEL A. SEPULVEDA, OF FLORIDA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY IN THE BUREAU OF ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND U. S. COORDINATOR FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

WILLIAM IRA ALTHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2018, VICE MICHAEL F. DUFFY, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

LAFE E. SOLOMON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD E. MEISBURG, RESIGNED.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CHAI RACHEL FELDBLUM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

DANIEL M. TANGHERLINI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES, VICE MARTHA N. JOHNSON, RESIGNED.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

KATHERINE ARCHULETA, OF COLORADO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN BERRY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JOHN H. THOMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2016, VICE ROBERT M. GROVES, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 23, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

MARK A. BARNETT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

CLAIRE R. KELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEBORAH KAY JONES, OF NEW MEXICO, 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 LIBYA.

JAMES KNIGHT, OF ALABAMA, 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 REPUBLIC OF CHAD.

THE JUDICIARY

SRIKANTH SRINIVASAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.

MICHAEL KENNY O'KEEFE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

ROBERT D. OKUN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES E. MCCLAIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DAVID L. GOLDFEIN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT C. BOLTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 9335:

To be brigadier general

COL. ANDREW P. ARMACOST

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN F. WHARTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. GABRIEL TROIANO

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. JEFFREY B. CLARK

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES A. ADKINS

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES D. CAMPBELL

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL WAYNE L. BLACK
COLONEL MICHAEL K. HANIFAN
COLONEL DANIEL M. KRUMREI
COLONEL ROBERT E. WINDHAM, JR.

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL MARK E. ANDERSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL JULIE A. BENTZ
BRIGADIER GENERAL COURTNEY P. CARR
BRIGADIER GENERAL DANIEL R. HOKANSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANCIS S. LAUDANO III
BRIGADIER GENERAL SCOTT D. LEGWOLD
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROGER L. MCCLELLAN
BRIGADIER GENERAL TIMOTHY M. MCKEITHEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL D. NAVRKAL
BRIGADIER GENERAL BRUCE E. OLIVEIRA
BRIGADIER GENERAL CHARLES E. PETRARCA, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL KENNETH C. ROBERTS
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM F. ROY
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM L. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL STEVEN R. BEACH
COLONEL KENNETH A. BEARD
COLONEL FRED C. BOLTON
COLONEL MICHAEL J. BOUCHARD
COLONEL GREGORY S. BOWEN
COLONEL MARK D. BRACKNEY
COLONEL JOHN E. BURK
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER M. BURNS
COLONEL SEAN M. CASEY
COLONEL RUSSELL A. CRANE
COLONEL RICHARD H. DAHLMAN
COLONEL MARC FERRARO
COLONEL ROBERT A. FODE
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER J. FOWLER
COLONEL PAUL F. GRIFFIN
COLONEL GERALD E. HADLEY
COLONEL PATRICK M. HAMILTON
COLONEL WILLIAM M. HART
COLONEL ROBERT T. HERBERT
COLONEL MARVIN T. HUNT
COLONEL CHARLES T. JONES
COLONEL HUNT W. KERRIGAN
COLONEL JOHN F. KING
COLONEL DIRK R. KLOSS
COLONEL JEFFERY P. KRAMER
COLONEL GORDON D. KUNTZ
COLONEL MASAKI G. KUWANA, JR.
COLONEL DONALD P. LAUCIRICA
COLONEL MARK S. LOVEJOY
COLONEL MARK A. LUMPKIN
COLONEL ROBERT K. LYTLE
COLONEL TAMMY J. MAAS
COLONEL FRANCIS B. MAGURN II
COLONEL MARK G. MALANKA
COLONEL THOMAS R. MCCUNE
COLONEL FRANCIS M. MCGINN
COLONEL MICHAEL D. MERRITT
COLONEL RICHARD J. NORIEGA
COLONEL ROBERT D. PASQUALUCCI
COLONEL VAL L. PETERSON
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER J. PETTY
COLONEL JOHN M. RHODES
COLONEL SCOTT H. SCHOFIELD
COLONEL LINDA L. SINGH
COLONEL DANNY K. SPEIGNER
COLONEL BRYAN E. SUNTHEIMER
COLONEL MICHAEL A. SUTTON
COLONEL STEVEN A. TABOR
COLONEL GREGORY A. THINGVOLD
COLONEL MICHAEL C. THOMPSON
COLONEL KIRK E. VANPELT
COLONEL WILLIAM A. WARD
COLONEL STEVEN R. WATT
COLONEL RONALD P. WELCH
COLONEL DAVID B. WILES
COLONEL GISELLE M. WILZ
COLONEL JAMES P. WONG
COLONEL JERRY L. WOOD
COLONEL GARY S. YAPLE

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL LOUIS H. GUERNSEY, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL KENNETH L. REINER

To be brigadier general

COLONEL STEPHEN G. KENT
COLONEL JUAN A. RIVERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD J. TORRES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL DILLARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DONALD E. JACKSON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM T. GRISOLI

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. JOHN M. CHO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. BRIAN E. ALVIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM F. DUFFY
BRIGADIER GENERAL RONALD E. DZIEDZICKI
BRIGADIER GENERAL MARK T. MCQUEEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL LUCAS N. POLAKOWSKI
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICKY L. WADDELL

To be brigadier general

COLONEL STEVEN W. AINSWORTH
COLONEL RONALD A. BASSFORD
COLONEL JOSE R. BURGOS
COLONEL JOHN E. CARDWELL
COLONEL DANIEL J. CHRISTIAN
COLONEL JOHN J. ELAM
COLONEL BRUCE E. HACKETT
COLONEL THOMAS J. KALLMAN
COLONEL WILLIAM B. MASON
COLONEL KENNETH H. MOORE
COLONEL THOMAS T. MURRAY
COLONEL MICHAEL C. O'GUINN
COLONEL MIYAKO N. SCHANELY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TERRY J. BENEDICT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOSEPH W. RIXEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN JOHN W. V. AILES
CAPTAIN BABETTE BOLIVAR
CAPTAIN DARYL L. CAUDLE
CAPTAIN KYLE J. COZAD
CAPTAIN RANDY B CRITES
CAPTAIN DANIEL H. FILLION
CAPTAIN LISA M. FRANCHETTI
CAPTAIN MARCUS A. HITCHCOCK
CAPTAIN THOMAS J. KEARNEY
CAPTAIN ROY J. KELLEY
CAPTAIN JAMES T. LOEBLEIN
CAPTAIN BRIAN E. LUTHER
CAPTAIN WILLIAM R. MERZ
CAPTAIN MICHAEL T. MORAN
CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER J. MURRAY
CAPTAIN JOHN B. NOWELL, JR.
CAPTAIN TIMOTHY G. SZYMANSKI
CAPTAIN RICHARD L. WILLIAMS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TIMOTHY J. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. NANCY A. NORTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBERT D. SHARP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. LOUIS V. CARIELLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

MARK I. FOX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MICHELLE J. HOWARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TED N. BRANCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SEAN A. PYBUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PAUL A. GROSKLAGS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. SCOTT H. SWIFT

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT R. RUARK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GLENN M. WALTERS

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MATTHEW J. GERVAIS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BRADLY A. CARLSON, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL LUCAS AHMANN AND ENDING WITH BERNARD JOHN YOSTEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES ACEVEDO AND ENDING WITH D011666, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 19, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARLAND A. ADKINS III AND ENDING WITH G010188, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 19, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN J. ACKERSON AND ENDING WITH G010128, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 19, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL B. MOORE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS G. BEHLING AND ENDING WITH RAYMOND G. STRAWBRIDGE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 23, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHERCODA G. SMAW, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CARL N. SOFFLER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF OWEN B. MOHN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARMELO N. OTEROSANTIAGO AND ENDING WITH JOHN H. SEOK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRENT E. HARVEY AND ENDING WITH JOOHYUN A. KIM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERRY M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH MAUREEN H. WEIGL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENNIS R. BELL AND ENDING WITH KENT J. VINCE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID W. ADMIRE AND ENDING WITH D006281, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER G. ARCHER AND ENDING WITH D011779, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES A. ADAMEC AND ENDING WITH VANESSA WORSHAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD P. C. AGER AND ENDING WITH JOHN P. ZOLL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF DARREN M. GALLAGHER, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF DUSTY C. EDWARDS, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF SAL L. LEBLANC, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MAURO MORALES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSICA L. ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW S. YOUNGBLOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 23, 2013.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICO ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH ANDREW J. ZETTS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 23, 2013.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF RANDOLPH T. PAGE, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JEREMY J. AUJERO, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOHN P. NEWTON, JR., TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DANIEL W. TESTA, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KEVIN J. PARKER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MARIA V. NAVARRO, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SHANE G. HARRIS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LATANYA A. ONEAL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN J. LEPP AND ENDING WITH JOHN C. RUDD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 6, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SARAH E. NILES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RICHARD DIAZ, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TANYA WONG, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KAREN R. DALLAS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RONALD G. OSWALD AND ENDING WITH NIKITA TIHONOV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG S. COLEMAN AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM R. VOLK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 16, 2013.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF A FALLEN HERO: PO 2ND CLASS TONY MICHAEL RANDOLPH—''A MAN ON A MISSION'', EODT, THE UNITED STATES NAVY

HON. MARKWAYNE MULLIN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, on this upcoming Memorial Day, I rise to honor an American Hero and a PO 2ND CLASS, Tony Michael Randolph, of Henryetta, Oklahoma. Last year, on July 6th, Tony was killed by a roadside bomb while traveling in a convoy in southern Afghanistan. His Strength in honor would make any American proud! And as a member of Navy's EOD Team, he had one of the most dangerous jobs in the military. He received a Bronze Star with Valor and a Purple Heart. From the early age of 12, he knew he wanted to be in the Military and serve his country. His reputation in High School and in the Military for his selfless and relentless work effort impressed all who had the pleasure to come into contact with him. Our prayers go out to him and his family on this Memorial Day and all of the thousands of families whose pain mounts. It's true, only The Good Die Young! I submit this poem penned in his honor and memory by Albert Caswell.

IN HONOR'S GRACE

In . . .
In Honor's Grace!
We now so see your face!
As high above all others,
we now you so place!
All in how you've so lived your life,
all in your most selfless of all sacrifice!
As up to Heaven,
to our Lord Tony you now so rise!
So rise!
As this new Angel,
so takes flight!
To so watch over us so day and night!
Day and night!
As here we so stand,
with tears all in eyes!
As our Hero,
has so died!
As we so all realize,
what pain before your family now so lies!
So lies!
And that great future before you would have so realized!
But it's far . . . far . . . better,
to have died for something,
than to have so lived for nothing at all!
As it's for you Tony,
America's son out to you our hearts now so call!
For your fine short life,
was but like a song up on high!
NAVY STRONG!
As A Man On A Mission,
who to our Lord now so belongs!
Who'd so cast his light!
As An Angel In The Army of Our Lord,
to so watch over us both day and night!
Day and night!
And we will hear you on the wind,
as you take flight!
And we will feel you in the morning,
as we awake all by our side!
As you Tony were EOD,
and as brave and as bold as could be!
Could be!
To So Make A Difference With It All!
Was want you so Tony wanted,
and what you so saw!
As you Tony,
so answered that most noble of all calls!
That Call To Arms!
Where only, the most courageous of all hearts of honor do so roam!
Moments,
are all that we so have!
To Grab Hearts!
To Make A Difference With It All!
To bring our light!
To evil,
to so fight!
Goodness!
Evil!
Darkness!
Light!
Those Brave Hearts,
who evil must fight!
Who bring their light!
And across Oklahoma on this very night,
as your love ones so lay their heads down so to sleep . . .
there comes a gentle rain as our Lord so weeps!
Are his tears coming down from Heaven to so ease your pain!
Until, up in Heaven you all so meet once again . . .
And you won't have to cry no more!
And now,
as we so lay your fine body down to rest!
For this our Nation Tony,
you have so blessed!
For it's All In Honor's Grace,
That You Now So Rest!
So Rest!
Amen!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 164, I was unavoidably detained off of the House floor at a doctor's appointment. Therefore, I was unable to cast my vote on H.R. 1412, the Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2013.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes''.

Also on rollcall No. 165, I was unable to cast my vote on H.R. 1344, the Helping Heroes Fly Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

And on rollcall No. 166, I was unable to cast my vote on H.R. 3234, the bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II, as amended.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

RAVEN CLEVELAND

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Raven Cleveland for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Raven Cleveland is a 10th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Raven Cleveland is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Raven Cleveland for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN ON ITS 95TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Republic of Azerbaijan in celebration of the 95th anniversary of Republic Day on May 28th.

Azerbaijan and the United States have developed a robust and growing relationship over the last two decades. I am extremely proud that we have established what Secretary Clinton has called ''deep, important, and durable bonds between the United States and Azerbaijan.''

Although located in a geopolitically tough location between Russia and Iran, Azerbaijan has consistently looked to the United States as an ally despite these difficult neighbors. A secular country with a predominantly Muslim population, Azerbaijan has also been home to vibrant Christian and Jewish communities representing a role model for peaceful coexistence and harmony of different religions and ethnic groups.

Azerbaijan was also the first country to open Caspian energy resources to development by U.S. and European companies and has emerged as a key player for global energy security. The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline project, supported by successive U.S. Administrations, is the most successful project contributing to the development of the South Caucuses region. Realization of the Trans Anatolian Pipeline (TANAP) Project between

Azerbaijan and Turkey will immensely contribute to energy security in Europe by exporting Azerbaijani natural gas to the European markets.

On a security front, Azerbaijan has been a key ally in a post 9 /11 era, emerging as one of the first countries to offer strong support and assistance to the United States. Actively participating in joint operations in both Iraq and Afghanistan, Azerbaijan has also extended important overflight clearances for U.S. and NATO flights and provided key supply routes to Afghanistan by making available its ground and Caspian naval transportation facilities. The transit route through Azerbaijan accounts for roughly 40 percent of the Coalition supplies bound for Afghanistan.

As the Co-Chairman of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, it is my distinct pleasure to honor the Republic of Azerbaijan in celebration of the 95th anniversary of Republic Day and to recognize the valuable bilateral relationship between the United States and Azerbaijan. I also encourage my colleagues who are interested in supporting Azerbaijan to join me as a member of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, a bipartisan group of more than 40 Members of Congress working to help foster the growing partnership between the United States and Azerbaijan and to advance U.S. interests in this pivotal region.

THE GREATEST GIFT IN HONOR OF THE FALLEN THIS MEMORIAL DAY THE ONES WHO GAVE THAT LAST FULL MEASURE

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and in gratitude, for all of the fallen and their families this Memorial Day. I submit this poem penned in their honor by Albert Caswell.

THE GREATEST GIFT

The . . .
The Greatest Gift!
As such as this,
is a many splendor thing!
To lay down ones life,
is but the brightest of all bright!
To go off to war,
all for your Nation . . . to so insure!
Our freedom to so bring!
As throughout the years . . .
As have so come here!
All of our most precious of all Daughter's and Son's,
who have so persevered!
With courage clear,
as the face of death upon them so appeared!
And for all of their lost loves,
we now hold so very high above so very dear!
The ones who so went off to war,
all for our freedoms to so insure!
To do what must so be done!
For these are the ones,
who so lived and so died and did so not ask why!
As the Angels up in heaven all for them so cried!
And, all of those families who so now live without!
As their pain and their heartache so seems to mount!
Until, up in Heaven again they all so meet on this you can count!
As all of their loved ones tears now so fall to the ground!
The Mother's! The Father's! The Sister's! The Brother's!
The Son's and The Daughters!
Who together no longer so remain!
Who so gave all that they so could!
But For The Greater Good!
The Ones Who So Heard The Call!
The Ones Who So Stood So Very Tall!
To Do What Must So Be Done!
On Earth as it is In Heaven,
In Thy Kingdom Come!
To take up that flight,
in The Army of Our Lord to so overcome!
To so watch over us all day and night!
And This Is Their Blood,
that which now so runs!
And these are the tears,
that which your families have now so begun!
And these are all of their dreams that which will so never become!
For this is The Day . . .
that which so all portrays . . .
America's very heart to so everyone!
So give thanks,
to all of those Yanks who lie now deep in the cold dark ground!
On This Memorial Day,
forget not what they all so gave!
And the families who with their tears will all so pay!
As on your knees,
I bid you please to so say a prayer for all of these!
Who but with their fine lives so bought us peace!
The ones who so lived and so died,
while all of their families so cried . . .
Who so fought all of those Wars which were waged!
With but their fine lives that they gave,
was but the high price of Freedom paid!
Sadly,
for any Nation to so live free!
For any Nation to so find her most blessed peace!
Her most precious of all Son's and Daughters,
must lay down into the ground so very deep!
Is but the cruel and high cost of most precious liberty!
North, South, West, and so East!
On This Memorial Day,
please . . . please . . . Remember All of These!
And so say a prayer!
Amen!

ROBERTO MAESTAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Roberto Maestas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Roberto Maestas is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Roberto Maestas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Roberto Maestas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) CHARLES CURRIE, RET.

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there are citizens making up this great country who never cease in offering themselves to their communities while improving the quality of our lives. They are the lights of our neighborhoods and families that bring hope long after they are gone. I rise today to celebrate one such glorious light and honor the legacy of Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Charles Currie, Ret.

Chaplain Currie dedicated his life to the calling of the Almighty and in service to the country he loved. During World War II, Currie played the trombone in the 11th Airborne Division Band. He returned to the Army as a Chaplain after graduating from Dallas Theological Seminary with a Master's Degree in Theology. He preached of the goodness and hope of the Almighty at Ft Bragg, Ludwigsburg, Germany, Fort Campbell, Pajori, Bayreuth, and Nuremberg, Germany, Vietnam, and Fort Knox. He retired as a Lt. Colonel with more than 20 years of service and began to travel the world serving and leading mission trips to more than 38 countries.

From all of Judea to the ends of the Earth, Chaplain Currie's legacy will be long remembered. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee 7th Congressional District is better for his lasting goodwill. I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring the life and service of Chaplain Charles Currie.

HONORING CAPTAIN EMERY BURK

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the valiant services of Captain Emery Burk and thank him, as he retires, for serving Wayne State University and wider Detroit communities for 36 years.

Captain Emery Burk is retiring from the Wayne State University Police Department after 36 years of dedicated service. Born in Detroit, Michigan, Emery Burk attended Hamtramck Public schools and then attended Michigan State University, graduating in 1975 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice. Mr. Burk was hired by the Wayne State University Department of Public Safety on June 21, 1976, and started the Detroit Police Academy the same month. Upon his completion of the Police Academy, Emery was assigned to patrol, often leading his shift in arrest and other related statistics. During his patrol operations, Emery was a Field Training Officer and trained many of the officers who came through the department.

Mr. Burk was the recipient of the Valor Award for heroic service as a patrol officer. At the time, he was only the second officer in the department to receive this high award. As an

officer, in addition to patrol and field training, he was also assigned to the Crime Abatement Team. He led the team to a record number of quality felony arrest and crime prevention efforts.

Captain Burk received promotions to Sergeant, Lieutenant and Captain, and currently serves as the Coordinator of Line Operations. In this capacity he has shaped and directed the Department's Comparative Statistic Model of data-driven policing, directed the campus high visibility campaign, and restructured the Field Training Program for all incoming officers.

All the while, he has worked on various university committees, including the Commencement Committee and Major Special Event Coordination Committee. In serving as Coordinator of Line Operations, he also managed the additional duties of Coordination of Auxiliary Functions, handling budget and grant management, and human resource functions.

Captain Burk has received 52 Letters of Appreciation from citizens, two Presidential Award for exceptional service to the University, a Lifesaving Award, 14 Commendations for outstanding police work, a Merit Award for exceptional service to the department, and a Valor Award for Heroic service. I applaud his career and wish him a wonderful retirement.

HONORING FATHER THEODORE HESBURGH

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, seventy years ago, a young man was ordained as a priest of the Congregation of Holy Cross and immediately volunteered to serve as a Navy Chaplain in World War II. At the time, duty to his church and commitments to his studies prevented him from serving in the Navy. Yet earlier this year, Father Theodore Hesburgh finally realized his dream: earning recognition as an Honorary Navy Chaplain.

This honor paid tribute to Father Hesburgh's extraordinary contributions—as a patriot of our country, as a leader of his Church, as a teacher and mentor, as a champion of the civil rights movement. He has been recognized by American presidents from Eisenhower to Obama. President Lyndon Johnson awarded him with the Presidential Medal of Freedom; President Clinton presented him with the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor Congress can bestow. These all paid tribute to a life that exemplified and gave meaning to the Navy Chaplain motto: ''vocati ad servitium''—''called to serve.''

It is only fitting that Father Hesburgh would be honored by the Navy, which has a rich history with Notre Dame. As he has noted in the past, during World War II, ''The Navy came in and kept us afloat until the war was over,'' using the Notre Dame campus for the Midshipmen's School, constructing drill halls and headquarters at the school, and building classrooms on the site of what is now the Hesburgh Library.

Father Hesburgh was called to serve his faith and his fellow Catholics. He would take his first job at Notre Dame as chaplain for married veterans and would rise to serve as President of the University. But what he has embraced most is performing the most basic duties of a C.S.C. priest: saying mass; assisting the needy and giving voice to the voiceless; serving the poor and the abandoned, the hungry and the homeless.

Father Hesburgh was called to serve the future of our country through his leadership in the field of higher education. He led Notre Dame for an incredible 35 years, yet his imprint extended further than a single campus. He demonstrated how to transform Catholic universities into exemplary institutions of higher education in modern times. He championed academic freedom and the pursuit of academic excellence. He has earned 150 honorary degrees, more than any other person in history.

Father Hesburgh was called to serve to advance the cause of human dignity and justice in our society. Appointed by President Eisenhower to the Civil Rights Commission in 1957, he would shine a light on the need for voting rights in the south. He would become known as an architect of the Civil Rights Act. He would find himself standing hand-in-hand with Martin Luther King Jr. at Soldier Field in Chicago, singing ''We Shall Overcome''—a photograph of which is proudly displayed in the National Portrait Gallery.

Known as ''Father Ted'' to many, he understood the purpose behind the call to service, once charging a gnpup of graduates to ''be the kind of person who not only understands the injustices of this life, but is also willing to do something about them.'' That is what Father Hesburgh has done every day for the past 70 years.

His students have been inspired by his message. Our country has been blessed by his leadership. The people have been strengthened by his presence. We are all grateful that he answered the call to serve.

On the 70th anniversary of his ordination and as we approach his 96th birthday, we know that Americans will long be blessed by the legacy of Father Theodore Hesburgh.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 21, 2013, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 164, ''yea;'' on rollcall No. 165, ''yea;'' on rollcall No. 166, ''yea.''

SARAH BOOTHBY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sarah Boothby for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Sarah Boothby is an 8th grader at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sarah Boothby is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sarah Boothby for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING MR. RODRIC J. MYERS UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today Ranking Member ROBERT BRADY and I join together on behalf of the House of Representatives to pay tribute to Mr. Rodric J. Myers, Director of House Garages and Parking Security with the Sergeant at Arms, on the occasion of his retirement on June 14, 2013. Rod has served this institution with distinction for over 40 years—both as an officer with U.S. Capitol Police and with the Office of the Sergeant at Arms. His capable guidance, trusted mentorship, and steady leadership have been invaluable assets not only to his staff and colleagues, but to every Congressional office.

A native of Indianapolis, Indiana, Rod Myers joined the U.S. Capitol Police in June 1972. He both began and ended his career with the U.S. Capitol Police in the Capitol Division, first as a uniform patrol officer in and around U.S. Capitol, and eventually as the Administrative Specialist for the entire Capitol Division. Rod was responsible for time and attendance for approximately 100 officers, the daily roster assignment of officers, as well as working an assignment of his own outside of his administrative duties. Rod was—as everyone who ever worked with him will attest—the man who made the trains run on time. His 29 years of service with the department were marked by a remarkable devotion to detail and a demonstration of professionalism in the highest degree.

During Rod's long tenure with the U.S. Capitol Police he had the honor of working ten Presidential Inaugurations, as well as 40 State of the Union addresses. Needless to say, he had the opportunity to meet and greet numerous dignitaries and heads of state over the years, but perhaps his most cherished moment was a visit by his beloved Dallas Cowboys football team. Rod—being the U.S. Capitol Police administrative specialist—got this assignment himself.

On July 9, 2001, Rod was appointed Director of House Garages and Parking Security with the Sergeant at Arms. Throughout the past 11 years, he has worked tirelessly to establish parking protocols and procedures that enhance both the safety and security of Members and staff. Rod has crafted a comprehensive on-going training program for all Garages and Parking Security staff, coordinating with the U.S. Capitol Police and the Office of the Attending Physician to ensure that his staff is

prepared for any eventuality. He has worked closely with the Committee on House Administration over the years concerning every facet of the House parking regulations. Rod is also involved in continuity and contingency planning efforts for the Sergeant at Arms.

Rod Myers' profound compassion and deep commitment to this institution are second to none. From events such as 9/11 and the anthrax incident, to an earthquake, his gentle nature always projects a sense of assurance and calm to all who encounter him. His leadership by example and an ability to motivate are benchmarks in a long and distinguished career.

Please join me in commending the outstanding service of Mr. Rodric J. Myers, to the Congress of the United States and congratulating him on his retirement. We wish you well in all your future endeavors.

IN MEMORY OF MR. LONAL XELA ROBINSON

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the memory of a gifted young man and community servant, Mr. Lonal Xela Robinson. With exceptional skill and purpose, he dedicated his life to helping those around him and enlightening his community through the arts.

Mr. Robinson was born in Champaign, Illinois on June 24, 1979. His parents instilled within him a love for community service and an evident compassion for all of God's creatures. While in high school, Mr. Robinson achieved the prodigious feats of writing the play ''CHANGE'' for the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Club, Inc, as well as serving as vice president in charge of programs for the organization. His play, ''CHANGE,'' won first place in a national convention held in New York City, judged by Broadway stage casts. Mr. Robinson later attended Langston University where he distinguished himself further by founding the Langston University Theatre and Drama Club, as well as traveling the country doing mission work with the Wesley Foundation and United Methodist Church.

After graduating college, Mr. Robinson went on to lead and write for the Houston Sun. Under his leadership, the newspaper expanded its presence and embarked on bold community initiatives in Houston. He led the organization in its adoption of Emancipation Park to present back-to-school rallies and talent shows for children in the community. He started the Houston Sun Presents program, which offered educational, instructive, and entertaining programs and services to the community. Along with his work in the community and leadership of the Houston Sun, Mr. Robinson wrote two yet-to-be published works of poetry, ''Pieces of Me'' and ''Poetry for all Seasons.'' He also served in various organizations: ombudsman for the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. and the National Council of Negro Women. He also received a number of awards for his contributions to the community, including the 4–H Club Spirit Award, Million Men March Award, and the Houston Sun Beacon of Light: Men of Valor Award.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robinson will be missed dearly by a multitude of family and friends. This family includes his mother, Dorris Ellis Robinson; brother, Sirrod Robinson; two sisters, Shuronda and Dorcaus Robinson; as well as a loving extended family. Mr. Robinson will be remembered in Houston as a thoughtful and intelligent young man who used the prime years of his life to make his community a better place.

HONORING HEROES FOR VICTIMS 2013 CONGRESSIONAL VICTIMS' RIGHTS CAUCUS AWARDS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, RAINN, Merced's Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Task Force, Michele Steeb, Martha Herm, LaWanda Hawkins, and Suzanne Beaudoin are six selfless individuals and organizations that have changed the lives of innumerable victims around the country.

Recently, the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus honored these very special advocates and organizations during our annual VRC Awards Ceremony for going above and beyond for victims.

Congressman JIM COSTA and I serve as co-chairs of the Victims' Rights Caucus.

I nominated RAINN, the Rape Abuse and Incest National Network, for the Suzanne McDaniel Award for Public Awareness. Just like Suzanne, RAINN has pioneered efforts in the victims' rights community.

RAINN was founded by my friend Scott Berkowitz. It began with the creation of the National Sexual Assault Hotline and has grown to assist and advocate for victims in a variety of innovative ways. Although Scott is from New Jersey, he's a lot like a Texan, and that is why I respect him so much.

Scott and his organization RAINN do not stop until they reach their goal. And their goal is to prevent sexual assault and serve the victims of this awful crime. RAINN never gave up advocating for the SAFER Act (Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting Act), a bill to end the rape kit backlog. This organization knows firsthand the importance of testing rape kits in order to bring justice to victims and put perpetrators behind bars. Because of RAINN's unceasing efforts, the SAFER Act was signed into law as part of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act earlier this year.

RAINN's National Sexual Assault Hotline has served more than 1.5 million victims, and the number of victims affected by RAINN's other services and advocacy are countless. Groups like RAINN turn victims into survivors.

Merced's Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Task Force, nominated by VRC co-chair Congressman JIM COSTA for the Lois Haight Award of Excellence and Innovation, is helping to prevent crime before it happens.

This organization is a collaboration of local leaders formed in 2006 in response to gang related violence in the Merced community.

The Task Force makes Merced a safer place by educating the community about violence, promoting character development, and providing information for families and youth.

From Gang Awareness Workshops to Merced County's first anonymous ''text a tip'' line, the Task Force has contributed greatly to the Merced community. Organizations like this Task Force are critical to stopping our citizens from becoming victims.

Congressman COSTA'S fellow member of the California Delegation, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, a particularly active member of the Caucus recognized a leader in her community, Michele Steeb. Ms. Steeb, the CEO of St. John's Shelter Program for Women and Children in Sacramento received the Allied Professional Award for her dedication. Under Ms. Steeb's guidance, St. John's Shelter Program has expanded into more than just a safe place for women and children but a program to help victims thrive. The unique assistance offered like parenting classes, financial management classes, and on-the-job training empower the victims under Ms. Steeb's care to take on the world. Leaders like Michele Steeb transform the lives of crime victims.

Like Michele Steeb, Martha Herm runs a domestic violence program with innovative, community-based components that have lead to the betterment of Peoria, IL for years. Ms. Herm is the Executive Director at the Center for the Prevention of Abuse, which she has lead for many years. The Center for the Prevention of Abuse is well known and highly regarded in Congressman AARON SCHOCK'S district. To honor Ms. Herm's leadership, Congressman SCHOCK nominated this hero to victims with the Ed Stout Memorial Award for Outstanding Victim Advocacy. This award honors the memory of Ed Stout, the Director of Aid for Victims of Crime of St. Louis, MO—one of the nation's three oldest victim assistance organizations—who died in 2005 following a 30+ year career of inspiring crime victims and those who serve them.

Through Ms. Herm's efforts, the Center has grown from serving mainly women and children to serving all populations and working to stop violence before it starts. In the words of Mike McCoy, the Sheriff of Peoria County, ''Martha Herm is a constant voice for those in need.''

LaWanda Hawkins is another one who helps those in need. Congresswoman KAREN BASS nominated her for the Eva Murillo Unsung Hero Award. Ms. Hawkins is an inspiration to her community and mothers around the country.

I won't forget the story Ms. Hawkins shared with us during the award ceremony. One day she was in her car, listening to a story on the radio about a young man that was murdered. She prayed for the young man and his family the whole car ride, only to find out later that it was her own son, Reggie. He had been tragically murdered.

Ms. Hawkins never wanted another family to feel the pain she felt when she answered the phone that day notifying her that the young man she heard about on the radio was her son. She connected with other parents who experienced similar tragedies. They realized that their cases were not being solved, and they were left out of the criminal justice process. Ms. Hawkins knew that this was not right and in 1996, founded Justice for Murdered Children. Through her organization, she provides a variety of services to families of murdered children, including legal assistance,

family support groups, counseling, and community outreach and education. Not only does she continue to help aid families, but she successfully advocates for legislation to protect victims' rights.

Ms. Hawkins is a force to be reckoned with and a true champion for crime victims.

Suzanne Beaudoin is another bold woman who dedicated her life to serving crime victims. She was nominated for the Ed Stout Memorial Award by one of our newest VRC Members, Congressman MARK POCAN from Wisconsin. Like Ed Stout, Ms. Beaudoin has seen her work directly benefit survivors of crime.

Suzanne Beaudoin currently serves on the Wisconsin Crime Victims Council and has been the Director of the Victim Witness Unit of the Dane County District Attorney's Office for 20 years.

Throughout her years working in the Victim Witness Unit, she established ground-breaking programs in her community and advocated for critical victim legislation, including Wisconsin Victim's Rights Constitutional Amendment and the establishment of a local children's advocacy center. We are thankful for Ms. Beaudoin and those like her who guide victims through the criminal justice system and address the needs of survivors.

The work of these determined individuals never ceases to amaze me.

America is the greatest country in the world because of people like these.

And that's just the way it is.

SAMANTHA BENNETT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Samantha Bennett for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Samantha Bennett is an 8th grader at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Samantha Bennett is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Samantha Bennett for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 20, 2013, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 161, ''yea;'' on rollcall No. 162, ''yea;'' on rollcall No. 163, ''yea.''

CONGRATULATING DR. DAVID J. VERDUGO, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE PARAMOUNT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dr. David J. Verdugo on his retirement after forty years as an educator. For the last eight years, Dr. Verdugo has served as the superintendent of the 16,000 student Paramount Unified School District. He will retire in June at the end of the current school year.

Before coming to the Paramount Unified School District, Superintendent Verdugo served at three uniquely different school districts: Spokane Public School District in the state of Washington, El Rancho Unified School District in Pico Rivera, California, and Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District, also in California. Dr. Verdugo has been a teacher, assistant principal, and principal, working with children grades K–12. He has also served as an assistant superintendent, where his responsibilities included school facility management, extensive involvement with budget development, implementation of technology programs, employer/employee relations, curriculum and instructional strategies and organizational development.

He is highly respected throughout the school district, the community and the education field. Dr. Verdugo is known for his strategic approach to major decisions, his communication with all stakeholders and his efforts to build a culture where individuals care about each other, resulting in a dramatic difference for students. His communications and work at Paramount Unified during the State's budget crisis resulted in everyone coming together so they could continue their efforts to benefit children, families and employees.

Dr. Verdugo has established a reputation as a leader focused on student learning and achievement. He possesses those critical skills essential to understanding and meeting the needs of students, staff, and parents. He is committed to excellence and believes that all students should be provided the highest quality of education in a safe and secure environment.

With experience serving students of diverse populations and socioeconomic levels in urban and suburban settings, Dr. Verdugo is a staunch supporter of strategic planning and believes strongly that it is essential to the success of any progressive school district.

As Superintendent, Dr. Verdugo has been instrumental in leading many of the school district's significant accomplishments, including dramatically increasing college and career pathways for students, fostering a resurgence of the arts, building new and transforming existing school facilities, and most importantly, raising the level of academic achievement of students to an all-time high.

Dr. Verdugo received his B.A. from Whitworth College in Spokane, Washington; his M.A. from La Verne University; and his Doctorate in Educational Administration from the University of Southern California. He was recognized as the 2008 ACSA Region 14 Superintendent of the Year. He also received the California State University of Long Beach Superintendent Leadership Award for 2012 and was selected as a National Governing Board Member for the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). He currently serves as President of the highly respected Southern California Superintendents' Association.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking and congratulating Dr. David J. Verdugo for his many years of outstanding service to our community and our young people, and wish him many happy years of retirement.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF BAHA'I LEADERS IN IRAN

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this month we mark the fifth anniversary of a terrible abuse of human rights in Iran.

Seven Baha'i leaders in Iran have been in prison for five years as of May 14, 2013. They are Mahvash Sabet, Fariba Kamalabadi, Jamaloddin Khanjani, Afif Naeimi, Saeid Rezaie, Behrouz Tavakkoli, and Vahid Tizfahm.

Tragically, there are many prisoners of conscience filling Iran's jails. Our Department of State's annual Human Rights Report documents case after case of violations of religious freedom. Indeed, in Iran, a climate of hostility surrounds all non-Shia religious communities. The Baha'i as well as Sunni Muslims, evangelical Christians, and Jews are victims of discrimination and persecution.

For all the victims of this persecution, and in particular for the seven Baha'i whose grim milestone we mark this month, it is critical that we raise our voices to send a message that they are not forgotten.

These seven leaders are all members of a national-level group—the ''Yaran-i-Iran'' or ''Friends in Iran''—which oversaw the welfare of Iran's Baha'i community. Their 20-year prison term is the longest sentence of any current prisoners of conscience in Iran.

The seven were charged with espionage, propaganda against the Islamic republic, the establishment of an illegal administration, and corruption on earth. These are typical of the false charges and misinformation used to vilify Baha'is in Iran. The defendants rejected these charges completely and categorically. Their crime is being members of the Baha'i Faith, a religion which has been the focus of systematic, government-sponsored persecution in Iran since the 1979 revolution.

The trial of the seven leaders was also the trial of an entire community of more than 300,000. For the last 30 years, more than 200 Baha'is have been killed, hundreds more imprisoned, and thousands deprived of jobs, education, and the freedom to worship.

In an act of communal self-preservation, the Baha'is created an internal university called the Baha'i Institute of Higher Education to educate those denied entry to university. It was raided in 2011 and seven educators and administrators were sentenced to four or five years' imprisonment.

In addition, some 600 Baha'is have suffered arbitrary arrests since 2004. The number of Baha'is arrested and/or imprisoned has increased dramatically in the past two years. In January 2011, 56 were in prison and 230 were awaiting trial, appeal, or sentencing; currently, there are 110 in prison and 436 awaiting the other procedures.

Followers of the Baha'i Faith, founded in Iran in 1863, are regarded as infidels and have suffered persecution both before and after the 1979 Islamic Revolution. Baha'i teachings emphasize the oneness of God, the unity of humankind, the underlying harmony of major religions, universal education, and the equality of women and men.

I support House Resolution 109 condemning the Iranian government for its persecution of its Baha'i minority. I call on my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join in co-sponsoring this resolution and my Senate colleagues in co-sponsoring Senate Resolution 75.

RAYANNA ROMERO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rayanna Romero for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Rayanna Romero is a 9th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rayanna Romero is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rayanna Romero for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING SING FOR HOPE AND THE SING FOR HOPE PIANOS PROJECT

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend the non-profit organization Sing for Hope, located in midtown Manhattan and dedicated to making the arts accessible to all. The Sing for Hope vision of ''art for all'' reflects their belief that the arts have the unique power to uplift, unite, and transform individuals and communities. They rely on the time and services donated by over 1,000 local New York City artists and performers who perform in schools, community centers and healthcare facilities. The mission of Sing for Hope is defined by the volunteer service of artists, and their belief in the transformative power of the arts.

The co-founding Directors of Sing for Hope, Camille Zamora and Monica Yunus, are internationally acclaimed opera singers who met as students at Juilliard. They established Sing for Hope in 2006 as a vehicle to encourage artists to give back to their communities. Since then, Sing for Hope has brought the magic of the arts to underserved communities throughout New York City and implemented a variety of outreach programs serving children, senior citizens, and people recovering from illness at healthcare facilities.

This summer marks the return of a very popular program created by Sing for Hope—''The Sing for Hope Pianos.'' Eighty-eight colorfully decorated pianos, which symbolize the 88 keys of a piano, are placed throughout New York City's public spaces in all five boroughs, for all members of the public to play and to enjoy. After the project ends, the pianos are then donated to underresourced schools and hospitals. ''The Sing for Hope Pianos'' are a striking embodiment of the role the arts play in our lives, and remind us that everyone should have access to treasured cultural resources. This year's return of ''The Sing for Hope Pianos'' has been made possible by the dedicated generosity of several entities: Chobani, Inc., a New York State-based company led by its President & CEO, Hamdi Ulukaya, as well as the Arnhold Foundation in honor of Sissy Arnhold, the Anna-Maria and Stephen Kellen Foundation, and the Bill and Ann Ziff Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking and congratulating Sing for Hope on this year's ''Sing for Hope Pianos'' project, as well as their ongoing dedication to volunteer service and community engagement, through encouraging greater access to the arts.

MS. LISA TATUM, J.D. ELECTED FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN PRESIDENT OF THE STATE BAR OF TEXAS

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to acknowledge the extraordinary accomplishment of Ms. Lisa Tatum, J.D. On June 21, 2013, Ms. Tatum will be sworn in as the 133rd President of the State Bar of Texas, and thereby become the first African American to hold that position. With exceptional dedication, Ms. Tatum has risen through the ranks of the legal profession to become one of the preeminent lawyers in the State of Texas.

Ms. Tatum grew up and still resides in San Antonio, TX, the product of an Air Force veteran father and a loving mother. In 1991, she received her Bachelor's degree from Smith College before going on to receive her Juris Doctor in 1994 from Santa Clara University Law School. Ms. Tatum quickly attained distinction in the legal profession, prosecuting over a hundred cases for Bexar County's Criminal District Attorney's Office before successfully transitioning to private practice. Eventually, Ms. Tatum established her own law firm, LM Tatum, PLLC, informally known as The Tatum Law Practice, in 2011. The Tatum Law Practice primarily handles cases related to corporate, public finance, financial transaction, employment, and estate contingency planning law. In addition to her remarkable career accomplishments, Ms. Tatum is a Leadership San Antonio graduate, lifelong supporter of the YMCA, and a Rotarian.

Ms. Tatum's leadership has been consistently recognized by her colleagues: Ms. Tatum was honored with a Presidential Citation in 2006 and named a Texas Rising Star by SuperLawyers in 2007. She also served on the Board of Governors of the National Bar Association, City of San Antonio Housing Authority Commission, the San Antonio Water System Citizen Advisory Panel, and as President of the San Antonio Black Lawyers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to pay tribute to Ms. Tatum, an accomplished lawyer and public servant. She is a determined and driven individual who will bring her diverse skills and life experience to the presidency of the State Bar of Texas.

RETIREMENT PLAN SIMPLIFICATION AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to come before the House to reintroduce the Retirement Plan Simplification and Enhancement Act of 2013. Our current retirement plan rules are very complicated. My bill includes a number of common sense reforms that will simplify the rules while still protecting participants.

For example, under current law, small businesses that adopt a new retirement plan are eligible for a tax credit to cover some of their start-up costs. We're increasing the credit to $5,000 to cover all of these expenses. I hope this will encourage more small employers to sponsor retirement plans.

Also, currently employers can exclude some part-time workers from participating in their 401(k) plans. As women are more likely than men to work part-time, these rules can be quite harmful for women in preparing for retirement. So my bill would require employers to allow certain long-term, part-time workers to make elective deferrals to their 401(k) plans.

My bill also reforms the Saver's Credit. The current Saver's Credit provides a tax incentive for families to save for retirement. However, because the Saver's Credit is currently non-refundable, it does not benefit those who need it most—low and moderate income households who have little or no federal income tax liability. Therefore, my bill would make the Saver's Credit refundable and also incentivize taxpayers to pay the credit into their retirement accounts.

The Retirement Plan Simplification and Enhancement Act also would establish a new automatic enrollment safe harbor. It was my legislation that established the existing safe harbor that promotes automatic enrollment in 401(k) plans. The power of inertia is a powerful tool. And automatically enrolling employees in 401(k)s unless they decide to opt out is a simple and effective way to harness this

power of inertia. And my legislation has incentivized many employers to implement automatic enrollment in their 401(k) plans.

However, the current safe harbor sets a minimum default level of contributions of 3 percent in the first year. Under the existing rules, employers can set the default at a higher percentage if they want to but many employers just stick with the floor amount of 3 percent. We all know that 3 percent is not enough savings for most American families—in fact, many financial institutions recommend that employees save at least 10 percent of their salary. So my proposal would keep the existing automatic enrollment but it would create a second safe harbor. And this second safe harbor would set the minimum default contribution rate at 6 percent in the first year, 8 percent in the second year and 10 percent in all subsequent years. Now remember, employees can lower the rate if it's too high for them—but this proposal would use the power of inertia to encourage employees to save more.

Finally, my bill would help consolidate and simplify the many employee notices required by retirement plans. The current rules require retirement plans to provide employees with lots of information regarding their plans. Although well intended, it has become information overload with many employees just ignoring the many notices—or even worse, it confuses employees. My bill would direct the Secretaries of Treasury and Labor to review the current retirement plan reporting and disclosure rules and make recommendations to improve these requirements.

Let me conclude by saying that I also intend to keep working on allowing for greater disclosure to participants in an electronic manner. We certainly need to protect employees without computers or individuals who just prefer paper. However, electronic disclosure provides many efficiencies, saves participants money that could otherwise be taken from their retirement accounts, and provides easy access to educational and financial tools. And, therefore, I plan to continue working on this issue.

My legislation provides common-sense reforms that will help Americans prepare for a financially secure retirement. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting "The Retirement Plan Simplification and Enhancement Act."

RAFAEL RESENDEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rafael Resendez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Rafael Resendez is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rafael Resendez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rafael Resendez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

EAST BAY PROFILE: VETERAN OF RICHMOND'S NEIGHBORHOOD WARS CHANGES LIFE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend my colleagues to read the following article, titled "East Bay Profile: Veteran of Richmond's neighborhood wars changes life," posted in the West County Times on May 21, 2013.

I've had the opportunity to meet this extraordinary young man, Eric Welch, a number of times, both here in Washington and in my district in Richmond, California, during visits with the City of Richmond's Office of Neighborhood Safety's Peacekeeper Fellowship program, of which Eric is a member.

Eric's only 24 years old but has had a long history of involvement with gun violence. At 14, he was almost killed in a shooting, and by the time he was 22 he had already been shot on four separate occasions. But now, he is on a new path in life now, and that is very encouraging.

I was so proud to read that this fall Eric will start classes at Tallahassee Community College in Florida, and that he hopes to later transfer to Florida A&M University. And just as exciting, Eric has been selected as a Summer Policy Fellow for the Campaign for Youth Justice in Washington, D.C. this summer where he will write for the group's blog, brief congressional committees on his experience, and work with grass-roots groups to reduce youth crime.

The Richmond ONS Peacemaker Fellowship exists to save lives—Eric is a living testament to that. It is designed to create a viable space for at-risk individuals ages 16–25 to contribute in a real way to building and sustaining community peace, health and well-being—with the express purpose of eliminating gun violence in Richmond. Time and again I'm blown away by the work these young men do to develop a positive life path forward and mentor other young men in similar situations.

I wish Eric all the best, both in Washington this summer and at school this fall. I hope his successes will serve as inspiration for many more to follow in his steps.

[From the Contra Costa Times, May 21, 2013]

EAST BAY PROFILE: VETERAN OF RICHMOND'S NEIGHBORHOOD WARS CHANGES LIFE

(By Robert Rogers)

RICHMOND.—Eric Welch's mind and heart are on a higher plane, but the street reflexes remain.

He'll be in Washington, D.C., this summer, wearing tailored suits and briefing Congress.

But for now, Welch still tenses when certain cars round the block.

He has good reason. He was shot four times before his 22nd birthday.

"At first, getting shot was a source of anger," Welch said. "Now I look back at it differently. I wonder why I got so lucky in a place where people like me get killed all the time.

Welch, now 24 but with the weary face and measured speech of an older man, has gone from self-described "goon" and survivor of multiple episodes of gun violence to celebrated member of the Office of Neighborhood Safety's fellowship program. The program appeals to about 50 violent residents with incentives, including small cash stipends, if they give up gunplay and pick up education and job training.

The program is unique in the region, a city-sponsored department that stems violence through intervention in the lives of violent offenders. For his efforts, Welch earned an internship with the Campaign for Youth Justice, a Washington, D.C.-based nonprofit focused on juvenile justice.

Welch will serve as a "policy fellow" from June 10 to Aug. 9, writing for the group's blog, briefing congressional committees on his experience and working with grass-roots groups to reduce youth crime.

It's a far cry from Welch's teen and early adult years, a haze of neighborhood beefs and sporadic gunfire, interrupted by hospital and jail stints. He bounced between a dozen schools, toting guns when most kids still were watching Saturday morning cartoons.

Guns and violence permeated his rugged south Richmond neighborhood. It was only when he enrolled in the Office of Neighborhood Safety program after a 2010 jail stint that he turned away from crime.

"Eric is a shining example to other young people in Richmond and beyond that people can change, and in the virtue of hard work," said program director DeVone Boggan.

CHEATING DEATH

Welch leans on a black gate in front of a California bungalow home at 26th Street and Virginia Avenue.

"This is the spot where I got shot that first time, almost died, man," Welch says, looking down the street. "I was 14."

Welch re-enacts the scene from a decade ago. He was "hanging" with another teen a few blocks from the apartment where he grew up with his mother and sister.

One block west, a car glided around the corner. Rifles poked through the windows and spit flames from the barrels, a nanosecond before the crackle of gunfire.

"I don't remember the car, just the flame spit out in the night; it was AK–47s," Welch said.

Welch and his friend dove to the sidewalk and crawled for cover.

"The bullets was whistling by, and ricocheting all over the concrete, too," Welch said.

The pain was an intense heat, Welch remembered. A large-caliber slug struck Welch underneath his left arm, collapsing his lung and breaking his clavicle. Welch's friend was hit in the hip. The car screeched away.

"Lot of blood, out my mouth, out my chest. I thought I was going to die," Welch said. "I couldn't breathe."

Three scars mark his upper torso. One is the entry point near his armpit. One is the spot in his side where doctors plunged a tube to help him breathe. The exit wound is on his back, knotted into a mound of dark scar tissue the size of a golf ball.

LOW POINTS

Welch survived, but his innocence didn't.

"After that, I was bouncing around schools, just living the neighborhood life," Welch said. "I was angry. I was vengeful."

His drive for vengeance intensified after the 2006 killing of Sean "Shawny Bo" Melson, a pint-size 15-year-old police say was a charismatic, up-and-coming neighborhood leader. To this day, odes to "Shawny Bo" and old photos are posted on social networking sites.

Welch and other friends vowed to ''keep it lit'' for Melson, meaning to exact retribution on rival neighborhoods they blamed for his death.

Welch was shot three more times, in both ankles, the buttocks and the hip. He declines to get into specifics but admits he has been involved in ''shootouts.''

''I have a chance at a peaceful life; I just don't want to die or go to jail when I am so close.''

Welch said that in Richmond's toughest neighborhoods, violent deaths of relatives and friends, shootouts and close calls ''hang over everything.''

THE FUTURE

The mere notion of a future is a far cry from where Welch has been.

''Eric was on his way to prison or death, for sure,'' said Sam Vaughn, an Office of Neighborhood Safety neighborhood change agent who has worked closely with Welch. ''Where he is now, about to go to college, is a miracle given what he's been through.''

Welch spends little time in the old neighborhood, knowing he could lose it all in an instant.

He plans to attend Tallahassee Community College in Florida in the fall, and he hopes to transfer to Florida A&M University. But first, he's on his way to the Capitol.

''I am really looking forward to a new start, a place where I can be by myself and focus and not worry about my past catching up with me,'' Welch said. ''I feel alone here, in my neighborhood. My friends are mostly dead or incarcerated.''

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

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 $16,787,282,992,090.73. We've added $6,160,405,943,177.65 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

SANDY MATA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sandy Mata for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Sandy Mata is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sandy Mata is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sandy Mata for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING MINNESOTA STATE REPRESENTATIVE KAREN CLARK

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of serving as a member of the Minnesota House of Representatives for eight years prior to being elected to Congress in 2000. One of my Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party colleagues from Minneapolis, State Rep. Karen Clark, was a constant and vocal champion for social justice, economic opportunity, environmental sustainability, and human rights. State Rep. Clark continues to serve in the Minnesota House, having just completed her thirty-third legislative session. Karen's passion, determination, and commitment as a legislator were recently displayed for the entire nation to admire as she authored legislation and lead the push for marriage equality. That legislation passed the legislature, was signed into law, and now Minnesota is the twelfth state in the union to legalize same sex marriage.

Today, the White House is recognizing the achievements and contributions of ten openly lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) public officials from across the United States. One of those officials being honored is State Rep. Karen Clark, who will join a distinguished group of leaders named ''Harvey Milk Champions of Change.'' This is a tremendous honor for Karen and I want to extend my heartfelt congratulations on this well deserved recognition.

Throughout her career, Karen Clark has advocated and given voice to the issues and hopes of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender Minnesotans. As the longest serving openly lesbian state legislator in the country, Karen has battled against discrimination, hate-crimes, and intolerance faced by LGBT Americans, yet she has always conducted herself with a spirit of openness, kindness, and courage. Karen has dedicated three decades to improving the lives of LGBT Minnesotans, but also all families in her South Minneapolis district. From LGBT youth to new African or Latino immigrants, low-income families to Native American women, Karen Clark has always been on the side of making government work for people to improve their lives.

Again, I would like to extend my congratulations and the shared sense of pride many friends, colleagues, and constituents of Karen feel as she is recognized by President Obama for her leadership. State Rep. Karen Clark is truly a national leader for LGBT Americans and a champion for all Minnesotans.

TRIBUTE TO BENTON AND SANDI MARKS

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional Hoosier couple, Mr. Benton and Mrs. Sandi Marks, who are being honored with the 2013 HAI-Life Distinguished Service Award by Hasten Hebrew Academy of Indianapolis. This honor is well-deserved because of their many years of philanthropic service to the Indianapolis Jewish community, as well as to the broader community.

Mr. Marks joined the Hasten Hebrew Academy Board of Directors in 1997 and has served in a number of leadership positions, including as president of the school. In the 1990s, he was president of the Bureau of Jewish Education and is the only person in the Indianapolis Jewish community to serve as president of both educational institutions. Mr. Marks also served as the president of the Jewish Federation and as Campaign Chair a record five times. He also was chairman of State of Israel Bonds for three years. Mr. Marks has served as a member of the Indiana Judicial Nominating Commission, and has donated his time locally to United Cerebral Palsy, Indiana Building Owners and Managers Association, and the Indiana Chapter of the Brown University National Secondary School Committee.

Mrs. Marks has devoted her life to education, serving on the Hasten Hebrew Academy Education Committee and as a board member of the school. She recently retired from Washington Township Schools but continues to serve the district as a school psychologist. She is a member of several women's organizations in our community and works with the Great American Songbook Initiative at the Center for the Performing Arts in Carmel. Mrs. Marks is also a trusted friend and confidant of mine on education issues in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. and Mrs. Marks are wonderful entrepreneurs, philanthropists, and friends. I am honored to know them and look forward to our continued friendship. I know they will continue to serve as leaders in our community for many years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF LUZERNE COUNTY HEAD START, INC. FOR DEDICATED AND SELFLESS SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Luzerne County Head Start, Inc. for recently celebrating its 48th Anniversary on Monday, May 20, 2013. For nearly half a century, the program has been serving Luzerne County and Wyoming County by providing quality prekindergarten education to children who come from low-income families. Head Start teachers work with children, and

their families, to help them set the foundations for success in school and in later life.

Head Start is unique in its comprehensive approach to the needs of children and families. Currently Luzerne County Head Start provides 1,037 children with early learning education. In addition to creating an environment for early academic development, Head Start also provides an environment for healthy early physical development. Children that attend Head Start receive health checkups, oral screenings and nutritious meals. The Head Start faculty also teaches their students about comprehensive health and nutrition, giving them the knowledge they will need to make the right choices about the food they eat.

Head Start also focuses on the whole family unit, not just the child. One primary goal of the program is to move preschool children and their families toward self-sufficiency. Parents are assisted with a wide range of family needs including housing and employment, as well as adult education. Head Start offers assistance to parents interested in obtaining a high school General Equivalency Diploma or other adult education and employment opportunities.

Head Start works with children at a critical learning age. The children begin to socialize with others, solve problems, and have other experiences that help them to become self-confident. I commend the Luzerne County Head Start program for their continuing service to the community. I thank them for being a valuable educational asset to the community these past 48 years, and I wish them all the best in the future.

ROSELINE MUGARUKA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Roseline Mugaruka for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Roseline Mugaruka is an 11th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Roseline Mugaruka is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Roseline Mugaruka for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PENNY FREDERICK RETIRES AFTER 25+ YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and career of Penny Angelle Frederick. For the last 25 years, she has served the people of South Louisiana for three Members of Congress as a dedicated Congressional staffer.

Penny began her career in public service working as a legislative assistant for Louisiana State Representative Harry L. Benoit. She then worked with U.S. Representatives James ''Jimmy'' Hayes and Chris John of South Louisiana. In January of 2005, Penny joined my staff as a constituent service representative. From Day One, Penny has been a great resource to the Third Congressional District of Louisiana. Her knowledge and guidance provided my office with a strong foundation to build on. Her personality and reputation have forged many bonds across South Louisiana. I will miss her ability to provide help and insight to constituents and most importantly, to me.

As Penny enters retirement, I would like to thank her for the work she's done as a public servant. However, I am positive her husband, Kendall, and daughters, Abbey and Lindsey, will be happy to have her around a little more. Penny, I wish you nothing but the best as you enter this next phase of your life and hope you know how grateful I am for all of your hard work over the course of these many years.

IN HONOR OF COLORADO STATE SENATOR PAT STEADMAN

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Colorado State Senator Pat Steadman, who today was honored by the White House as a ''Harvey Milk Champion of Change'' for his commitment to equality and public service.

Pat has championed equality for LGBT Coloradans for over 20 years. While studying at the University of Colorado School of Law, Pat fought against ballot issues that targeted gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender communities. After law school, Pat worked to oppose Amendment 2 on the 1992 Colorado general election ballot. When that anti-gay amendment passed, Pat co-founded the nonprofit organization that spearheaded the lawsuit to challenge the constitutionality of Amendment 2; the case eventually went all the way to the Supreme Court. This landmark case Romer v. Evans declared Amendment 2 unconstitutional and established the first major court precedent protecting the equal rights of LGBT Americans.

In 2009, Pat was selected to fill the vacant Colorado Senate seat in the 31st District. Since that time, he has worked hard to protect and defend the rights of all his constituents and continue his fight for equality. Last year, his partner of many years Dave Misner was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer and died in September after a brief battle. Dave was also a champion for equality, and I know he would have been so proud when this year Pat introduced for the third time the Colorado Civil Unions Act, which legalized civil unions for any two unmarried adults, regardless of gender. This landmark was signed into law by Governor John Hickenlooper on March 21, 2013. I was honored to be able to perform some of the first civil union ceremonies in Denver earlier this month. The joyful celebrations reinforced the fact that Pat has achieved extraordinary things that empower and inspire his fellow Coloradoans. And I know Dave would be even more proud of Pat today.

Yesterday, Pat visited the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D.C. and shared online his favorite inscription at the Memorial. On the southeast interior panel, he was moved by an inscription from an 1816 letter by Jefferson to a friend that reads: ''I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors.''

Pat, your service to Colorado has embodied this quote, as you work to keep our laws and institutions moving hand in hand with progress. On behalf of a grateful state, thank you.

IN HONOR OF SECOND LIEUTENANT LUTHER McILWAIN

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and pay tribute to Second Lieutenant Luther McIlwain, of the United States Army Air Corps' famed Tuskegee Airmen. Mr. McIlwain recently passed away at the age of 91 and I seek to honor him for his dedicated service to the United States as an airman escorting bombers during World War II.

Lieutenant McIlwain was born in Blaine, South Carolina. His family moved to Lawrence, Massachusetts when he was two and he lived there until his graduation from Methuen High School in 1939. He attended college at Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina. Upon graduation, he sought to join the military in order to serve his country at a momentous time. On his first attempt, military recruiters ridiculed him for his desire to become a pilot. He was repeatedly told that he would not be able to fly because of his race. Undeterred, Luther enlisted in the Army Air Corps in 1943 and ultimately became an aviator with the famed Tuskegee Airmen.

The Tuskegee Airmen were a group of soldiers who continuously placed their country's needs above their own, often in the face of extreme adversity. Due to the segregation of the military at the time, the Tuskegee Airmen were routinely subjected to racial discrimination from their fellow service members and civilians alike. This never dissuaded their devotion to their duty or their Nation. They chose to pursue difficult training, knowing it would ultimately place them in direct confrontation with enemy combatants. Luther McIlwain proudly stood as a member of this elite unit.

Luther McIlwain fought in the skies above Europe and North Africa with bravery and distinction. He continued to place others first by serving as an instructor during the war, training nearly one thousand aviators in his unit.

Shortly after WWII, Mr. McIlwain was honorably discharged. He went on in his great tradition of service after the war by serving 22 years on the New York City Police Department.

In 2007 he was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal by President Bush. The ceremony was held in the U.S. Capitol, and Mr. McIlwain, along with nearly three hundred surviving members of the Tuskegee Airmen and their families, accepted the award on behalf of their departed colleagues.

Today, we honor Second Lieutenant Luther McIlwain for his lifetime of exemplary service, especially during WWII as a member of the legendary Tuskegee Airmen, who, undeterred by the rampant racism and prejudice of the time, sought to place their country above all else and paved the way for desegregation of our Armed Forces.

SAVANNAH GALLEGOS-ALEXUS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Savannah Gallegos-Alexus for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Savannah Gallegos–Alexus is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Savannah Gallegos-Alexus is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Savannah Gallegos-Alexus for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

MAY IS MOTORCYCLE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. TIM GRIFFIN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as Co-Chair of the Congressional Motorcycle Caucus and a motorcycle enthusiast, I rise today in support of Motorcycle Awareness Month, which is celebrated each May.

With more than 27 million motorcycle riders today, and that number steadily increasing, being mindful of other types of road and highway users is critical for everyone.

This is especially the case as the weather is warming up and more motorcycle riders are hitting the road.

Drivers' failure to see motorcycles is one of the leading causes of motorcycle crashes, and the prevalence of distracted and inattentive driving poses a significant threat to motorcycle riders.

I urge vehicle drivers to check mirrors and blind spots and actively look for motorcycles—especially at intersections. Taking that brief moment can mean the difference between life and death for motorcycle riders and vehicle drivers alike.

I also encourage my fellow motorcycle riders to take appropriate safety precautions by practicing safe riding techniques and wearing appropriate safety equipment.

The goal is to get all road and highway users to their destinations without incident.

Let's work together to make this a reality.

RECOGNIZING THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC DAY OF AZERBAIJAN

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of the Republic of Azerbaijan—as they are celebrating the 95th anniversary of the Republic Day on May 28.

The Republic Day commemorates the day Azerbaijan first declared independence from the Russian Empire on May 28, 1918. Though the independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan was ended by occupying Soviet forces in 1920, in its 2 years of independence Azerbaijan made important accomplishments on state-building, armed forces, education, their economy, and universal suffrage, from which it benefits today.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Azerbaijan restored its independence in 1991. Parliament adopted the Constitution Act on the Restoration of the State of Independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan on October 18, 1991.

The last two decades of independence has not been without challenges. The territorial integrity of Azerbaijan was violated and the Nagorno–Karabakh and seven surrounding regions of Azerbaijan have been occupied by neighboring Armenia. In 1993 the UN Security Council adopted four resolutions demanding complete, unconditional, and immediate withdrawal of Armenian forces from the occupied territories of Azerbaijan. I am happy that Azerbaijan is committed to peaceful resolution of the conflict with Armenia, and I support a swift, peaceful resolution to this conflict, as well.

Azerbaijan is a key global security partner for the United States. Azerbaijan has extended important over-flight clearances for U.S. and NATO flights to support ISAF and has regularly provided landing and refueling operations at its airports for U.S. and NATO forces. Also, Azerbaijan plays an important role in the Northern Distribution Network, a supply route to Afghanistan, by making available its ground and Caspian naval transportation facilities. Azerbaijan was also the first predominantly Muslim country to send troops to Iraq.

Azerbaijan has opened Caspian energy resources to development by U.S. companies and has emerged as a key player for global energy security. The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline project is the most successful project contributing to the development of the South Caucasus region and has become the main artery delivering Caspian Sea hydrocarbons to the U.S. and our partners in Europe. Notably, Azerbaijan also provides roughly 40% of Israel's oil consumption. Azerbaijan is considered a leading initiator of the Trans Anatolian Natural Gas Pipeline (TANAP) which will open up the Southern Gas Corridor to Europe. As a co-chair of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, I congratulate the Republic of Azerbaijan on the Republic Day. I believe we will continue to work with them to advance our partnership which benefits both the US and Azerbaijan. I look forward to further collaboration between our two nations.

HONORING BOB J. McDONALD

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize Mr. Bob McDonald from Athens, Texas. Mr. McDonald is to be commended for his work to support and maintain the historic Athens Cemetery in Henderson County, Texas.

A retired engineer, Mr. McDonald began his work at the cemetery at a time when it was badly in need of refurbishment. He designed and oversaw the installation of a new sprinkler system, a new brick entry and wrought-iron fencing, a columbarium, and numerous other improvements. For more than fifteen years, he has played a vital role in the cemetery's operation, serving as treasurer, public liaison, and overseer of the grounds.

Mr. McDonald also spearheaded efforts to research and classify the cemetery's interments so that visitors could easily find the graves they sought. He also created a roster of veterans buried at the cemetery that dates back to 1850, which is sorted according to the conflict in which the veterans served.

Mr. McDonald also volunteers his time at the East Texas Arboretum, and is a former member of the Trinity Valley Community College Board of Trustees. He was honored as the Athens Citizen of the Year in 1999.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the entire 5th Congressional District of Texas, to thank Mr. Bob McDonald for his dedicated philanthropy to the citizens of Henderson County, Texas.

IN HONOR OF THE QUAKERTOWN BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Quakertown Business and Professional Women's Club celebrates its 60th anniversary on May 28, 2013. The diverse group of working women came together in January 1953, setting a goal of equity and economic self-sufficiency for women by elevating standards, promoting their interests and bringing about a spirit of cooperation among business and professional women in Quakertown.

Club members provide support for local organizations: St. Luke's Hospital, Children's

Developmental Center, Quakertown Community Day, Quakertown Alive, YMCA and A Women's Place.

Also, they proudly participate in the March of Dimes Walk, American Cancer Society, Relay for Life, Quakertown Cares, Quakertown Food Pantry, and the Sarah Parvin Soccer Fest.

The club annually awards two $1,000 scholarships to graduating seniors at Quakertown Community High School.

Congratulations to the Quakertown Business and Professional Women's Club for inspiring women to achieve their personal goals and contribute to the greater community.

THE GROWING CRISIS IN AFRICA'S SAHEL REGION

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, which I chair, held a hearing that examined the challenges faced by the nations of Africa's Sahel region, especially the spread of terrorism and drug trafficking in the area. These problems alone pose a danger to the security of both the Sahel and developed countries, not only because of air traffic to West Africa that transits northern Mali, but also because of the use of the region as a base of attacks by Islamic extremists on Western targets. Moreover, the preexisting humanitarian crisis is now worsened, as are human rights concerns. The underlying political instability is becoming equally serious.

We held the hearing as a joint session because the threat we face goes beyond the jurisdiction of one subcommittee. It involves not only Africa's Sahel region, but also countries in North Africa, specifically Algeria and Libya. It also involves terrorist groups originating from and based in nations outside the Sahel. It is a sign of how seriously the Foreign Affairs Committee considers this matter that our three subcommittees have come together today to consider this matter.

There are various definitions of the Sahel, but for the purpose of the hearing, we meant the nations of Senegal, Mauritania, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger and Chad.

In early 2012, the Government of Mali was overthrown in a military coup and subsequently lost control of the northern area of the country, which constitutes more than half of its land area. Mali had long been considered a stable example of African democracy, but as we learned in our Subcommittee's hearing in June 2012, the coup and resulting loss of so much territory revealed a hollowness and rot within the Mali democratic system. The influx of well–armed terrorist groups, broken promises to neglected ethnic groups, lack of adherence to democratic principles and rampant drug smuggling all made the Mali government vulnerable to breakdown. We must ask now whether other countries in Africa's Sahel region are also more vulnerable than we think.

Mali provided a staging ground for al–Qaeda in the Islamic Mahgreb, or AQIM, which is daily becoming an ever–greater threat in the region and perhaps globally. AQIM is considered the best funded of all al–Qaeda affiliates and, through its ties to other terrorist groups, may be funding their activities as well.

In a July Subcommittee hearing last year, we learned that Boko Haram in Nigeria is not a unified organization, but rather various factions—some of which are focused on embarrassing the Nigerian government, but others that have a more global jihadist view. It is the latter that have been present in northern Mali and pose a threat to Western interests. Boko Haram attacks led Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan last week to declare a state of emergency in three northern states in his country. A radical Boko Haram splinter group, known as Ansaru, may have attacked Nigerian troops en route to the peacekeeping operation in Mali.

In Mali, three terrorist groups dominate the rebellion that split off the North: MUJWA, a splinter group of AQIM; Ansar al Deen, an Islamist Tuareg rebel group, and the MNLA, a more secular Tuareg group. These groups have different aims and sometimes clash with one another. Nevertheless, they collectively have posed and continue to pose a threat to the peace in Mali and the region. As a result of the rebel actions in northern Mali, there currently are more than 300,000 internally displaced persons in Mali, more than 74,000 refugees in Mauritania, 50,000 refugees in Niger and nearly 50,000 refugees in Burkina Faso. The displacement of nearly half a million Malians strains already–scarce resources in the Sahel, with aid recipients often in remote areas.

French forces were able to forestall a rebel advance into southern Mali earlier this year, and an African military contingent is in the process of being deployed to Mali even now. However, chasing rebels out of Mali's major northern towns will be easier than ending ongoing terrorist attacks or reconciling ethnic groups whose enmity has grown over the last year.

TRIBUTE TO JANE MARKS

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jane Marks for her years of work helping families affected by Alzheimer's disease, not only in West Virginia, but across the United States of America.

Jane Marks joined the Alzheimer's Association, West Virginia Chapter in 2001 as Executive Director and has been serving in the role as a tireless advocate ever since. Through her work with the State chapter, Jane has raised the association's profile by expanding their programmatic reach and championing various policy initiatives.

Recently, Jane served on the 2012–2014 Alzheimer's Association Strategic Plan Steering Committee, which aimed to aggressively advance their mission to eliminate Alzheimer's disease. In addition, she presented at the White House Conference on Aging Solutions Forum and has testified at numerous legislative committee hearings. Jane has also developed a wide variety of training and curriculum for families and caregivers, focusing on all facets of Alzheimer's, from caring for the baby boomer generation to a new extended learning course in partnership with West Virginia University.

On May 23, Jane Marks will receive the 2013 Rockefeller Award for her outstanding support and dedication to the cause of Alzheimer's disease in West Virginia, and indeed, throughout the United States. Jane is truly deserving of this honor, as thousands of Alzheimer's families, including my own, have her to thank for many years fighting this disease and helping those affected by it. After twelve years as Executive Director, Jane will be retiring June, however, she will remain a passionate advocate for everyone facing this terrible disease.

Jane lives in Charleston with her husband, John. She has two children, John Thomas and Elizabeth, and is expecting her first grandchild in just a few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia, the United States of America, and my own family owe Jane Marks a sincere and heartfelt thanks for her tireless service to everyone affected by Alzheimer's disease.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF LANDSMAN WALTER P. JOHNSTON

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor Civil War Medal of Honor recipient Landsman Walter P. Johnston.

At the young age of 13, Landsman Johnston bravely enlisted in the United States Navy. He was assigned to the USS *Fort Hindman*, a steamboat built in Jeffersonville, Indiana. During an engagement near Harrisonburg, Louisiana, Landsman Johnston suffered a severe hand wound that dramatically impaired his physical condition. Despite his horrendous injury, Landsman Johnston bravely took the place of another seaman to sponge and lead one of the cannons against the Confederate forces. The USS *Fort Hindman* was severely damaged in the battle, but thanks to the heroism of Landsman Johnston and his fellow sailors, the ship lived to see another day. After serving in the Navy, Landsman Johnston moved to La Porte, Indiana where he worked in the broom manufacturing business, until he passed away on May 8th, 1888 at the age of 39.

Too often, the heroic tales of our Nation's brave servicemen are lost to the back pages of history. Thanks to the hard work of Ms. Colleen Malinowski and the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Landsman Walter P. Johnston's legacy has been revived. Landsman Johnston leaves behind an incredible legacy that will live on to inspire many Hoosiers. His life is a testament to the American fighting spirit that still lives on in all our men and women currently serving in the Armed Forces.

I am honored to recognize the selfless heroics of Landsman Walter P. Johnston. Joining Hoosiers across the State, we remember his brave actions that helped preserve the lives of his fellow sailors, and the Union.

HONORING THE KENTUCKY HEADHUNTERS

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, what began in 1968 as family members joining together to play in an old house on their farm in Metcalfe County, Kentucky, eventually grew to become the Grammy-winning group, the Kentucky Headhunters.

Recognized by the Country Music Association, Academy of Country Music, and American Music Awards, the Kentucky Headhunters share elite company with other legends such as Bill Monroe, The Everly Brothers, and Loretta Lynn in the Kentucky Music Hall of Fame.

Like several other leading bands, the road to success for this small-town group was paved with various stumbling blocks and changes in course, but eventually they found their way and in doing so established their own brand of music.

In honor of this journey, quite fittingly, new signage will be unveiled today proclaiming Highway 640 in Metcalfe County ''The Kentucky Headhunter Highway.''

Also, in conjunction with this, Metcalfe County Judge Executive Greg Wilson and Mayor Howard Garrett will sign a proclamation declaring today ''Kentucky Headhunter Day'' in Edmonton/Metcalfe County.

As business owners and residents throughout this community come together to celebrate this occasion, I too wish to recognize the accomplishments of band members Richard Young, Fred Young, Greg Martin, and Doug Phelps.

Forty-five years after first assembling in that farmhouse in rural Metcalfe County, a permanent marker will now stand to remind travelers of the road to success for this enduring band. May it also seek to inspire others to follow their dreams and never give up on their own pursuits.

NOW THERE ARE FIVE TEAMS FROM VANDALIA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL CALLED CHAMPIONS

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, Vandalia Christian School in Greensboro, North Carolina, wrapped up its spring sports season with two more championships—girls soccer and boys baseball. I say two more because this past fall, Vandalia Christian won State championships in boy's basketball, boy's soccer, and cheerleading. It is a year unlike any other, five championships for one school from the Sixth District of North Carolina.

The boy's baseball team finished the regular season with an impressive 15-game-winning streak. This was the first time in school history that the boys won championships in soccer, basketball, and baseball in the same school year. A ton of credit can be given to VCS triple threat athlete, Houston Miller, who was a part of all three championship squads and pitched for the Vikings throughout the season. On May 10, Vandalia defeated Wilson Christian, 8–3, for the championship. This was the boy's baseball second championship in the past two years under Coach Luke Oates. Those who assisted Coach Oates included Assistant/Pitching Coach Ryan Nelson, Statistician Alyce Lentz, and Bookkeeper Laura Joyce. The team roster include the aforementioned Houston Miller, Michael Matthews, Nathaniel Hobbs, Josh McClellan, James Wagoner, Jasper White, Noah Joyce, Ethan Willis, Brayden McMillan, Jordan Mitchell; Bryson Gordon, Jacob Cable, Hunter Miller, Tyler Crook, Matt Hobbs, Henderson Lentz, and Rex Atkins.

On May 11, the Vandalia girls won the State soccer crown with their win over Wilmington Christian after the game came down to a series of penalty kicks (PKs). Katelyn Roop scored in regulation for the Vikings, while Allison Garner, Sydney Mitchell, and Laurie Powell scored the penalty kicks. The Vikings went three for four in PKs while VCS goalie Makayla Miller stopped three of four PKs by Wilmington Christian. The team was led by Head Coach Bobby Kaiser and Assistant Kristen Kaiser. The championship squad includes Katie Talkington, Laurie Powell, Melissa Pando, Ashley Pollard, Sydney Mitchell, Cristan Lewis, Abby Pack, Addy Hargett, Rene Burton, Lauren Chestnutt, Kalie Hazelwood, Elizabeth Fondow, Courtney Wood, Kara Smith, Whitney Dickens, Jill Georgevich, Allison Garner, Madison Ellis, Katie White, Makayla Miller, and Katelyn Roop.

Everyone who calls themselves a Viking should be rightfully proud of the five State championships this year. Congratulations to Principal Jeremy Cordova, Athletic Director Luke Oates, the faculty, staff, students, and particularly, the athletes of Vandalia for winning five sports crowns this year. The citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina are proud to say that we are the home of the champions from Vandalia Christian School.

HONORING CHAIM WEIZMANN

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man with considerable ties to the 8th District of Indiana and the first President of the State of Israel, Chaim Weizmann.

Weizmann was born in Poland in 1874 and became an accomplished chemist. While lecturing in England in 1916 he was asked by Winston Churchill to help Britain meet its acetone shortage.

In an effort to meet this request, Weizmann created a new process of acetone production through the fermentation process, which came to be known as the Weizmann Process and greatly outpaced previous production processes. As a physician with a strong background in organic chemistry, I can appreciate this work.

This breakthrough led to the issuance of U.S. Patent on the Weizmann Process, and in 1917 Weizmann established his first U.S. acetone plant on the Wabash River in Terre Haute, Indiana, a city in my home district.

The profits from his Terre Haute plant, Commercial Solvents Corporation, ultimately aided Weizmann in realizing his dream of establishing the State of Israel.

I am glad to honor President Weizmann for his contributions to the establishment of the State of Israel and to the 8th Congressional District of Indiana.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY CIPOLETTI

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nancy Cipoletti for her twenty-two years serving thousands of West Virginia families affected by Alzheimer's disease through outreach and support programs.

Nancy Cipoletti began her work with the Alzheimer's Association as Executive Director of the Southern West Virginia Chapter before becoming Program Director for the merged statewide chapter. Currently, Nancy works with Alzheimer's families as Director of Alzheimer's Programs for the West Virginia Bureau of Senior Services, where she manages and monitors the Family Alzheimer's In-Home Respite (FAIR) Program and Title III-E of the Family Caregiver Support Act.

In addition, Nancy serves on the Advisory Council of the West Virginia Partnership for Elder Living as well as the Direct Care Worker Curriculum Work Group, which developed a standardized curriculum and certification process for in-home direct care workers. As a part of the Alzheimer's Association's Make-A-Plan Subcommittee on Care Systems, Nancy helped develop West Virginia's Alzheimer's State Plan in 2011.

On May 23, Nancy Cipoletti will receive the 2013 Rockefeller Award for her outstanding support and dedication to the cause of Alzheimer's disease in West Virginia. Nancy is truly deserving of such an honor, as thousands of West Virginia Alzheimer's families have her to thank for support coping and fighting this awful disease.

Nancy lives in Charleston with her husband of forty-six years, Jack Cipoletti. Together they have two sons, Jay and Chad, and three granddaughters.

Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia owes Nancy Cipoletti a debt of gratitude for her many years of working with, and caring for, Alzheimer's families.

ADVOCATING FOR AMERICAN JACOB OSTREICHER'S FREEDOM AFTER TWO YEARS IN BOLIVIAN DETENTION

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I chaired a hearing of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations that pressed for the immediate freedom and repatriation of Mr. Jacob Ostreicher, a U.S. citizen from Brooklyn, New York, who has been detained in Bolivia for 720 days. I especially

want thank our distinguished witness who testified at that hearing, Mr. Sean Penn, for taking time out of his very busy schedule to testify before the subcommittee.

The human rights subcommittee that I chair held two hearings in the 112th Congress on Mr. Ostreicher's case, one in June and the second in August 2012. The witnesses included Mr. Ostreicher's wife, Miriam Ungar, his daughter, Chaya Weinberger, Steve Moore, a retired FBI agent who investigated Mr. Ostreicher's case on a pro bono basis, and Mr. Ostreicher's two Bolivian attorneys, Mr. Yimy Montaoño and Mr. Jerjes Justiniano–who are not only extraordinarily effective and competent defense lawyers, but brave as well.

The record—including their testimonies—established that Mr. Ostreicher is innocent, and is the victim of an elaborate, high-level government extortion ring that has fleeced approximately $27 million worth of assets from the rice operation that he had been managing.

It's time Jacob came home to his wife and family and friends. Basic justice and humanitarianism—Jacob is very ill—adds to the urgency that he be freed.

In one sense, a lot has happened since the hearing last August. Tragically, Mr. Ostreicher has developed the symptoms of Parkinson's Disease, likely due to the sustained, severe stress to which he has been subjected.

Immediately following meetings that I had with Bolivian officials in La Paz last June, including Carlos Romero, Minister of Government, Bolivia started to investigate whether Mr. Ostreicher was the victim of extortion. A total of 27 prosecutors, judges, and officials responsible for confiscated goods who were involved in Mr. Ostreicher's case have now had charges made against them. Currently, 13 of them are in the Palmasola prison, 9 are under house arrest, and 5 are fugitives.

One of those in prison, Fernando Rivera, is a Ministry of Government adviser who I personally witnessed threaten the judge presiding at one of Mr. Ostreicher's hearings in a Santa Cruz court room. Mr. Rivera recently apologized to Mr. Ostreicher during a bail hearing, claiming that he was only following orders from then-Minister of Government Sacha Llorenti. In one of the many bizarre twists to this story, Mr. Llorenti is now the Bolivian representative to the United Nations, living in New York, just a few miles from Mr. Ostreicher's home.

I traveled for a second time to Bolivia in early December, this time with Representative NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, to visit Mr. Ostreicher and again to press Bolivian officials to either produce the evidence that he has committed a crime or free him. High level officials assured us that Mr. Ostreicher's case would proceed fairly and expeditiously now that the extortion network was being exposed. Some officials even admitted to us privately that they believed Mr. Ostreicher is innocent.

Mr. Penn became involved in the case in October, and was instrumental in obtaining medical care for Mr. Ostreicher and for helping to secure his release from the Palmasola prison to house arrest on December 18th. With Mr. Penn's personal intervention with President Morales and with Mr. Penn in the court room, all of us hoped that Jacob would be at long last released and vindicated at a hearing in December. Inexplicably, that didn't happen.

The State Department references Mr. Ostreicher's case in its 2012 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for Bolivia, and notes the arrest of government officials and the stolen assets as part of its section on ''arbitrary arrest or detention.''

However, in another sense, the most important aspects of the case have not changed. Mr. Jacob Ostreicher is still in the custody of the Government of Bolivia. On June 4th, it will be two years since he was imprisoned. Bolivian officials are employing delay tactics and giving excuses for his continued detention that we have heard before. No evidence whatsoever has been presented to indicate that Mr. Ostreicher is guilty of any crime. And there is no sign of the $27 million in assets from his rice operation that were confiscated. Perhaps this last fact is the real reason why Mr. Ostreicher still is not home with his family in the United States.

Recently, there have been reports from credible sources that there is another ''security threat'' to Mr. Ostreicher's safety. These followed the sudden removal of Bolivian security officers from the parameter of Mr. Ostreicher's residence, the day after Mr. Rivera implicated the current Bolivian representative to the U.N. in the extortion case. As long as Mr. Ostreicher is forced to remain in Bolivia, the government is responsible for and must take all necessary measures to ensure his safety.

As a result of the continued injustice in Mr. Ostreicher's case, and also in response to the growing number of cases of Americans being detained abroad in violation of their human and due process rights, I together with Rep. VELÁZQUEZ have reintroduced the Justice for Imprisoned Americans Overseas Act, or ''Jacob's Law.'' H.R. 1778 would deny visas to foreign government officials responsible for violating the human or due process rights of an American in their custody. The travel ban would also apply to the officials' immediate family members.

It is wrong for our government to give foreign officials and their families the privilege—and it is a privilege, not a right—to visit and study in the U.S. while those same officials are wrongfully detaining an American abroad.

While this bill works its way through the legislative process, my committee will continue to pursue every means possible to secure Mr. Ostreicher's safe return to his wife, children and grandchildren. And that is why we are holding this hearing.

President Morales is flying to Atlanta today for a meeting with former-President Jimmy Carter to ask for his assistance in negotiating land access through Chile to the Pacific Ocean.

While the Bolivian media is reporting on these events, I hope that they will also note that I am sending the former president the transcripts of the hearings that this subcommittee has held on the case of Jacob Ostreicher. I contacted the Carter Center earlier today to ask the former President Carter to intervene personally in Mr. Ostreicher's case. I was advised that Jacob's case is on the agenda today and would be raised.

It was very much a privilege to have Mr. Penn with us this week, not only because of the fame that he has rightly garnered through his Academy Award-winning acting, and not only because of the highly commendable assistance he is bringing to the suffering people in Haiti through the relief organization that he founded, but also because of the extraordinary assistance that he has provided to Mr. Ostreicher, who he had never met and to whom he owed no obligation prior to being asked to assist with the case last fall. That assistance now includes joining us today to highlight Mr. Ostreicher's continued plight and to advocate for his freedom.

IN HONOR OF SHERRY POST

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Sherry Post of the 8th Congressional District of Pennsylvania is an outstanding and enterprising businesswoman who created a successful company that manufactures nutritional supplements in the Borough of Hatfield. The company, Simple Brandz, was recently certified as a veteran–owned business through the United States Veterans Administration, which will assist in its further growth by expanding business opportunities. She is an 8–year Army veteran, who is recognized as a dynamic entrepreneur and recently received the 2013 Women of Influence Community Achievement Award in the Greater Lehigh Valley. We commend her for outstanding achievement and also her goal of providing manufacturing jobs for other veterans in the region. We congratulate Sherry Post for setting an example of professional excellence and advocacy of women in business, as well as her commitment to the greater community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF REVEREND O.C. STIGGERS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the House's attention today to recognize Reverend O.C. Stiggers, who is retiring at the age of 85.

Pastor Stiggers was born in Chambers County, Alabama to the late John and Historia Williams Stiggers. Pastor Stiggers graduated from the Lanett School System. Afterwards, he attended the Columbus, Georgia branch of American Baptist Theological Seminary of Nashville, Tennessee. He also attended Moody's Bible College. He received his Doctorate of Divinity and his Doctorate of Laws.

Pastor Stiggers has served as the Executive Chair of the Western Union Missionary Baptist Association, as a member of the Board of Trustees of Mt. Calvary Baptist Association and a Dean of the Bryant Theological Seminary School in Hamilton, Georgia. Pastor Stiggers is also a former member of the Board of Trustees at Selma University in Selma, Alabama, and he is a former president of the Parent/Teachers Association.

Currently, Pastor Stiggers is a member of the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Lanett, Alabama. He also serves as Pastor of Ozias Ministry Baptist Church and Eastside Baptist Church.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join Reverend Stiggers' friends, family, and congregation in wishing him the best after his retirement.

RETIREMENT OF DEPUTY SERGEANT AT ARMS KERRI HANLEY

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the House of Representatives to pay tribute to Kerri Hanley, Deputy Sergeant at Arms, on the occasion of her retirement on June 30, 2013. Kerri Hanley has served the people's House with distinction since 1988, and her sound leadership, extensive institutional knowledge, and trusted guidance have been heavily relied upon by two Sergeants at Arms, House Leadership and Officers, and Members of Congress alike.

Kerri Hanley—a native of America's heartland, Mitchell, South Dakota—began her 25 years of service to the House of Representatives in 1988 with the Republican Leader of the House, Robert H. Michel of Illinois. She left the House briefly in 1989, to serve as Confidential Assistant to the Administrator, United States General Services Administration. However, she soon returned to the Office of the Republican Leader in August 1989, to serve as Deputy Press Secretary. In 1994, Leader Michel promoted her to Press Secretary and she remained in that position until he retired from the House of Representatives in January 1995. Hanley then joined the staff of incoming Sergeant at Arms Wilson Livingood as Executive Assistant. In January 2001, she was appointed Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States House of Representatives. As Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Hanley serves as chief of staff and together with the Sergeant at Arms she is responsible for the overall planning, organization, and implementation of all of the office's activities.

Kerri's commitment to this institution is second to none, clearly demonstrated by the variety of highly trusted positions she has held while serving the House of Representatives. Her keen insight and a practical, hands-on approach to problem solving, are the hallmarks of a consummate professional. Her natural sense of calm and whenever needed, a dose of good humor in stressful situations, have helped her to provide effective leadership and guidance during some of the most challenging times in this institution's history—in particular, 9/11 and the anthrax incident. Her tireless work over the years has helped shape the Office of the Sergeant at Arms into one of the most respected support organizations in Congress. She has much to be proud of as she reflects on her long and distinguished career, during which she has earned the respect and admiration of her peers.

I know her husband Jon—a long-time Capitol Guide Service employee who recently retired—and their two children, Christopher and Keli, are very proud of all of her accomplishments. While we are certainly sorry to see Kerri go, I am hopeful she will now be able to devote far more time to all of them in the months and years to come.

Please join me in commending the outstanding service of Kerri Hanley to the Congress of the United States and congratulating her on her retirement. On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives we wish you well in all your future endeavors.

TAIWAN–PHILIPPINES FISHERY DISPUTE

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 9, 2013, a Taiwanese fishing vessel, the Guang Da Xing No. 28, was fired upon by a Philippine government vessel in waters 164 nautical miles southeast of Eluanbi, the southernmost part of Taiwan in waters considered by both Taiwan and the Philippines to be within Taiwan's 200 nautical-mile-from-shore Exclusive Economic Zone.

The Taiwanese fishing boat was severely damaged and suffered engine failure, causing it to float adrift. Crew member Hong Shicheng, a Taiwanese national, was shot and killed. The Philippine government vessel sailed away without offering any assistance.

A government vessel's shooting of an unarmed fishing boat is an act of violence, and is in violation of international law. Therefore, we call upon the Philippines to promptly and sincerely respond to the requests of the Taiwan government to apologize, punish the perpetrators, and provide proper compensation to the victim's family based on humanitarian grounds.

It is imperative that these two close and longstanding allies of the United States work together for an immediate and peaceful resolution of this incident. The circumstances that have given rise to such an incident must be addressed so as to guarantee as much as possible that such an incident will never happen again. Ultimately, this means the negotiation of an agreement or treaty on marine fishing between Manila and Taipei.

During this difficult time, we express our condolences to the family and friends of Mr. Hong.

REMEMBERING COMMANDER ROBERT EDWARD MAY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Commander Robert Edward May. Commander May passed away late last year at the age of 88. He served in the United States Navy for over 25 years and worked for another 25 years as an engineer in process control in Honeywell, part of Phoenix, Arizona.

Mr. May had various interests from a young age. At 15, he was Rochester's 1939 Soap Box Derby Champ and flew his first solo airplane at the age of 16. At 20, he graduated from the US Naval Academy in three years, and his first orders were to be stationed on the Flagship USSN Nashville in the Pacific, surviving the largest naval battle in history. He witnessed a Kamikaze strike killing hundreds and injuring many more on Nashville's command center.

After returning to the US for repairs on the Nashville, Mr. May married his sweetheart Ruth Schilitzer. Together, they had 10 children. During that time, he sailed as Lieutenant and Lieutenant Commander aboard vessels in Key West. He then attended the Naval Postgraduate School before earning a Master's in Science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, writing a then classified dissertation on fire control for torpedoes in conjunction with the latest sonar.

After finishing his post-doctorate work, Mr. May was assigned to one of the largest and most successful projects ever completed, the Polaris Project. The Polaris nuclear missile placed on submarines was the first submerged launch missile to use thrust vectoring and onboard telemetry to guide the missile, changing the course of warfare. Mr. May also aided in the development of the TALOS missile system, and worked in the submarine Anti-Submarine Warfare.

After retiring from the Navy, Mr. May continued to do work for SAC and NELC through data control at Honeywell. While raising his 10 children, he was active in his community, as an organizer and volunteer at church, scouts, little league, and blood drives.

Mr. May's successes in the United States Navy and local communities across the country have strengthened our nation's Defense program. His dedication and passion to serve our country well will certainly be missed. I would like to extend my sincerest condolences to Commander May's family and friends as he will be laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia on April 23, 2013.

Family members include: Bill & Marsha May, John Fredrick May, Joanne Mell, Ruth & Schuyler Hoffman IV, Martin Hoffman, Schuyler Hoffman V, Eileen May, Cynthia & Karl Ponath, Quentin Ponath, Jim & Sugene (McClain) May, James May, Collin May, Ashton May, Don & Connie May, Harrison May, Kenny May, John & Chris Ann (Hardin) May, Caroline May, Daniel May, Ray & Delores Schlitzer, Pete Schlitzer, Marta Schlitzer, Tom Schlitzer, Mary Ann (Schlitzer) & Tom Maszerowski, Walter May, Christopher and Cynthia May, Bill and Gail Schults.

PASTOR VANDY S. POPE—50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pastor Vandy S. Pope, on the 50th anniversary of his calling to serve his community through the word of God.

While he currently serves as pastor of New Life Apostolic Church in Cartersville, Georgia, Pastor Pope's vocation has taken him across the globe. Since he graduated Bible College in 1966, his sermons have been heard in 17 different countries, and the 3 States where he served as Pastor. In Georgia alone, Pastor Pope has served three separate communities, and touched countless lives.

1 Peter 4:10 says, ''Each of you should use whatever gift you have received to serve others, as faithful stewards of God's grace in its various forms.''

All too often, we forget that our religious leaders take on roles that extend so much farther than that of a pastor. These chosen few work long hours, undertaking duties of educators, social workers, charity organizers, and counselors. Moreover, they are often by the

side of families and friends, as they face the challenge of laying a loved one to rest.

Mr. Speaker, it is with this in mind that I extend my most heartfelt thanks to Pastor Pope for accepting God's call to this challenging, yet critical profession for the future of our great Nation. On behalf of Georgia's 11th District, I congratulate him as he marks this most impressive achievement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall 179 on final passage of H.R. 3, the Northern Route Approval Act, my vote was incorrectly recorded as "yes." I intended to vote "no."

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF FONTANA, CALIFORNIA

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today to the City of Fontana, California, as their community celebrates 100 years of settlement.

Fontana has a rich history of hard work and ingenuity. From its humble roots as a rural community and agricultural town of citrus orchards, vineyards and chicken ranches astride historic Route 66, the city is now home to over 200,000 residents.

Since its incorporation in June of 1952, Fontana has grown to become a regional hub of the trucking industry, with Interstate 10 and State Route 210 transecting the city from east to west and Interstate 15 passing diagonally through its northwestern quadrant. Due to its prime location, the City is also home to a number of product distribution centers for large companies, including Target and Sears. Fontana is also the home of the Auto Club Speedway, which has hosted national racing events since 1997. The Speedway is the home of the Auto Club 400 race in the NASCAR Spring Cup Series, the NASCAR Nationwide Series Royal Purple 300, the IZOD Indy Car Series race, and numerous other local events. Fontana is also home to numerous industrial sales centers and commercial strip zoning such as "The Miracle Mile" and the Fontana Auto Center.

With a city theme of "open for business" and dedication to a "Healthy Fontana" lifestyle, the citizens of Fontana continually demonstrate their enthusiasm for their City by actively participating in local government and future city planning. It is indeed my pleasure to represent the residents of this beautiful city, who have contributed much of their time towards the betterment of their community.

Mr. Speaker, on this very special year for the City of Fontana, please join me in commemorating their one hundredth anniversary.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR UNVEILING OF STATUE OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support S. Con. Res. 16, legislation authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for the unveiling of a statue of Frederick Douglass.

Frederick Douglass was an historic figure, whose work and legacy continues to improve lives and help us form a more perfect union.

The battle he valiantly led in the 19th century for equal rights and dignity has yielded great results and his sage advice to agitate at every turn continues to inspire men and women into action.

With each passing generation the march toward freedom and equal opportunity is moving closer to full realization thanks in part to the actions of Frederick Douglass.

I have had the pleasure of meeting Nettie Washington Douglass, the great, great granddaughter of Frederick Douglass, who chairs the Frederick Douglass Foundation, and continues the difficult work he started.

I proudly joined with her in urging President Obama to issue posthumously the Presidential Medal of Freedom and I am proud to support this resolution to properly recognize this great man and all that he has given to our country.

HONORING JOHN C. TOY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Kentucky native John C. Toy, a true American patriot.

John C. Toy was born on August 14, 1918, in Montgomery County, Kentucky to Ella Lee and Edward Joseph Toy. Mr. Toy joined the Army in June, 1941, and was stationed at Schofield, Honolulu, Hawaii, in the anti-aircraft division. While there, he survived the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. He served in the Army until 1945 when he was Honorably Discharged with the rank of Staff Sergeant.

Since his military service to this country, Mr. Toy has remained active in his community by teaching Sunday school at the First Church of God in Mt. Sterling, serving on the Board at Mt. Sterling Swimming Pool and Park, as a Member and Past Commander American Legion Post 22, and as current President of the Kentucky Pearl Harbor Association.

Mr. Toy is married to Gerturde Fletcher of Bourbon County, and has been blessed with two daughters, Pam Ishmael and Sandy McDonald, as well as three grandchildren and four great grandchildren.

As a U.S. Congressman, I am forever grateful for John C. Toy's service to our country. Because of his bravery and that of his fellow men and women in uniform, our American freedoms are protected for future generations. Truly, he is a hero to us all.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF TIM CAUSEY AND THE CAUSEY FAMILY

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I recognize the Causey Family today, as they have lost a husband, father, son, and friend. Deputy Sheriff Tim Causey passed away on Sunday from complications he suffered from bravely fighting the devastating fire in Windsor Green this past March.

Beloved by family, friends, and co-workers, Mr. Causey served Horry County with a fervor and commitment that residents can only hope to find in a first responder. As we look back on his 25 years of service, his bravery and selflessness in times of crisis will not be forgotten.

On behalf of Horry County and the Seventh Congressional District of South Carolina, I ask that we remember today Deputy Sheriff Tim Causey for his service and ultimate sacrifice. Wrenzie and I hope that they may find peace in a time of sorrow, clarity in a time of distress, and strength through the support of family and friends.

CUMBERLAND CID 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Cumberland Community Improvement District (CID), which is celebrating 25 years of fostering economic growth in Cobb County, Georgia.

First known as "Cobb County CID," Cumberland CID was launched in 1988 as the first program of its kind in the State of Georgia. Since then, the Cumberland economy has grown into one of the largest economic engines in the state, attracting companies like The Home Depot, GE Energy, Travelport, and many more. Because of their efforts, the Cumberland market now totals an estimated five percent of Georgia's overall economy, and has brought tens of thousands of jobs to Cobb County.

Not only has the Cumberland CID been critical to economic growth, but it represents hundreds of millions of dollars in state infrastructure project investments. Over the next 30 years, Cumberland CID will underscore their commitment to Georgia's economic future by investing $133 million in community improvement projects.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my thanks to the hard-working people who make up the Cumberland CID, and who have played such an important leadership role in making Cobb County's economy flourish. On behalf of Georgia's 11th district, congratulations to Cumberland CID on 25 years of success, and here's to 25 more.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Older Americans Month.

Every year since 1963, May has been a month to honor older Americans and highlight the value that senior citizens contribute to our communities.

The theme for Older Americans Month 2013 is "Older Americans: Connecting the Community." Older Americans are more active in community life than ever before and continue to make a significant impact across the region. Our seniors are mentoring the leaders of tomorrow, taking to heart the need for intergenerational learning to guide and inspire young minds.

In my Congressional District, we are lucky to have many older Americans embracing their role in building connections for the community. I want to recognize individuals who were recently honored by the Cayuga County Legislature as Senior Citizens of the Year: Trudy Buxenbaum of Aurora, Joni Lincoln and Anita Messina of Port Byron, and Betty Miller of Auburn.

I appreciate this opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of older Americans in New York's 24th District and applaud the Cayuga County Office for the Aging for its efforts to enhance the quality of life for seniors and encourage them to share their lifetime of experience with those around them.

COMMEMORATING THE FIVE YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT OF THE IRANIAN BAHA'I LEADERSHIP

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Iranian Baha'i community, Iran's largest minority religion, and in commemoration of the five year anniversary of the unlawful imprisonment of its leadership, known as the Yaran-i-Iran, or "friends of Iran."

In 2008 the Iranian regime arrested seven members of the Yaran-i-Iran on several trumped up charges including espionage, propaganda activities against the Islamic order, the establishment of an illegal administration, cooperating with Israel, sending secret documents outside the country, acting against the security of the country, and "corruption on earth." Fariba Kamalabadi, Jamaloddin Khanjani, Afif Naeimi, Saeid Rezaie, Mahvash Sabet, Behrouz Tavakkoli, and Vahid Tizfahm were "tried" in a series of closed-door sessions from January to August 2010, during which they were denied meaningful access to their lawyers.

Shirin Ebadi, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and a member of the group's legal team, has said that there is no evidence against them to sustain the charges. Nonetheless, all seven were sentenced to 20 years in prison—the longest of all prisoners of conscience in Iran. The conditions within the prison where they are being held are appalling. Their unfortunate circumstance reminds us of the intolerant character and brutality of the current Iranian regime, not only towards the Baha'i, but also the Iranian population as a whole.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my support for the Baha'i community in calling for the immediate release of the Yaran-i-Iran members, as well as the release of all Iranian prisoners of conscience. I will continue to monitor this situation and hold Iran accountable for its abuse of its citizens.

HONORING MR. DANIEL SISTO

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and members of the New York delegation, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MALONEY, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, I would like to recognize Daniel Sisto of The Healthcare Association of New York State (HANYS) for his many years of outstanding service to the cause of advancing health care delivery and improving the health of all New Yorkers.

Mr. Sisto is one of the nation's leading experts on health care public policy. Over the course of his nearly three decades as President of HANYS he has worked tirelessly to advance positive change in health care and achieve fairness and balance in resolving essential health policy issues. Because of his leadership, Mr. Sisto has helped establish HANYS as a valued, trusted voice on health policy matters in Washington, D.C., and in New York State.

Mr. Sisto has never been satisfied with the status quo. Recognizing the need to improve the health care delivery system to ensure efficient, high–quality care for all New Yorkers, he embraced patient–centered delivery system reform, worked to expand coverage, and has positioned HANYS as a leader in guiding quality improvement initiatives at hospitals and health systems across the state.

Under Mr. Sisto's guidance, HANYS has worked with hospitals, nursing homes, and other health care provider organizations in collaboratives, including the New York State Partnership for Patients, sharing best practices and facilitating the widespread adoption of proven clinical protocols to improve care delivery for all New Yorkers.

Mr. Sisto began his career in health care advocacy on Long Island, New York, as the Executive Vice President of the Nassau–Suffolk Hospital Council and former Deputy Director of the Nassau–Suffolk Health Systems Agency. Mr. Sisto holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Management and a Master of Business Administration degree in Marketing from St. John's University.

During his nearly three decades of distinguished work in health care, Mr. Sisto has repeatedly proven himself to be one of New York State's most respected advocates and health care leaders and we, as New York's Delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives, wish him health and happiness in his retirement.

HONORING CHRISTIAN THORNTON BRYAN

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Christian Thornton Bryan, who graduated from Lehigh University in Bethlehem, PA on May 20, 2013.

Christian graduated with a degree in International Relations. He also participated in the ROTC program where he was selected to join the Lehigh Valley Steel Battalion. As a member of this Battalion, he competed in the 2nd Army ROTC Brigade's Ranger Challenge Competition and helped his team place third. He will now serve as an Infantry Officer in the United States Army and is assigned to Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington as an Infantry Platoon Leader.

Christian follows in the footsteps of his father, who serves as a Major in the U.S. Army Infantry. I am proud of this young man's decision to serve his country, and I know he will go above and beyond to uphold this duty.

I wish him the best of luck in the Army and in all his future endeavors. Mr. Speaker, I ask those present today to join me in honoring Christian Thornton Bryan.

RECOGNIZING SUPPORT OUR SOLDIERS FOR ITS UNWAVERING DEDICATION TO OUR TROOPS

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work and admirable service of a very special military support nonprofit in Texas—Support our Soldiers (SOS).

Led by Teresa Nelson, whose father served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division, SOS was founded to care for our troops at home and abroad with support they might otherwise not receive. SOS volunteers often create custom boxes to meet the unique needs of troops. Just this week, a Marine unit serving overseas received a shipment of pillows after SOS learned they had none. Since its establishment in June 2011, over 17,000 pounds of food and supplies have been sent overseas to benefit more than 500 soldiers.

Texans are always looking for ways to give back to the men and women of the United States armed forces, and SOS provides a wide range of opportunities for its surrounding communities to serve those who wear the uniform. Teresa and her team host monthly meetings with sell-out crowds and organize community events across 6 cities in Tarrant and Johnson County to raise awareness, funds, and support for our troops. Beyond collecting and distributing material goods, SOS also works with ROTC programs and students to teach them the importance of patriotism.

It's people like Teresa Nelson and organizations like Support our Soldiers who embody the American spirit of gratitude and generosity. Our nation is free today because of the selfless sacrifices of thousands of brave men and women who have answered the call of duty. We owe these troops and their families abundant support, whether it's food, shelter, clothing, or comfort. I commend SOS for their commitment to providing this much-needed support, and I am proud to know the wonderful leaders and volunteers of this great organization.

God bless our troops and God bless America.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JILLIAN DAGON ANDOLINA

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of a truly courageous young woman, Jillian Dagon Andolina. Jill, 26, passed away on May 11, 2013 after a two-and-a-half-year battle with leukemia. She always carried a bright smile with her and was an inspiration for her parents, Dr. Richard and Molly Andolina, and for all those in our community who had the fortune of meeting her.

A resident of Arkport, New York, Jill graduated from Arkport Central School in 2005. She received an associate's degree from SUNY Alfred before continuing on to SUNY Geneseo where she earned a bachelor's degree in psychology in 2009. The diagnosis of leukemia interrupted her plan to acquire a master's degree in November of 2010.

Despite this setback, Jill persevered through chemotherapy and bone marrow transplants to remain an active member of the community. She was a member of the Hornell Association and the Arkport American Legion Post 1248 Auxiliary. The Hornell Humane Society and Relay for Life were also graced with her time and efforts.

Jill Andolina will be missed by all, but her legacy will continue to inspire. She touched the lives of hundreds of people and her spirit and determination motivate each and every one of us every day.

TRIBUTE TO PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a hospital system that has served as a beacon for 75 years in Columbia, South Carolina. Providence Hospital in the Palmetto State's capital city has provided extraordinary care and healing for three quarters of a century, earning it the appreciation and admiration of a grateful community.

Providence Hospital was founded in 1938 as an act of faith and charity. The vision behind the hospital came from Father Martin C. Murphy of St. Peter's Church, who wanted to bring the quality care that Catholic hospitals provide to the Columbia area. With a generous donation from local businessman James B. Younginer, he was able to put a downpayment on an 18-acre tract of land. The final piece of the puzzle fell into place when the Sisters of Charity of St. Augustine in Ohio mortgaged their motherhouse in Cleveland in order to finance the new hospital. This was extraordinary considering the sisters had never been to Columbia.

Today Providence Hospital operates under the auspices of the Sisters of Charity Health System. Over the last 75 years, the non-profit organization has grown to provide 304 beds in four hospitals: Providence Hospital, Providence Heart & Vascular Institute, Providence Hospital Northeast and Providence Orthopaedic & Neuro Spine Institute. Providence Hospital is a faith-based health care facility that employs more than 1,900 caring individuals.

Providence Hospital is renowned as South Carolina's ''heart hospital.'' Since 1974, Providence Heart & Vascular Institute physicians and staff have performed more cardiovascular procedures than any medical team in the state. It is recognized statewide as a referral center for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of cardiovascular disease.

In 1985, Providence Hospital added a helicopter service to help bring critically ill patients to the facility to be treated. Today LifeNet South Carolina is a 24 hour a day airborne intensive care unit serving Providence and other facilities in the Carolinas and Georgia.

In 1999, Providence Hospital established a 46-bed community hospital in the Northeast area of Columbia. This facility offers a range of medical services in surgery, emergency care, women's and children's services and rehabilitation. Also located on this campus is the Providence Orthopaedic & Neuro Spine Institute, which offers an integrated continuum of care for orthopaedic and neurosurgical patients throughout the region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in congratulating Providence Hospital for its 75 years of compassionate health care. As the facility continues to grow and expand, I commend Providence for its commitment to improving the delivery of quality health care to the people of South Carolina and maintaining its focus on faith. Providence Hospital has become synonymous with exceptional patient care and embodying the values of respect, compassion, collaboration, courage and justice. I look forward to its continued service to the community and the Creator.

5-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF PARKERSBURG TORNADO

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, May 25th, 2008, a devastating tornado ripped through northeastern Iowa. This was the strongest to hit Iowa in 32 years and the most powerful tornado in the United States that year, leaving a path of devastation throughout Iowa's First District. Five communities—Dunkerton, Hazelton, New Hartford, Lamont, and Parkersburg, Iowa—suffered massive damage. Eight people lost their lives, 50 businesses were destroyed, and thousands of homes were severely damaged.

Five years later, the memory of the tornado is still fresh in the minds of many Iowans. But tremendous progress has been made since then. Parkersburg is a model for recovery after a natural disaster. Through community service the town has rebuilt and come together to improve the lives of its citizens and its community.

I also want to acknowledge the tragic events in Oklahoma. The people of Iowa stand in solidarity with those affected by the devastation caused by the tornado. Our hearts and prayers go out to them. We take solace in knowing that if communities like Parkersburg can rebuild after such tragedy, then there is hope for the people of Oklahoma.

These communities have shown incredible strength and resolve in the face of such a terrible catastrophe. As we look to the future, we must never forget the service and sacrifice made by those who have rebuilt and revitalized Parkersburg.

HONORING OUR TROOPS AND VETERANS ON MEMORIAL DAY

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, with Memorial Day just around the corner, I rise to honor the memory of our brave men and women in uniform who have sacrificed their lives for our country in what Abraham Lincoln called ''the last full measure of devotion.''

At this weekend's parades, festivals, and barbeques, let's all pause for a moment to recognize the sacrifices of those who put themselves in harm's way so we don't have to.

Let's continue to support our troops on the battlefield, and let's make sure to support our veterans and their families when they return home. That means ensuring quality health care for the 61,000 veterans in New Mexico's First Congressional District, ending the unconscionable backlog of disability claims at the VA, and providing our veterans with good-paying jobs.

Our national heroes deserve nothing less.

HONORING ANDREW REID BRYAN

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Andrew Reid Bryan, who will be graduating from Patriot High School in Nokesville, VA on June 13, 2013.

Andrew is a member of the National Honor Society and Future Business Leaders of America, a two-time Varsity Boy's Lacrosse team captain, and has earned All District Athletic Honors as well as All District Academic Honors. Andrew also made the academic honor roll for both his junior and senior years. He plans to continue his education at Stevenson University in Baltimore, Maryland, where

he will study Business Administration and play for the Men's Lacrosse team.

Andrew's achievements set a wonderful example for his peers around him, and I am confident he will have continued success. I wish him the best of luck in all his endeavors, both on and off the field. Mr. Speaker, I ask those present today to join me in honoring Andrew Reid Bryan.

PEACE FOR THAILAND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at 1.8 million people, Thailand is home to the third largest ethnic Malay population in the world. Since 2004, extremists in the country have been fighting the government for an independent state for the ethnic group. This has been one of the bloodiest conflicts in Southeast Asia and has left nearly 5,000 people dead.

According to the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, in the past four years alone, more than 1,400 people have died and 3,200 have been wounded. The violence has killed indiscriminately. Fatalities have included soldiers, policemen, village leaders, monks, teachers, and innocent civilians. While most of those killed were the victims of shootings, there have also been nearly 600 improvised explosive device attacks and 40 beheadings since January 2009.

Thankfully, it is possible this cycle of violence could be coming to an end.

With the help of Malaysian mediators, the chairman of the Thai National Security Council and a representative of one of the Malay separatist groups active in the region, Barisan Revolusi Nasional (BRN), signed an agreement in February to formally begin peace talks. Reports indicate former Thai Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra's started talks behind the scenes years ago that helped lead to this milestone agreement. He should be commended for those efforts.

Public peace talks between the government and the rebels will be a big step forward in solving the conflict in southern Thailand. While previous attempts have been made, this marks the first time that both sides have agreed in writing to hold talks.

Mr. Speaker, the progress that is slowly being achieved in southern Thailand is significant, and we should hope that it continues until there is lasting peace throughout the country. And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE ROTARY CLUB OF NORTH CHICAGO AND THEIR 2013 HUMANITARIAN PATRIOT HONOREES

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the outstanding community service of the Rotary Club of North Chicago and to recognize this year's recipients of their Humanitarian Patriot Award.

Each year the Rotary Club in North Chicago, home of Naval Station Great Lakes, recognizes their Humanitarian Patriot honorees for their service to veterans. This year's recipients have all demonstrated an incredible sense of commitment to the men and women of our armed forces. They understand that veterans have sacrificed greatly for this country and deserve nothing but our highest gratitude and respect.

The Rotary Club was founded on the principle of service, and the Humanitarian Patriot Award is an inspiring extension of that original mission.

It is entirely fitting that this year's ceremony will be held at the Lovell Federal Health Care Center—an institution dedicated to caring for the brave members of our armed forces, veterans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate this year's recipients: Alan Belcher; Ken Duffy; Patricia Jones; Alain H. Oller, Donna E. King; Tom Marks; John Mroczka; the Navy League of the United States, Lake County Council; Paula Caraballido; William R. Beiersdorf; Gregory Padovani; Eli Williamson; Thomas Zengeler; and Jim Dolan.

But much more than that, I thank them for the incredible work they have done. Their service strengthens our communities, and I am grateful for the work of the Rotary Club of North Chicago and all of this year's honorees.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF ARLENE BILLAK

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the extraordinary life of my friend and supporter Arlene Billak who sadly passed away on April 21, 2013. Arlene was born January 13, 1949, in Sharon, Pennsylvania to her loving parents Stan and Marie Izenas. Arlene was a graduate of Sharon High School and retired from State Farm Insurance as an office manager.

Arlene was a devoted wife and mother who provided constant love and support and was always willing to sacrifice her all for her family. Arlene was a woman of strength and humility who never refused to give up after being diagnosed with cancer. She courageously fought until her final days, always making sure that she had a smile on her face. Her loving heart and spirit will continue to be felt everyday by those who loved her and those she loved.

I would like to extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathies to Arlene Billak's family: her husband Rick, her son Damian, her two brothers Paul and Bob Izenas, and her two sisters Kathy and Irene. Rest assured the love and devotion she had for her family and friends will never be forgotten.

I have known Arlene and Rick for many years. They have been active in politics for decades. They were always there to support and push their candidates and those issues that improve the quality of life for those who have the least. Arlene believed that politics could make a positive difference in people's lives, and she showed us all how one person can make a difference. I will always remember the example she set and how she constantly shared her upbeat and positive demeanor with the world. Our community, and all that knew her, are better because we crossed paths with Arlene Billak.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM BRIDENSTINE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of Representatives that on May 21, 2013, I was unable to participate in three recorded votes due to my participation, along with the entire Oklahoma delegation, in a tour of tornado affected areas in and around Moore, Oklahoma.

I wish to submit for the record a summary of these bills, as well as statement on how I would have voted on each had I been present. I would also like to note that these are the only votes I have missed so far as a Member of Congress.

H.R. 1412, the Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2013, passed the House by a vote of 416–0. Had I been present, I would have voted for H.R. 1412. The bill incentivizes private sector companies to participate in Veterans Administration (VA) on-the-job-training (OJT) training programs by reducing the level of employer contributions. It also requires the VA to enter into OJT agreements with other federal departments and agencies, which will encourage the federal government to hire veterans by fully leveraging available authorities. Finally, H.R. 1412 offsets any additional costs by extending for one month the VA's authority to pay reduced pensions to veterans using Medicaid-approved nursing facilities. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), H.R. 1412 would reduce direct spending about $14 million from FY14–FY18 and produce an "insignificant effect on discretionary spending."

H.R. 1344, the Helping Heroes Fly Act, passed the House by a vote of 413–0. Had I been present, I would have voted for this bill. H.R. 1344 directs the Department of Defense to develop processes to expedite airport screening for severely injured and disabled service members and veterans.

H.R. 324, to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II, passed the House by a vote of 415–0. I co-sponsored this bill and I would have voted for it had I been present. The bill authorizes two Congressional Gold Medals for the First Special Service Force, a joint Canadian-U.S. special operations unit that served with distinction during WWII. The First Special Service Force was the precursor unit for both the U.S. and Canadian Special Operations forces.

IN RECOGNITION OF EXERCISE IS MEDICINE MONTH

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as Exercise is Medicine Month.

Physical inactivity is a fast-growing public health problem and contributes to a variety of chronic diseases and health complications, including obesity, diabetes, hypertension, cancer, depression and anxiety, arthritis, and osteoporosis. The Exercise is Medicine program seeks to reverse that trend. In addition to improving a patient's overall health, increasing physical activity has been shown to be effective in the treatment and prevention of chronic diseases. Beyond the benefits to individual health and quality of life, increased levels of physical activity are associated with lower health care costs, reduced environmental impact and other co-benefits.

Exercise is Medicine is an initiative focused on encouraging primary care physicians and other health care providers to include exercise when designing treatment plans for patients. Exercise is Medicine is committed to the belief that exercise and physical activity are integral to the prevention and treatment of chronic disease and should be regularly assessed as part of medical care. The U.S. Federal Physical Guidelines and many studies show that 150 minutes per week of moderate-intensity physical activity is required to achieve these health benefits.

During May, communities throughout the U.S. will hold activities that recognize physical activity and exercise—shown to help prevent and treat more than 40 chronic diseases—should be part of everyone's health care plan. Since 2010, Exercise is Medicine Month has been proclaimed by mayors, governors, Congress and the President. Individuals and organizations of all kinds, from youth groups to universities, churches, fitness centers, corporations and hospitals, hold events aimed at keeping people active and healthy.

I urge all Americans to recognize Exercise is Medicine month this May to build, support and advocate for physical activity as essential for global health and wellbeing by committing to action.

REMEMBERING ONE YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE SARTELL VERSO MILL FIRE

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of the upcoming one-year anniversary of the tragic Memorial Day explosion and fire at the Verso Paper Mill in Sartell, Minnesota. Jon Maus, a father of four from Albany, Minnesota was tragically killed during the accident. This mill has been a fixture in the community for nearly a century, and its destruction and ultimate closure were devastating for hundreds of employees and their families.

One year later, the community is still working to recover from this setback. While many of the former workers have found jobs elsewhere or have gone back to school, quite a few are still searching for full-time employment. Our heart breaks for their struggle. But remember that when times are tough, Minnesotans band together. It is because of the love, support and friendship within the Sartell community that I know that they will overcome this tragedy.

The Maus Family and all those affected by the explosion and fire remain in my prayers. My staff and I will continue to work with local leaders and community members to make sure that they receive the support they need to get back to work.

NORTH KANSAS CITY SCHOOLS CENTENNIAL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating North Kansas City Schools for celebrating 100 years of providing exceptional education to our youth.

The North Kansas City School District 74 was founded on March 14, 1913. During the district's inaugural year, it employed a principal, an assistant, and taught 32 students in grades one through nine. By 1917, the school district was home to grades 1–12. As enrollment increased, the district voted to build a high school building that was dedicated on January 24, 1926.

After World War II, the district passed bond issues for long-range building programs. The enrollment swelled to 17,273 in 1963 due to the arrival of the baby boomers. Currently, the North Kansas City School District is home to 21 elementary schools, 5 middle schools, and 4 high schools. The newest of these is Staley High School, which was added in 2008.

North Kansas City Schools is a state and nationally accredited school district, and they are known for innovation and excellence. For example, they were the first local school district to provide laptops to their students and offer Apple technology-powered classrooms. They offer outstanding educational programs that no other area school district provides, including the International Baccalaureate Diploma.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in applauding North Kansas City Schools for celebrating their 100th anniversary of providing extraordinary educational experiences to students in Clay County, Missouri. North Kansas City Schools is a true community partner, and I wish them 100 more years of greatness to come.

RECOGNIZING THE NORTH SYRACUSE FIRE DEPARTMENT'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my congratulations to the North Syracuse Fire Department on the occasion of its Centennial Celebration. I am honored to join the community in celebrating the Department on this historic occasion.

The North Syracuse Fire Department has changed significantly over the past 100 years. From having just two hand drawn chemical carts, to now operating with over a dozen fire and rescue vehicles, the North Syracuse Fire Department has been able to adapt to the changing times. The North Syracuse Fire Department Operates out of two stations: Station 1, located at 109 Chestnut Street, and Station 2, located at 70 General Irwin Boulevard, both in North Syracuse, New York.

In 1913, a group of citizens living in the village of North Syracuse presented a petition to the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, asking that a fire district be established in North Syracuse. As a result, the North Syracuse Fire Department was founded and began its extraordinary service to the residents of North Syracuse. In 1950, the department moved to its new quarters in the old trolley station at the corner of South Bay Road and Church Street. In 1983, a new building was built on Chestnut Street. This was the first building in fire department history built solely for fire department use.

Despite the dramatic changes that have taken place over the past 100 years, a few things remain the same. The North Syracuse Fire Department continues its mission of Fire Prevention and Education, Fire Suppression, and the prevention of the loss of life. This mission continues that the department shall assist in any disaster, emergency, or occasion for which it is properly equipped. The Fire Department continues to be a central part of life for residents. Furthermore, for 100 years North Syracuse's finest have dedicated themselves to protecting their fellow citizens and making the community a safer place to live.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful for the extraordinary service that the volunteers of the North Syracuse Fire Department have provided to residents of our community over the past century, and I ask this Honorable Body to join me in congratulating the members and supporters of the North Syracuse Fire Department and wishing them good luck in the next 100 years.

HONORING OFFICERS OF THE ST. PETERSBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THE U.S. MARSHAL'S SERVICE FOR RECEIVING THE CONGRESSIONAL BADGE OF BRAVERY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Jeffrey Yaslowitz, Sergeant Thomas Baitinger, Sergeant Karl Lounge, Officer Timothy McClintick, Officer Max McDonald, and Officer Douglas Weaver of the St. Petersburg Police Department and U.S. Deputy Marshal Scott Ley for being awarded the Congressional Badge of Bravery.

The Congressional Badge of Bravery was established to honor exceptional acts of bravery in the line of duty by federal, state, and local law enforcement officers. In award year 2012, only 16 Badges of Bravery were awarded.

On January 24, 2011, Officer Yaslowitz, Officer McClintick, and Marshal Ley attempted to apprehend a violent fugitive in St. Petersburg, Florida.

Officer Yaslowitz and Marshal Ley courageously engaged the suspect, who was hiding in an attic. While attempting to handcuff the suspect, Officer Yaslowitz was shot and killed. Marshal Ley was also shot and severely

wounded. Officer McClintick was able to pull Marshal Ley from the kill zone while coming under fire himself.

Immediately, a Rapid Response Team comprised of Sergeant Baitinger, Sergeant Lounge, Officer MacDonald, and Officer Weaver was formed. Sergeant Baitinger, a Rapid Response Instructor, volunteered to lead the team into the house to rescue of his fellow officers and was fatally wounded.

Officer Weaver dropped his weapon and attempted to recover the body of Officer Yaslowitz, but was driven back by the gunfire and was wounded himself. He then helped Officer MacDonald move Officer McClintick and Marshal Ley to safety. Officer Weaver was then able to move Sergeant Baitinger's body out of the house along with Sergeant Lounge and Officer MacDonald.

On that January evening, it pained me to take to the House floor to inform my colleagues of the tragedy that had occurred. As I stated that day, "This is a sober reminder that the men and women who serve us as law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every day. It is also a good time to say thank you for all those who serve us in uniform at home or abroad."

Sergeant Baitinger and Officer Yaslowitz made the ultimate sacrifice while serving their community and now have their names inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, D.C. Marshal Ley, Sergeant Lounge, Officer MacDonald, Officer Weaver, and Officer McClintick all showed tremendous bravery in the line of fire. Because of their selfless actions, these law enforcement officers earned the Congressional Badge of Bravery.

IN HONOR AND MEMORIAM OF STANLEY WILSON, A COURAGEOUS DALLAS FIREFIGHTER

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of fallen Dallas firefighter Stanley Allen Wilson.

Stanley worked selflessly alongside his fellow firefighters and was an exemplary example of steadfast commitment to bettering, protecting and saving lives. When others run away, the brave men and women who serve as our first responders rush in. Stanley Wilson was no different. Responding to a massive six alarm fire, he answered the call of duty and made the ultimate sacrifice to keep our community safe.

Stanley, a lifelong native of Dallas, Texas, was a 1979 graduate of Lake Highlands High School and attended the University of Texas. As a 28-year veteran of the Dallas Fire Department, Stanley served proudly at Dallas Fire Station #53 in Lakewood.

Stanley's life reflected his love for family and community. He was a devout Christian, dedicated husband and father, and a true public servant. Whether it was serving his church community at Park Cities Baptist Church, serving his sons as the quartermaster for Boy Scout Troop 890, or serving the City of Dallas as a firefighter, Stanley held true to his principles and never wavered in his loyalty to those around him.

Stanley Wilson is survived by his wife of 20 years, Jenny and his two sons Noah and Luke.

I am privileged to honor this fellow Boy Scout Leader and commend him for "leaving his campsite better than he found it." Stanley Wilson will be greatly missed. May the peace of God be with those he loved and sustain them through this hour of sorrow.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL ARTHRITIS MONTH

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Arthritis Month. Arthritis is a disease that affects more than 50 million Americans of all ages including some residents of Pennsylvania's 7th District. Arthritis includes more than 100 joint diseases that can affect the entire body, causing severe pain for many. While questions still remain, I am encouraged by the cutting edge research being conducted on arthritis, particularly at the NIH. Early diagnosis and disease management can help prevent long term pain for individuals living with arthritis and their families. As May draws to a close, let us continue to raise awareness of arthritis, remembering the individuals living with the disease every day.

A TRIBUTE TO WWII VETERAN JERRY LUPTAK

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Jerry Luptak, a Michigan resident, a veteran, and a hero of one of World War II's most infamous battles—the "Battle of the Bulge."

Jerry began his military career in the ROTC at Michigan State University. His group was called into duty and assigned to the 36th Infantry division. Upon landing in Italy, he and his unit fought through southern France, advancing the Allied line.

During the Battle of the Bulge, Jerry served as a 2nd Lieutenant in the 131st Field Artillery Battalion. He was positioned as a forward Artillery Observer on a bridgehead on the German side of the river, the very front of the Allied line. From his position in the fourth floor of a building, Jerry saw the enemy advancing with an overwhelming force of troops and tanks. Thinking quickly, Lieutenant Luptak called for his fellow troops to take cover, then called in an artillery barrage on the German advance. Still exposed in his fourth floor position, Jerry put his own life in danger to give the American forces their only chance at avoiding defeat. His quick decision–making and bravery proved successful, and the artillery barrage defeated the German advance.

Lieutenant Luptak was awarded a silver star for his gallantry in action. According to his citation, Jerry "effectively directed artillery fire was of material aid in crushing enemy attacks." This battle was an important stepping stone in halting the German opposition during World War II.

Jerry's vast combat experience and tactical knowledge provided vital tools to the United States Armed Forces. In addition to his silver star, he also received the American Theater Service Medal, German Occupation Medal, and the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal.

As Memorial Day approaches, all Americans should remember our brave servicemen and women, like Jerry Luptak, who dutifully and nobly answered the call to service for our nation, and the debt of gratitude we owe to them. On behalf of Michigan's 4th Congressional District, the Members of the Michigan Congressional Delegation, and all Americans, I thank Jerry Luptak for his dedicated and selfless service, and bravery in the face of the enemy.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATION AND SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN DAVID L. GIBSON OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize the dedication and service of Chaplain David L. Gibson upon the occasion of his retirement. Chaplain Gibson is a proud resident of the Gulf Coast, where he is retiring after serving his nation with honor and distinction as Command Chaplain and Protestant Chapel Pastor at Naval Air Station Pensacola.

Chaplain Gibson was born in Mableton, Georgia, and began serving his community at an early age through religious education. He acted as a minster of Youth, Music, and Christian Education at numerous churches, first as an intern and ultimately as director of a tri-city area based in Midland, Michigan. After receiving his Bachelor's degree in Christian Education in 1980 and his Masters in Divinity in 1983, Chaplain Gibson was ordained in July 1984 and commissioned as an officer in the United States Navy.

Chaplain Gibson led his military communities spiritually in posts as Chaplain or Command Chaplain in Naples, Italy; Norfolk, Virginia; Yorktown, Virginia; and Beaufort, South Carolina; before arriving in Pensacola to serve in 1998. While assigned to Naval Air Station Pensacola as the Assistant Department Head of the Naval Education and Training Professional Development Command, he designed and delivered over two hundred professional development courses. For his dedication and exceptional service, Chaplain Gibson was awarded the Navy-Marine Corps Commendation Medal and the Meritorious Service Medal. Following his promotion to Commander in 2003, Chaplain Gibson moved to serve at the Navy Chaplains School in Newport, Rhode Island for three years before returning to Naval Air Station Pensacola. In a further testament to his devotion to education, he earned his Doctorate of Strategic Leadership from Regent University in 2006.

During his career, Chaplain Gibson founded the Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training Program. Today, this program is the standardized training that all chaplains and other Navy

leaders receive in order to effectively deal with suicide situations. Further, he worked extensively on combat operation stress, particularly with its diagnosis and response. He co-authored a chapter in a 2012 Marine Corp University textbook on combat operation stress titled, ''Spiritual Injuries: Wounds of the American Warrior on the Battlefield of the Soul.'' He was also instrumental in training chaplains on how to minister to these hidden wounds. As a pastor and an educator, Chaplain Gibson has had an enormous impact on our Armed Services both in Northwest Florida and throughout the United States.

From an early age, Chaplain Gibson learned the importance of serving God and his community. It is evident that this dedication has remained over the years, and thousands have been touched by his presence and service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pride to honor the selfless service of David L. Gibson. My wife Vicki joins me in wishing David, his wife Tami, and their children, Zachary and Micah, all of the best.

NORTHERN ROUTE APPROVAL ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes:

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chair, I rise today in astonishment that the House even had to consider H.R. 3, the Northern Route Approval Act. Now, I'm a cosponsor of this bill and I strongly supported its passage yesterday in the House. But we wouldn't need to pass it if the Administration would've green-lighted the Keystone XL pipeline like it should have long ago. For more than seventeen-hundred days, Americans have waited for the Administration to approve this pipeline. We have waited long enough for 20,000 new jobs—600 of which would be created in my home state of Iowa. We have waited for $20 billion to be added to the economy, much of it in the Midwest and Iowa. And we have waited for more than 800,000 barrels of North American oil per day to be carried to U.S. refineries—to help fuel our economy. The State Department has found twice that this pipeline would have a limited impact on the environment. Labor groups support its construction. And seventeen Senate Democrats endorsed it earlier this year by helping to pass a budget amendment approving the pipeline. Approval of the Keystone XL pipeline means jobs, a boost to the economy and greater American independence when it comes to energy.

So today, Mr. Chair, I urge our colleagues in the U.S. Senate, in the strongest possible terms, to consider and pass this bill as soon as possible—but I also urge the Administration to stop hitting the snooze button on real chances to create American jobs and energy independence.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE MAY 23, 2013 HONOR FLIGHT OF THE QUAD CITIES

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today, over ninety Iowa veterans of World War II and the Korean War will travel to our Nation's Capital. Together, they will visit the monuments that were built in their honor by a grateful Nation.

We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude. For many, today will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial. I can think of no greater honor than to be able to greet them and thank Iowa's—and our Nation's—heroes for their service to our country.

That is why I am deeply honored to join them for their visit to the National World War II Memorial to personally thank these heroes for their service to our Nation and to pay tribute to the incredible sacrifice they made for our country.

We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude and the Honor Flight demonstrates that we as a State and as a country will never forget the debt we owe those who have worn our Nation's uniform. As a reminder of the service and sacrifice of the Greatest Generation, I am proud to have a piece of marble in my office from the quarry that was used to build the World War II Memorial. Our World War II and Korean War veterans rose to defend not just our Nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest Nation on earth. They did so as one people and one country. Their sacrifices and determination in the face of great threats to our way of life are both humbling and inspiring.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Honor Flight of the Quad Cities and Iowa's veterans of World War II and the Korean War to our Nation's Capital today. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, last week, the needs of my constituents took me away from D.C. and my work here in this Chamber. Though this absence was excused, I would like the record to show my support for legislation which was passed to repeal the misguided and over-burdensome health care law known as Obamacare, and two bills which increase analysis of new and existing regulations and strengthen our local financial institutions. I have supported these pieces of legislation in the past, and would have voted for them had I been here.

That being said, last week, a devastating forest fire—the largest Wisconsin has seen in 33 years—hit the northwest corner of my district in Douglas County. I was grateful to be back home to evaluate the damage, offer assistance to those who suffered loss and personally thank the first responders. By the grace of God, and with the help of many selfless first responders and firefighters, no one was injured and the destruction was limited. I was inspired by neighbors coming together to help each other, and was proud to see governments at the local, State, and Federal level respond quickly and effectively. I commend all those who stepped up and took charge in this situation, and my staff and I will continue to offer our assistance in any way we can.

HONORING WHITNEY COY AND OTHER MEMBERS OF FIREWIVES.COM

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a group of my constituents from Lancaster, Ohio, who pulled together to make a difference in the wake of an explosion at a fertilizer plant in West, Texas that injured hundreds and killed at least 14 people.

Of those lost in the explosion on April 17, many were firefighters from different departments who responded to the fire and explosion. When the wives of Lancaster firefighters and members of ''Firewives.com'' heard about what happened, they knew something had to be done.

Whitney Coy and the other members of ''Firewives.com'' formed a committee to fundraise for the West, Texas Volunteer Fire Department. Their group has grown to roughly 350 members since April. The group's original goal was to sell 150 T-shirts, which they sold in the very first day. So far, they have sold more than 850 t-shirts and raised more than $7,500 for West, Texas.

The money raised by our neighbors in Lancaster will be used to purchase new equipment to help protect firefighters in West, Texas. I am confident that Whitney Coy and her team played a very important role in ensuring the new equipment could be purchased.

Again, I am thankful for Whitney Coy's hard work in helping the people of West, Texas. I ask that all Members of Congress stand with me to recognize her, and her team, for their acts of selflessness and kindness.

CONGRATULATING THE COMMITTEE OF 100 ON THE FEDERAL CITY ON ITS 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating The Committee of 100 on the Federal City on its 906th anniversary and for its work in promoting the District of Columbia's distinction, beauty, and grace as a community.

Founded in 1923 by Frederic A. Delano under the auspices of the American Civic Association, the Committee of 100 was formed to sustain and to safeguard the fundamental values for establishing strong standards for parks, monuments, public buildings, and scenic vistas far beyond the monumental core of

Washington, D.C. Today, the Committee of 100 acts as a force of conscience in the evolution of the nation's capital city, engaging in the planning processes for the development of significant large sites in the District, including the Southwest Waterfront, St. Elizabeths, Walter Reed and the McMillan Reservoir.

For 90 years the Committee of 100 has continued to work to ensure that what is built—or not built-in the nation's capital reflects the historical significance of the District and its diverse, growing population. We appreciate the Committee 100 for its long presence in the District and its continued service to the ever-changing landscape of the District, and we wish them many more years of outstanding service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 90th anniversary of Committee of 100 on the Federal City.

FULL HMTF UTILIZATION RESOLUTION

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, our ports are a vital part of our nation's economy. They move more than 2.3 billion tons of cargo a year in the United States, generating economic activity that touches every Congressional district in the country.

Our ports are more than just gateways, they are engines—for the economy and for jobs.

Unfortunately, our nation's ports and harbors are severely under-dredged and under-maintained. According to a recent report by the American Association of Port Authorities, full channel dimensions are available less than 35% of the time.

We need to keep our ports strong. And so in 1986, we came up with a way to fund strong, fully dredged and well maintained ports and harbors, by assessing a tax on the goods imported through U.S. ports. That Harbor Maintenance Tax collects roughly $1.6 billion a year: plenty of money to keep our ports and harbors the best in the world.

Yet as our ports suffer from historic under-dredging and lack of investment, we continue to spend only half of the funds we collect with the Harbor Maintenance Tax on maintaining our harbors.

We have an $8 billion dollar surplus sitting in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. That's outrageous.

When our ports have such a clear need, when we have such a desperate need for the jobs that the work of dredging and modernizing out ports would create, it is scandalous that we will not fully utilize the funds we have collected for that very purpose.

I am introducing this resolution because we need to fully utilize the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. The wind in Congress is shifting, and I believe that we will pass legislation to achieve that. The Army Corps of Engineers needs to prepare to put people to work fixing our ports the day after the President signs that bill into law.

A TRIBUTE TO THE IOWA ELK'S ASSOCIATION

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the great work of the Iowa Elk's Association for their efforts to make the reunion of Marine Sergeant Ross Gundlach and his former combat partner, a yellow Labrador named Casey, a reality. Their dedication to this great event has truly changed two deserving lives.

In Afghanistan, Sergeant Gundlach and Casey were deployed on more than 125 missions to detect and clear suspicious packages along military convoy routes. Sergeant Gundlach and Casey's great work no doubt saved American lives as they were able to detect improvised explosive devices along the road and contain them before they could harm US Marines aboard the convoy. As their tour of duty concluded, Sergeant Gundlach made a promise to Casey he would do everything in his power to find her and care for her when they returned to America.

Upon returning home, Sergeant Gundlach, a Wisconsin native, was able to locate Casey, who had been acquired to continue her work detecting bombs in Iowa on behalf of the State Fire Marshal's Office. He reached out to Casey's new handler via email in an attempt to adopt Casey, often relaying photographs and stories of their service together. Unfortunately, hope for a reunion looked dim as the State Fire Marshal's Office would require $8,500 to acquire a replacement dog equipped to inspect venues for explosives should Casey's position be vacated.

To make this reunion happen, the Iowa Elk's Associaiton, a fraternal organization with a proud history of assisting our veterans, graciously donated the full sum required to the State of Iowa to purchase a new explosive detection K–9. Governor Terry Branstad accepted the gift request and Sergeant Gundlach was unknowingly invited to Iowa under the pretense he would have to present his case for the adoption of Casey to a bureaucratic state board. Instead, the Iowa Elk's generosity supported a heartwarming surprise ceremony in Iowa's Capitol to formally reunite this remarkable veteran and his faithful companion after 333 days of separation. The selfless efforts of the Governor's Office, the State Fire Marshal's Office, and the Iowa Elk's Association left few dry eyes as Casey greeted her old friend and new adoptive parent.

Mr. Speaker, in an increasingly chaotic and unpredictable world, it can seem good news is harder and harder to come by. Yet, the actions of the Iowa Elk's Association and the State of Iowa as a whole to do the right thing in such a remarkable fashion is a testament to our state and nation's innate optimism and gratitude to our servicemembers. It is with great pride that I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in thanking all those involved in this heartwarming event and wishing both Sergeant Gundlach and his dog Casey a long and happy future as the friends they have been from day one.

CONGRATULATING NOREEN SALAH BURPEE

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Noreen Salah Burpee on winning the Ellis Island Medal of Honor. Ms. Burpee is an outstanding member of our community, and I am proud to represent her in Florida's 22nd District.

The Ellis Island Medal of Honor recognizes American immigrants who make extraordinary contributions to the community, and Ms. Burpee has certainly earned this distinction. As the executive director of The Salah Foundation, she helps distribute millions of dollars to small nonprofits nationwide, while helping those nonprofits maximize their funds and fulfill their missions. Many of the Salah Foundation's beneficiaries are right here in Palm Beach and Broward Counties. For example, she worked with nonprofit Broward Health Systems, helping them mobilize more than $1 million to improve cancer-treatment facilities and marketing efforts.

In honor of her Ellis Island Medal of Honor, I am proud to recognize Noreen Salah Burpee for her amazing achievements and wish her continued success in her endeavors.

HONORING DICK WEAVER FOR HIS SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day 2013, I hope that everyone spends some time this holiday to honor the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice to preserve our nation's freedoms. We also need to thank those who serve today in harm's way for their dedication to the ideals and principles that made this country great.

I would like to take this opportunity to tell the story of one such man who performed heroic feats on the battlefield, and thankfully, is still with us today so that we may honor him for his service. That man is named C.W. (Dick) Weaver, Jr., and he lives in the Sixth District of North Carolina.

Dick Weaver is a man who was destined to receive honors for his leadership ability in many aspects of his life. He graduated in 1951 from Rankin High School in Guilford County, North Carolina, where he was Valedictorian and President of the Senior Class. As an athlete at Rankin, he was All Conference for two years in baseball and football. He then attended Lees McRae Junior College until he became a United States Marine. Dick was shipped overseas to join the Korean Conflict.

On March 28, 1953, Sergeant Weaver was subject to devastating enemy artillery fire. The unit received word that one of the men had been wounded and was lying helpless and unprotected. Under heavy artillery fire, Sergeant Weaver rushed to the stricken man and carried him to cover. He was painfully injured in his heroic act of courage. Sergeant Weaver, by his outstanding leadership, indomitable

courage, and selfless efforts on behalf of another, served to inspire all who observed him and upheld the highest tradition of the United States Naval Services. For his action, he was awarded the Silver Star and Purple Heart by the President of the United States.

Sergeant Weaver spent 11 months in a military hospital for his wounds. Joseph J. McCaffrey, in a letter to Sergeant Weaver's mother wrote, "that his action inspired his men to get the wounded men out of danger." McCaffrey added, "that he literally walked into an artillery barrage and certain death."

Dick Weaver returned to Lees McRae and was graduated in 1957. He was student body president, Phi Beta Kappa, Best All-Around Student, Most Valuable Player in baseball, and the recipient of a prestigious Morehead Scholarship to the University of North Carolina, from where he was graduated in 1959.

After serving in personnel positions at Cone Mills, General Dynamics, and Duke University, Dick founded and served as president of Dick Weaver Associates from 1975 to 1995, and his company was rated by the College and University Personnel Association as one of the top three in the nation.

Dick Weaver has been a friend of mine for decades. As youngsters, we competed against each other on the ball fields of Piedmont North Carolina. In all the years that I have known Dick, I never really knew of the heroism he displayed in Korea. Dick is a humble and self-effacing gentleman who doesn't seek out the glory. I wanted to take this moment, as we celebrate Memorial Day 2013, to honor Dick Weaver and the countless others just like him who serve our country with dignity and distinction.

HONORING KAYLEIGH FAAS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share these with my House colleagues.

Kayleigh Faas is a sophomore at Needville High School in Fort Bend County, Texas. Her essay topic is: In your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

THE POSITIVE POWER OF GOVERNMENT

What role should government play in our daily lives? In my opinion, government should be a structured framework for our education system, economy, and healthcare programs. In hopes of creating a "more perfect union", our founding fathers strived to create a fair and just system to serve Americans.

We depend on our government to protect its citizens. Government affects all human activity. Some of the important groups are consumers, workers, investors, and the environment. The Constitution was designed to defend our "lives, liberties and pursuits of happiness". Only the government has the power to maintain these rights.

Government itself is valuable and beneficial to Americans. It is a powerful force in forming and maintaining a strong society. Citizens have different relationships with their government whether it be at the federal, state, or local level. In my opinion, people should support their governmental systems and view them as an institution rather than an administration. We may not agree with elected officials on all issues, but should work together with them to better our nation. We are lucky to live in a democratic society where we have a voice and the right to vote for our leaders of choice.

We should have a positive attitude towards our democratic government. As stated in our Constitution, our forefathers created our government in order to create a more perfect union and to defend and promote the welfare and tranquility of our citizens. These are assurances that most of the world's countries wish they could achieve.

Government, in my opinion, is valuable and beneficial to all citizens and should continue to positively affect various aspects of our lives on a daily basis. Our government is the only entity that can help us grow together as a strong and healthy nation. It provides the foundation for our economic growth. It also positively impacts our education system and promotes a higher level of competency which results in better lives. Other nations look to our form of government as a model for shaping and bettering their own. Our government has a vital and indispensable role to play in continuing to improve the lives of all Americans. We, as responsible citizens, must support our government system, because after all, WE have created it.

HONORING WOMEN OF INFLUENCE

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor 32 women who were recognized as New Mexico "Women of Influence" for 2013.

It is important to highlight women in our communities who are achieving incredible success as local business and community leaders. Albuquerque Business First partnered with the local business community to evaluate a record number of nominations for the Women of Influence awards.

I understand the challenges of being a small business owner and overcoming hurdles that are all-too-common for women in a male-dominated culture. I appreciate and applaud this year's honorees, each of whom has contributed to the state of New Mexico in unique and exiting ways.

New Mexico's Women of Influence include CEO's, educators, entrepreneurs, and leaders in financial services, government, health and fitness, non-profits and technology firms.

BUSINESS SERVICES

Virginia R. Dugan, Esquire, Atkinson & Kelsey, P.A.; Annette Gardiner, President, New Mexico Gas Company; Debra P. Hicks, PE/LSI, President and CEO, Pettigrew & Associates, P.A.; Jennifer Hise, Vice President, CEMCO, Inc.; Laurie Monfiletto, Vice President of Human Resources, PNM Resources; Dorothy Stermer, Manager, Sandia National Laboratories; Dr. Sandra Taylor-Sawyer, Director, NM Small Business Development Center, CEO, Dream Givers, LLC, Independent Associate, LegalShield.

EDUCATION

Barbara Bergman, Interim Dean, University of New Mexico School of Law; Marilyn Melendez Dykman, Director, University of New Mexico Veterans Resource Center; Dr. Viola E. Florez, Professor and PNM Education Endowed Chair, University of New Mexico College of Education.

ENTREPRENEUR

Sherry M. Keeney, President/CEO, PECOS Management Services, Inc.; Janice J. Lucero, CEO/Owner, MVD Express; Susan MacLean, President & CEO, The Solutions Group; DeAnn Sena O'Connor, Creative Director, dso creative.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

Karen M. Bard, Wealth Management Advisor, Merrill Lynch; Dohnia Dorman, MBA, VP of Marketing, Rio Grande Credit Union, Part-Time Adjunct Lecturer II, UNM; Tammy S. Jaramillo, Director of Administration, Burt & Company CPAs, LLC.

GOVERNMENT

Mary Ann Chavez-Lopez, Executive Director, El Camino Real Housing Authority; Ann Lerner, Film Liaison, City of Albuquerque; Katherine Carroll Martinez, Director, Construction Industries Division/Manufactured Housing Division, Regulation and Licensing Department, State of New Mexico.

HEALTH/FITNESS

Kristie Bair, J.D., President, Bair Medical Spa; Gayle Dine'Chacon, MD, Surgeon General, Navajo Nation, Associate Professor, UNM School of Medicine; E. DeAnn Eaton Azar, CEO, Haverland Carter Lifestyle Group; Kim E. Hedrick, Vice President Strategic Business Development, University of New Mexico Medical Group, Inc.; Mary G. Martinez, Franchise Owner/CEO, Home Instead Senior Care; Dawn Tschabrun, COO, Chief Nursing Officer, Lovelace Regional Hospital-Roswell.

NONPROFIT

Andrea Fisher Maril, CEO, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Northern New Mexico; Kathy Mechenbier, Founder and president of the board, El Ranchito de los Ninos Inc.; Carol Wight, CEO, New Mexico Restaurant Association.

TECHNOLOGY

Marjorie M.K. Hlava, President and chairman, Access Innovations Inc.; Caroline Dennis, Cyber Security and STEM education consultant; Elizabeth J. (Lisa) Kuuttila, President and CEO, STC.UNM.

I congratulate these women leaders and thank them for their contributions to New Mexico.

A TRIBUTE TO ACACIA SCOTT

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Acacia Scott for being named a 2013 recipient of the Dorothy Andrews Kabis Memorial Internship by the National Federation of Republican Women.

The Dorthy Kabis Internship is named after former National Federation of Republican Women President who served from 1963–1967 before being appointed as the United States Treasurer by President Nixon. This Memorial Internship Program is a highly selective program that offers just three young women from across the nation the chance to work in the headquarters of this prominent women's political organization in our national's capital. This program is reserved for undergraduate college students that display a keen knowledge of government and a strong interest in politics.

Mr. Speaker, Acacia's ability to be named to just one of three nationwide internships by the National Federation of Republican Women speaks volumes to her abilities and renowned Iowa work ethic. It is an honor to represent future leaders like Acacia from the great state of Iowa in the United States Congress and I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her for receiving this prestigious designation. I wish her the best of luck in her future studies and career.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR UNVEILING OF STATUE OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. Con. Res. 16, which authorizes the use of Emancipation Hall for the unveiling of a statute of Frederick Douglass. It is fitting and proper that Emancipation Hall is the venue for the dedication of a memorial to one of this nation's greatest abolitionists and orators, and one of the closest friends and advisors of the Great Emancipator himself, Abraham Lincoln.

Frederick Douglass was born Frederick Augustus Washington Bailey near Easton, Maryland, on February 18, 1818, and lived the first 20 years of his life as a slave before escaping to freedom in 1838 through the Underground Railroad. With the assistance of abolitionists, he resettled in New Bedford, Massachusetts and changed his name to avoid recapture by fugitive slave bounty hunters.

Frederick Douglass had no formal education but he recognized the power of education and taught himself to read and write. He would go on to become the publisher of ''The North Star,'' a leading abolitionist newspaper, whose motto was ''Right is of no Sex—Truth is of no Color—God is the Father of us all, and we are all brethren.''

Frederick Douglass also authored one of the seminal works in American history, the influential autobiography ''Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave,'' which explained with unsurpassed eloquence how slavery corrupts the human spirit and robs both master and slave of their freedom.

Frederick Douglass devoted his life to the struggle for freedom, human dignity, and the full measure of civil and human rights for all men and women, famously observing that ''where there is no struggle, there is no progress; power concedes nothing without demand. It never has and never will.''

Frederick Douglass was also one of America's greatest orators. He was the only African American to attend the first women's rights convention in 1848 at Seneca Falls, New York, where he spoke powerfully and forcefully in favor of women's suffrage. In his moving address, he said that he could not accept the right to vote as a black man if women could not also claim that right and suggested that the world would be a better place if women were involved in the political sphere:

> In this denial of the right to participate in government, not merely the degradation of woman and the perpetuation of a great injustice happens, but the maiming and repudiation of one-half of the moral and intellectual power of the government of the world.

On July 5, 1852, Frederick Douglass delivered the address for which he is perhaps best known. The theme of that address to the Ladies of the Rochester Anti-Slavery Sewing Society was ''What to the slave is the 4th of July?'' In that speech, he described in stark and vivid detail the gap between America's principles and practices, its aspirations and the actual condition of people's lives, especially those persons of African descent. In answering the question, ''What to the slave is your 4th of July,'' he said:

> [A] day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciations of tyrants, brass fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade, and solemnity, are, to him, mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages.

But Frederick Douglass was not bitter at America, he was determined to make her better. And he did through his writings, lectures, speeches, and civic activism. Most of all, the bond of friendship he forged with President Lincoln helped the nation summon the will to accept civil war as the price to be paid to abolish American slavery and emancipate from bondage millions of slaves and their descendants.

On April 14, 1876, the eleventh anniversary of the Lincoln's assassination, Frederick Douglass was the keynote speaker at the dedication of the Freedmen's Monument in Memory of Abraham Lincoln in the City of Washington, in which the Great Abolitionist spoke for all former slaves in paying tribute to the Great Emancipator:

> Despite the mist and haze that surrounded him; we saw him . . . in the light of the stern logic of great events, and in view of that divinity which shapes our ends, . . . we came to the conclusion that the hour and the man of our redemption had somehow met in the person of Abraham Lincoln. [He] was at the head of a great movement, and was in living and earnest sympathy with that movement, which, in the nature of things, must go on until slavery should be utterly and forever abolished in the United States.

After the Civil War, Frederick served as U.S. Marshal for the District of Columbia and later as the first African American Recorder of Deeds. In 1888 at the Republican National Convention, he became the first African-American to receive a vote for nomination as president of the United States by one of the major parties. From 1889 to 1891, Frederick Douglass served his country as Minister-Resident and Consul-General to Haiti. He died in Washington, D.C. on February 20, 1895, at the age of 77.

Mr. Speaker, the life of Frederick Douglass affirms what is great about our country. Here was a man who overcame the conditions of his birth and the disadvantages of his race to become one of the towering figures of his age. His life proves that Margaret Mead was right when she said:

> Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.

With the unveiling of the statute in memory of Frederick Douglass, fittingly located in Emancipation Hall of the U.S. Capitol, the story of this great man who led such a consequential life will be made known to all who visit for generations to come.

GREAT TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS ACT OF 2013

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today Rep. JARED POLIS and I are introducing the Growing Excellent Achievement Training Academies (GREAT) Teachers and Principals Act.

The bill would implement reforms to encourage the growth of teacher and principal training academies that are held accountable for producing effective graduates in exchange for freedom from unnecessary regulations and bureaucracy.

Research continues to confirm that effective teaching is a critical component of student success. However, despite these findings, many teachers report feeling ill-prepared for their work in the classroom. These reforms will harness the power of innovation to create teacher and principal preparation programs that are more effective and more responsive to the needs of educators.

One leading study found that a majority of education school alumni (61 percent) reported that schools of education did not adequately prepare their graduates for the classroom. Principals surveyed as part of that study also gave schools of education low marks, with only 30 percent reporting that such schools prepare teachers very well or moderately well to meet the needs of students with disabilities, and only 16 percent reporting at those levels for students with limited English proficiency. It is well known that nearly half of new teachers leave the profession in the first five years.

In our bill, states would be given the flexibility to use a portion of the funds they receive for teacher and principal reforms to support the development of teacher or principal preparation academies. These academies, which may be traditional colleges of education but need not be, would be required to be selective in their admissions processes; emphasize clinical preparation by pairing their candidates with effective teachers or principals in the classroom; and produce a certain number of effective teachers or principals in order to maintain their authority to operate. In exchange for this accountability, they would be

free of much of the red tape currently imposed on schools, much of which has no demonstrated tie to student achievement.

The GREAT Act also has more than 80 endorsements from prominent education organizations, college of education deans, and state chief school officers, including Chiefs for Change, the Business Round Table, Teach For America, and the United Negro College Fund.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Rep. POLIS in supporting these important reforms.

RECOGNIZING SPECIALIST DANIEL LUCAS ELLIOT IN MEMORIAM

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and sacrifice of Specialist Daniel Lucas Elliot.

On July 15, 2011, Specialist Elliott's vehicle was in the lead vehicle of a convoy performing an improvised explosive device patrol in Basra, Iraq. Specialist Elliot's vehicle struck an improvised explosive device, killing him instantly. Specialist Elliott is survived by his parents, Ed A. and Martha P. Elliott of Youngsville, North Carolina, and his wife Trisha H. Elliott of Raleigh, North Carolina.

Specialist Elliott was born on July 18, 1989 in Youngsville, NC. He entered the United States Army Reserve on January 10, 2007. Specialist Elliott attended Basic Training and Advanced Individual Training at Fort Leonardwood, MO where he was awarded the Military Occupational Specialty of Military Police.

In January 2009, Specialist Elliott deployed with the 810th Military Police Company to Baghdad, Iraq, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Later that year he moved to Basra, Iraq, where he served the rest of his deployment.

In March 2011, Specialist Elliott volunteered to deploy to Iraq a second time with the 805th Military Police Company in support of Operation New Dawn. He found himself stationed in Basra, Iraq, with the 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Calvary Division. It was during this assignment that he gave his life for his fellow soldiers.

Specialist Elliott's awards and decorations include the Bronze Star Medal (posthumous), Purple Heart Medal (posthumous), Meritorious Service Medal (posthumous), Army Commendation Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Iraqi Campaign Medal and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal.

On June 8, 2013, the Army Reserve will dedicate the Cary, North Carolina, US Army Reserve Center to the memory of Specialist Elliot and his sacrifice for our country. The "Specialist Daniel Lucas Elliot Army Reserve Center" will serve as a reminder to the community, the nation, and our army of the courage and sacrifice of our Soldiers as they provide us security and defend our way of life.

Mr,Speaker, I ask that you please join me, and the United States Army Reserve, in recognizing Specialist Elliot's dedicated service to the Army and our Nation. His performance and selfless service are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the United States Army Reserve, and the United States Army.

CONGRATULATING MOLLY FREY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Molly Frey on her achievement as a Military Kid of the Year from "Our Military Kids." I am honored that one of my very own constituents has been selected for this prestigious award.

According to "Our Military Kids," Molly was selected for the award because of her talents in ballet, figure skating, and sailing. She also has a philanthropic spirit, which has led to her helping raise money for breast cancer awareness and volunteering to support other military families through "Operation Baking GALS" (Give a Little Support).

Molly's father, Ohio Air Reserve Guard Senior Master Sgt. Kim Frey, was away on a seven-month deployment, which included six months in Afghanistan. As a Colonel in the Ohio Army National Guard and veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom, I am impressed with the sacrifices that Molly and her family have made for our country and our freedom. Their family knows all too well that these sacrifices are shared, and I admire their strength to persevere.

Again, I offer my congratulations to Molly Frey. It was an honor to meet her and her family in April when she was in Washington, DC I ask that all Members of Congress rise and join me in recognizing the sacrifices that all military families and personnel make for this great nation, including Molly Frey and her family.

SEC REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1062) to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and order:

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, the U.S. House of Representative has passed a bill called the SEC Regulatory Accountability Act (H.R. 1062). Congress intended with this legislation to ensure that the Securities and Exchange Commission consider the costs and benefits of its regulatory apparatus, and further intended for this legislation to protect investors and improve capital formation.

INTRODUCTION

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 states that there is a compelling national public interest in the regulation and control of securities transactions occurring either on exchanges or over-the-counter to "protect interstate commerce, the national credit, the Federal taxing power, to protect and make more effective the national banking system and Federal Reserve System, and to insure the maintenance of fair and honest markets in such transactions." Nothing in the HR 1062 is meant to undermine the implied statutory authority of the SEC to protect the national interest.

In this bill, Congress did not intend to change the well-established rule, set forth in Supreme Court precedent, that any court reviewing an agency rule under the Administrative Procedure Act must be deferential to the agency's judgment and must not substitute the court's judgment for that of the agency.

In this bill, Congress did not intend the SEC to determine whether regulation is warranted if Congress has required the SEC to promulgate a rule. In other words, Congress did not intend to grant the SEC any right or power to ignore Congress's rulemaking mandates. Similarly, in this bill, Congress did not intend to condition any SEC rulemaking on any type of cost-benefit analysis if Congress has required the SEC to promulgate a rule on a matter.

In this bill, Congress did not intend to overturn the SEC's longstanding duty, above all other responsibilities, to protect investors and ensure the integrity of our financial markets. Thus, Congress's intent here is that the SEC, when engaged in rulemaking, do what is necessary to maximize the protection of investors and the integrity of our markets, and only attempt to minimize burdens once the attainment of those goals has been assured.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 determines that a significant cost of a lack of regulation are as follows: "National emergencies, which produce widespread unemployment and the dislocation of trade, transportation, and industry, and which burden interstate commerce and adversely affect the general welfare, are precipitated, intensified, and prolonged by manipulation and sudden and unreasonable fluctuations of security prices and by excessive speculation on such exchanges and markets, and to meet such emergencies the Federal Government is put to such great expense as to burden the national credit."

The most recent National Emergency was the financial crisis of 2007–2009. According to the Government Accountability Office, this crisis reduced economic activity and aggregate wealth of the United States by $22 trillion. Congress, in passing this law, construed that this $22 trillion number is the implied "benefit" of the SEC's regulatory apparatus. Congress intends the SEC to construe $22 trillion as the benefit of its aggregate regulatory apparatus in any cost/benefit analysis, and to apply at least part of this $22 trillion "benefit" as the benefit of any specific regulation. In any regulation in which the benefit of a specific rule or regulation is unclear, Congress intends for the SEC to consider the possibility of an averted National Emergency as a clear benefit.

The specific section of the Act amended by this bill grants to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, and other agencies the power "to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to implement the provisions of this chapter for which they are responsible or for the execution of the functions vested in them by this chapter." Nothing in this bill shall be construed to limit the authority of these agencies to regulate the securities markets.

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT IN SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

In (e)(1)(A) of this bill, Congress mandated that the SEC consider the ''nature and source of the problem that the proposed regulation is designed to address, as well as assess the significance of that problem'' before issuing a regulation. Congress believes, consistent with systemic risk exceptions for open bank assistance, that the SEC may issue regulations to reduce systemic risk, and that such a rationale for a regulation is sufficient for a consideration of the nature and source of a problem, as well as determining its significance. Congress, consistent with the 1934 Act's reasoning around the prevention of National Emergencies, intended for the SEC to consider the maximum possible loss to investors and maximum possible decline in capital formation should a regulation not be promulgated. This maximum cost should include considering the possibility of another systemically risky event similar to the financial crisis of 2008, with its implied cost of $22 trillion (according to the Government Accountability Office).

See also, e.g., Better Markets, the cost of the Wall Street Collapse and Ongoing Economic Crisis Is More Than $12.8 Trillion (Sept. 15, 2012), available at http://bettermarkets.com/sitesidefault/files/Cost%200f%20The%20Crisis.pdf. It is Congress's intent that when promulgating rules, the SEC must consider whether a rule will help prevent such an economic catastrophe from happening again.

In (e)(1)(B) of this bill, Congress intended the Chief Economist to make a determination of the implied cost to society of not issuing a regulation, and the burden to society implied by current business practices. In requiring the Chief Economist to assess ''both qualitative and quantitative'' costs and benefits, Congress intended the Chief Economist to take into account costs and benefits that are not easily quantified, and to give such unquantifiable benefits of financial regulation the same consideration as the quantifiable benefits. These unquantifiable benefits include, but are not limited to, the avoidance of investor losses, heightened transparency, greater systemic stability, the benefits of increased investor confidence in the integrity of the financial system and the overall economic system, and, above all, any risk of a collapse of the global financial system and prevention of another crippling financial crisis. As some commentators have observed, it is imperative that rulemaking be conducted in a holistic way, one that accounts for the huge benefits that accrue when a collection of rules helps prevent financial crises or other widespread abuses. See Better Markets, Setting the Record Straight on Cost-Benefit Analysis and Financial Reform at the SEC (July 30, 2012), available at http://bettermarkets.com/sites/default/files/CBA%20Report.pdf.

In Sections (e)(1)(B) and (e)(2)(A) of this bill, Congress recognized that when members of the regulated industry do not provide data on the costs of regulation to the SEC, and when cost data is not otherwise available, the SEC has no obligation to develop its own studies or generate its own data. 6Congress agrees with the assessment of the courts, which have long held that no agency has to go to such lengths when assessing costs, and this bill does not alter this important limit on an agency's duty.

In (e)(1)(C) of this bill, Congress intended that a determination that a regulation is intended to reduce systemic risk is a sufficient ''explanation of why the regulation meets the regulatory objectives more effectively than the alternatives.'' In this subsection, Congress intended the SEC to report on alternatives that it considered so as to provide a complete picture of the justification for the regulation; Congress did not intend to create a requirement that the SEC consider any minimum number of alternatives, or any alternatives at all.

In subsection (e)(1)(D) of the text added by this bill, Congress intended that any regulation should be easy to understand to the extent allowed by the subject matter of the regulation; Congress did not intend that regulations should be substantively simplified solely for ease of communication, or that a regulation might be invalid because of its complexity.

In (e)(2)(A) of this bill, Congress noted that, ''in deciding whether and how to regulate, the Commission shall assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives, including the alternative of not regulating, and choose the approach that maximizes net benefits.'' Congress believes that the avoidance of systemic risk and the attendant $22 trillion cost of National Emergencies needs to be considered for any proposed regulation that the SEC determines is intended to reduce systemic risk.

In subsection (e)(2)(A)(ii) of the text added by this bill, Congress intended that the SEC, in identifying the regulation that imposes the ''least burden on society,'' should consider both the costs and benefits of the regulation itself, and should evaluate those burdens on society created by the regulation and those burdens on society that exist in the absence of regulation and would be mitigated by the proposed regulation. Congress intended the SEC to take into account not only the ''cumulative costs of regulation,'' but also the cumulative benefits of regulation.

Further, in subsection (e)(2)(A)(iii) of this bill, Congress intended that to ''evaluate whether the regulation is consistent, incompatible, or duplicative of other Federal regulations'' means to publish the regulation for comment in the Federal Register.

In (e)(3) of this bill, Congress intended that that phrase ''industry group concerns'' referenced in the second part of the paragraph also apply to the ''consumer groups'' referenced earlier in the same paragraph. Congress intended that Commission explain any changes resulting from comments by industry or consumer groups, and similarly requires them to give specific reasons if changes suggested by industry or consumer groups were not implemented. Congress intended ''consumer groups'' to mean groups that act in the public interest and provide a perspective that is generally a counterweight to industry financial interests and facilitating an appropriately diverse marketplace of ideas within the process of making and evaluating regulations. In addition, the SEC may explain a decision not to incorporate an industry group concern by citing an opposing concern raised by another commenter or by the SEC itself.

In (e)(4) of this bill, Congress intended for the Commission not only to take into account the ''large burden of such regulation when compared to the benefit of such regulation,'' but to also consider whether a regulation imposes only a relatively small burden when compared with its benefit, which could possibly warrant expansion, as is further indicated by references in same subsection that the Commission should determine whether regulations are ''ineffective [or] insufficient'' and should be ''expand[ed].'' In other words, Congress's intent for Section (e)(4) of this bill was that when the SEC is reviewing its regulations, it will devote the same attention to strengthening and expanding rules that have become weak over time as it does to streamlining or repealing ineffective rules.

In the same paragraph, in determining whether any regulations are ''outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome,'' Congress intended that the Commission should be particularly attentive to the rapid pace of change in the financial industry and the securities markets and the new risks that are created in those markets, including risks to the financial system as a whole, to corporations that rely on those markets, and to investors in those markets. Congress intends that the Commission, in using this periodic review process to ''modify, streamline, expand, or repeal'' regulations, should proactively protect against new threats to the financial system and close loopholes that are opened up by financial innovation aimed primarily at evading regulation.

In (e)(5)(A)(ii) of this bill, Congress intends that the ''quantitative and qualitative metrics'' should include, where relevant, the prevention of financial crises and severe recessions caused by those crises, as well as the maintenance of individual investor confidence in the securities markets.

In (e)(5)(B) of this bill, Congress intends that the mandated assessment plan may be in whatever form the Commission deems appropriate for the regulation at issue, subject to the requirements of subsection (e)(5)(B)(i). In particular, some or all of the costs or benefits of the regulation may be qualitative and not reducible to quantitative figures, and the Commission may determine that no action will be taken on the regulation on the basis of qualitative factors included in the assessment.

A TRIBUTE TO THOMAS GRIFFIN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Thomas Griffin of Ankeny, Iowa for receiving a coveted 2013 James Madison Fellowship from the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation.

The James Madison Fellowship is offered to current and prospective teachers of American history and social studies to support study of the history and principles enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, at the graduate level. These fellowships provide a valuable service to our Nation by both fostering the aspirations of the Nation's most promising and distinguished teachers while continually improving the quality of teaching in our Nation's schools.

Mr. Griffin, a teacher at Johnston High School, represents one of just 56 fellowships that were awarded Nationwide in 2013. His selection for this honor will include up to $24,000 toward a master's degree in his field of study.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Mr. Griffin from the great

State of Iowa in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House will join me in congratulating him for receiving this recognition, and I wish him the best of luck in his studies and continuing career in education.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERICES WEEK

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May 19–25 as National Emergency Medical Services Week. The goal of this important week is to encourage safety and to honor the dedication of those who provide day-to-day lifesaving services. Though this honorary title may only last a week, the highlighted message should be recognized throughout the entire year.

This year's theme is ''EMS: One Mission. One Team.'' This powerful theme serves as a reminder that emergency providers work selflessly each and every day to aid those in need whenever the call may be heard. Though the titles may differ—paramedics, first responders, firefighters—they all strive to improve the communities in which we live and work.

One does not have to look past the recent tragedy in Boston to fully understand just how important emergency medical services are in our daily lives. The heroes on that dark day were ordinary citizens who rose up in the face of tragedy to treat the dozens of wounded runners and innocent bystanders.

It is my hope that everyone takes a moment to thank those around them who perform these live-saving services. They are America's true everyday heroes.

CONGRATULATING THE BOROUGH OF NEW BRIGHTON ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Borough of New Brighton on the 175th anniversary of its founding in 1838. The Borough of New Brighton is located on the east bank of the Beaver River, about two miles from its junction with the Ohio River.

The present site of New Brighton was first settled by United States Army Colonel Josiah Harmar, who built a blockhouse with the help of troops from nearby Fort McIntosh in 1788. William and David Constable surveyed and laid out the site of the new town, which they named Brighton, after their old home in England. Residents soon popularized the name to New Brighton, and the new town was incorporated as such by an Act of Assembly in 1838.

New Brighton's early settlers were skilled tradesmen drawn by good factory sites, water power, and the demand for their specialized skills. Others sought religious freedom and economic opportunity. Today, New Brighton's residents take pride in their community, which balances suburban living with a walkable downtown area. New Brighton is one of Beaver County's Rivertowns, and it offers a variety of recreation and cultural attractions including Big Rock Park, the New Brighton Fishing Park, and the Merrick Art Gallery.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, please join me in congratulating the Borough of New Brighton on the 175th anniversary of its founding.

HONORING STEVE PATERNOSTER

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Steve Paternoster, who was recently selected as the National Restaurant Association's 2013 Cornerstone Humanitarian of the Year for his extraordinary contributions to his community and for his philanthropic service to others. Steve has selflessly dedicated his life to improving the lives of countless New Mexicans. An alumnus of New Mexico Military Institute, Steve now serves as CEO of the YMCA of Central New Mexico and is the owner of a successful restaurant. From donating about $200,000 annually through his business to serving on local non-profit boards, he focuses on organizations that support chronic disease, the less fortunate, young adults at risk and the arts.

In 2009, Steve and his daughter Haley founded the Special Programs Youth Assistance Foundation to help troubled arid disadvantaged youth in New Mexico, including those in Children's Drug Court and those suffering from domestic abuse. After losing Haley to a heroin overdose in 2010, Steve has made it his life's mission to help others overcome obstacles similar to those Haley and the Paternoster family faced. Steve also hosts an annual holiday dinner at his restaurant for troubled teenagers, their families, Court staff and their families.

Steve works closely with many other causes including Isshin Ryu, a non-profit organization designed to provide education, recreation and enrichment activities to disadvantaged youth. He also works with the Heart Gallery of New Mexico Foundation, which helps hard-to-place children in foster homes. Additionally, Steve is involved with New Mexico AIDS Services, the American Heart Association, the American Stroke Association, the Heart Hospital of New Mexico Foundation and Dismas House, which provides support for people with chronic illnesses.

I congratulate Steve on receiving this prestigious award and thank him for his hard work and for the many contributions he has made and will continue to make to New Mexico.

NORTHERN ROUTE APPROVAL ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, which is a transparent attempt to skirt federal law so that the majority can impose its own preferred outcome on the State Department's ongoing regulatory review of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Although my colleagues on the other side of the aisle make much of their professed commitment to regular order and distaste for earmarks, recent developments—including today's legislation—make clear that commitment is only as deep as it is convenient.

Regular order? We are now 37 days past due on delivering an FY 2014 Budget, and the majority still refuses to go to conference.

Earmarks? This legislation—which carves out numerous special exceptions for a single pipeline project benefitting one company—is clearly an earmark.

Mr. Chair, the decision as to whether to build the northern route of the Keystone XL pipeline should be made based on a complete and thorough evaluation of its impacts on our climate, energy security, water supply, job creation, air quality, balance of trade, human health and other relevant factors—not some hastily thrown together, ill-considered and politically driven exercise.

I urge a no vote.

TRIBUTE TO DEBORAH OSAKUE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share these with my House colleagues.

Deborah Osakue is a senior at Hightowner High School in Fort Bend County, Texas. Her essay topic is: In your opinion, why is it important to be involved in the political process?

Our constitution was framed according to the Lockean social contract that government should have the ''consent of the governed''. As an African American female, I know that people have died and have spent their lives fighting to give me an opportunity to participate in the American political process. If I abstain from the political process, these people would have fought and died in vain. I owe the likes of Susan B. Anthony, Sojourner Truth, and Martin Luther King the respect of my participation in a democracy they toiled to create. The American system of government gives its citizens one crucial responsibility: to vote. Men and women have died on foreign and domestic soil all so that I can be free. To abstain from the democratic process is to spill their blood in contempt. It is undeniable that the practice of gerrymandering has been used to oppress minority voices. I know our political

process is not flawless, but I also know that it is my responsibility to improve it.

Mahatma Ghandi once said, ''You must be the change you wish to see in the world.'' I am responsible for creating the America of tomorrow. I must be involved in the political process in order to do so. I grew up observing the disparity between the quality of public education provided to students of lower and higher income homes. I spend a good amount of time each day watching the news and reading about what is wrong with the world. According to Beyond ABC 2012, an assessment of children's health, about eight percent of children in the U.S. have no medical insurance but the percentage of Texas children without medical insurance is significantly higher at fourteen percent. According to the National Institutes of Health, twenty percent of Americans suffer from a diagnosable form of mental illness and yet the problem of mental illness remains largely unscathed. These problems will not simply fix themselves. It is up to me to exercise my rights as a citizen to change my city, state and nation for the better. If I do not make an effort to fight for what I believe in, I cannot expect others to do so for me.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES W. GOULD

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a tremendous educator and wonderful visionary on the occasion of his retirement. Dr. Charles W. Gould is retiring as president of Florence-Darlington Technical College after nearly 20 years of service. His leadership will certainly be missed, but his legacy will continue at the college and throughout the State of South Carolina.

Dr. Gould knew from a young age that he was passionate about education. He earned a Master's degree from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee with an emphasis on the philosophy of mathematics and a Ph.D. from Duke University with an emphasis on ethics and law.

Early in his career, Dr. Gould taught at Duke University, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and he was an Associate Managing Editor of a national educational publishing company. He has been in the technical college system of South Carolina for over thirty years and has served in three of the system's sixteen technical colleges.

His last and most significant position is serving as president of Florence-Darlington Technical College since November, 1993. During his tenure he has more than doubled the student body from less than 3,000 to more than 6,000 today. He has also grown the college by adding the health sciences campus in downtown Florence, the Lake City and Mullins satellite sites as well as expanding the Hartsville campus.

My service in Congress has coincided with Dr. Gould's presidency at Florence-Darlington Tech. During those two decades it was an honor to work with him, especially to secure funding for his crowning achievement. In 2007, the Southern Institute of Manufacturing and Technology (SIMT) opened and fulfilled Dr. Gould's vision for the college to provide hands on technical training in advanced manufacturing for students and local industry professionals. He oversaw the completion of the second phase of SIMT earlier this year which serves as a manufacturing business incubator.

In addition to his leadership at Florence-Darlington Tech, Dr. Gould serves on the board of the Commission on Colleges for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and frequently chairs accreditation teams and special projects for the Commission on Colleges. He also serves on the board of the National Council of Advanced Manufacturing and Technology Centers, Global Learning Systems and several other national organization boards of directors.

In the community, he currently chairs the Florence County Economic Development Partnership; is past president and ex-officio board member of the Greater Florence Chamber of Commerce; is an advisory board member for the Darlington County Economic Development Board, SCANA, Progress Energy, and BB&T Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Charles Gould for his visionary leadership and tremendous dedication to Florence-Darlington Technical College and the State of South Carolina. He deserves commendation for his many contributions as he embarks on a well-deserved retirement. I extend best wishes to him as he enters this new phase in his life, and thank him for his service and his friendship.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 164–179, had I been present, I would have voted: Nos. 164—''yes''; No. 165—''yes''; No. 166—''yes''; No. 167—''no''; No. 168—''no''; No. 169—''no''; No. 170—''yes''; No. 171—''yes''; No. 172—''yes''; No. 173—''yes''; No. 174—''yes''; No. 175—''yes''; No. 176—''yes''; No. 177—''yes''; No. 178—''yes''; No. 179—''no''.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 179, Final Passage of H.R. 3: Northern Route Approval Act (Keystone XL Pipeline), my vote is not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my absence from the House for the first votes on the evening of May 22, 2013. During this time, I was unfortunately detained in traffic returning to Capitol Hill following an event in downtown DC. I would like to submit how I would have voted had I been in attendance for the following votes:

Rollcall No. 169, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 1 (H.R. 3). I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall No. 170, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 2. I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall No. 171, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 3. I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall No. 172, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 4. I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall No. 173, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 5. I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall No 174, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 6. I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall No. 175, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 7. I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall No. 176, on Agreeing to Amendment No. 8. I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I missed several votes on Monday, and I wish to state for the record how I would have voted had I been present: rollcall No. 161—''yes''; rollcall No. 162—''yes.''

THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act. This is the seventh time I have introduced legislation that would grant federal recognition to six Indian tribes in Virginia: the Chickahominy, the Eastern Chickahominy, the Upper Mattaponi, the Rappahannock, the Monacan, and the Nansemond. I am joined by my Virginia colleagues, Reps. BOBBY SCOTT, ROBERT WITTMAN and GERRY CONNOLLY.

Similar measures passed the House and the Senate Indian Affairs Committee during the 110th and 111th Sessions of Congress. Unfortunately, both measures were ultimately defeated when the objections of a few Senators were not overridden.

The impasse in Congress and the demeaning and dysfunctional acknowledgement process at the Bureau of Indian Affairs only compound the grave injustices this legislation seeks to redress and compels me to continue this cause and reintroduce this legislation today. The injustices the Virginia tribes have experienced extend back in time for hundreds of years, back to the establishment of the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown. For the Members of these tribes are the descendants of the great Powhatan Confederacy who greeted the English and provided food and assistance that ensured the settlers' early survival.

Six years ago, America celebrated the 400th anniversary of the settlement of Jamestown.

But it was not a celebration for Native American descendants of Pocahontas, for they have yet to be recognized by our federal government. Unlike most Native American tribes that were officially recognized when they signed peace treaties with the federal government, Virginia's six Native American tribes made their peace with the Kings of England. Most notable among these was the Treaty of 1677 between these tribes and King Charles II. This treaty has been recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia every year for the past 334 years when the Governor accepts tribute from the tribes in a ceremony now celebrated at the Commonwealth Capitol. I had the honor of attending one of what I understand is the longest-celebrated treaty recognition ceremony in the United States.

The forefathers of the tribal leaders who gather on Thanksgiving in Richmond were the first to welcome the English, and during the first few years of settlement, ensured their survival. Had the tribes not assisted those early settlers, they would not have survived. Time has not been kind to the tribes, however. As was the case for most Native American tribes, as the settlement prospered and grew, the tribes suffered. Those who resisted quickly became subdued, were pushed off their historic lands, and, up through much of the 20th Century, were denied full rights as U.S. citizens. Despite their devastating loss of land and population, the Virginia tribes survived, preserving their heritage and their identity. Their story of survival spans four centuries of racial hostility and coercive state and state-sanctioned actions.

The Virginia tribes' history, however, diverges from that of most Native Americans in two unique ways. The first explains why the Virginia tribes were never recognized by the federal government; the second explains why congressional action is needed today. First, by the time the federal government was established in 1789, the Virginia tribes were in no position to seek recognition. They had already lost control of their land, withdrawn into isolated communities and been stripped of most of their rights. Lacking even the rights granted by the English Kings, and our own Bill of Rights, federal recognition was nowhere within their reach.

The second unique circumstance for the Virginia tribes is what they experienced with the destruction of their official records. From the destruction of local courthouses wrought by the Civil War to the 20th Century "paper genocide" perpetrated by the Commonwealth of Virginia, there are gaps in their records which could ultimately invalidate their petitions for recognition that have been filed with the Interior Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs.

With great hypocrisy, Virginia's ruling elite pushed policies that culminated with the enactment of the Racial Integrity Act of 1924. This act directed Commonwealth officials, and zealots like Walter Plecker, to destroy Commonwealth and local courthouse records and reclassify in Orwellian fashion all non-whites as "colored." It targeted Native Americans with a vengeance, denying Native Americans in Virginia their identity.

To call oneself a "Native American" in Virginia was to risk a jail sentence of up to one year. In defiance of the law, members of Virginia's tribes traveled out of state to obtain marriage licenses or to serve their country in wartime. The law remained in effect until it was struck down in federal court in 1967. In that intervening period between 1924 and 1967, Commonwealth officials waged a war to destroy all public and many private records that affirmed the existence of Native Americans in Virginia. Historians have affirmed that no other state compares to Virginia's efforts to eradicate its citizens' Indian identity.

All of Virginia's state-recognized tribes have filed petitions with the Bureau of Acknowledgment seeking federal recognition. But it is a very heavy burden the Virginia tribes will have to overcome, and one fraught with complications that officials from the bureau have acknowledged may never be resolved in their lifetime. The acknowledgment process is already expensive, subject to unreasonable delays, and lacking in dignity. Virginia's paper genocide only further complicates these tribes' quest for federal recognition, making it difficult to furnish corroborating state and official documents and aggravating the injustice already visited upon them. The Bureau of Acknowledgement officials have admitted that the Virginia petitions may not be resolved for generations.

In appreciation of the fact that the issue of gambling and its economic and moral dimensions influence many Members' perspectives on tribal recognition issues, you should be aware that the bill has carried language every year prohibiting these tribes from gaming on their federal lands. This prohibition extends indefinitely, even if Virginia were to one day change course and allow gaming. The tribes find gambling offensive to their moral beliefs. They are seeking federal recognition because it is a matter of justice.

In the name of decency, fairness and humanity, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and bring closure to the centuries of injustice Virginia's Native American tribes have experienced.

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER ELLEFSON

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share these with my House colleagues.

Jennifer Ellefson is a junior at George Ranch High School in Fort Bend County, Texas. Her essay topic is: In your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

Government should be nothing more than a regulatory force. Too often people see the Government as a great power, but the government should only be given the power it is deemed worthy of by the people. That is the principle of popular sovereignty, the people rule. Without that principle, governments lose balance and forget their purpose. Our government's purposes are in protection, business regulation, law enforcement, and medicine among other things. The government's job is not to be a part of your life, but to keep your life from becoming anarchy, and provide ease for certain things. An oppressive form of government is one that is invasive in day to day life; the American government should play scarcely a role in your life outside of organization and providing order. Our police officers are given their power by the people. They are not above us, but they regulate us due to the right we give them through our government, the people's government. Law enforcement ensures that we are not victimized by the masses daily, without the government to regulate our protection, anarchy would ensue, and violence and murder would ravage the land. Business regulation insures that employees cannot be mistreated, and that customers are kept safe through standard requirements of cleanliness and durability. Before the FDA, thousands of people would die a year from food poisoning. While some still slip through the cracks, the government has all but eliminated business corruption at the production and employment levels. Standardized medical procedure has saved millions of lives in the last century; if it were not government regulated there would still be frequent abortions in truck beds and household remedies killing people all over. Now the government is attempting to regulate medicine even further; socialized medicine, in my view, is a must. Part of government regularity is protection; is it not protection to ensure that even a homeless man should not die from a disease because he cannot afford the surgery? Some people say it is invasive, but further taxation for the better of you and all is not an invasion of life, it is a regulation of order. Regulation and facilitation is the government role and nothing further.

PORT OPPORTUNITY, REINVESTMENT AND TRAINING ACT

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. HAHN. Ms. Speaker, as Memorial Day, the unofficial start of summer approaches, students across the country are turning to figuring out how they are going to fill their time. But this summer, many of those students looking for a summer job face an uphill battle.

High teen unemployment continues to cast a shadow over communities struggling to bounce back from the recession. For many teens, summer is a time to find their first jobs and learn their first lessons about making and managing money, building vital professional and personal skills. Unfortunately, the recovery has not reached many of our communities, which impacts these teens as they struggle to find employment to keep themselves out of trouble and maybe bring in a little extra money to ease the burden on their families today, we are diminishing their ability to compete in the workforce tomorrow.

Last summer, the unemployment rate for teenagers in the United States remained intolerably high, at 17.1 percent. The teen unemployment rate is even higher for young African-Americans and Latinos, putting them at a special disadvantage as they try to enter the adult workforce. Just in my community of Compton, the overall unemployment rate jumped to a staggering 20 percent, as schools

let out for the summer and students tried to find summer work.

That is why I have re-introduced the ''Port Opportunity, Reinvestment and Training (PORT) Act'' with my colleague, Chair of the Congressional Urban Caucus and PORTS Caucus member, Congressman CHAKA FATTAH of Pennsylvania. This legislation authorizes the creation of a grant program at ports throughout the country to hire eligible high school students over the summer. This is a win-win for the American economy. Our nation's ports have long been engines of economic growth, and so there is no better place for students to learn the skills they need to compete in today's workforce.

These grants are an investment in the communities that need them most. Not only will these grants put money in the pockets of high school students facing unprecedented levels of unemployment, but they will build a foundation for successful communities and successful adults.

I urge my colleagues to support this crucial investment in our students, our communities, and our economy.

CELEBRATING JOHN AND JEANETTE MASON'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John and Jeanette Mason, who are celebrating their 50th anniversary this month. As John and Jeanette have discovered, the secret to a successful marriage is having a supportive partner. Interestingly enough, this same quality serves as the foundation for strong and vibrant communities. John and Jeanette's commitment not only to one another but also to our community has touched the lives of countless families in Fairfax City and across Northern Virginia, and I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this wonderful couple.

John's public service began with the U.S. Army, where he served for 21 years before retiring as a Colonel. Any longtime resident of Northern Virginia is familiar with the tremendous work done during John's 14-year tenure as the Mayor of the City of Fairfax, where his leadership ensured adoption of the city's ''2020 Plan,'' which became the roadmap for Fairfax City's revitalization efforts. Moreover, John is responsible for spearheading the redevelopment of Old Town Fairfax, including the new City of Fairfax Regional Library that serves as the anchor for the area's redevelopment efforts. John and Jeanette were instrumental in the building of the beautiful Stacy C. Sherwood Community Center in Fairfax City and countless other community projects that have ensured Fairfax remains one of the region's top-rated communities in which to live, work, and raise a family.

I have had the privilege of working closely with John on many of the issues he is most passionate about and dedicated to, including the future of transportation in Northern Virginia. After retiring from the Army, John was tapped by SAIC for his expertise on transportation issues, and with Jeanette's support, John's decision to enter public service once again ensured that Northern Virginia benefitted from his wealth of knowledge on transportation policy. Through John's tireless work on the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board at the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, he became the go-to elected official on regional transportation issues. Over the years, John became a force to be reckoned with. As many can attest, few individuals know more than John does about bus fleets, congestion patterns, Metro, or commuter delays in Northern Virginia.

John's work on the Fairfax County-Fairfax City Interjurisdictional Committee and his belief in vigorous good neighbor policies elevated the relationship between the City and County to new heights. In addition, John worked to strengthen the City's ties with neighboring George Mason University, which would not enjoy the prominence it does today without John's advocacy for a robust relationship between the university and the surrounding community.

More recently, John and Jeanette have made incalculable contributions to Fairfax's local arts community. John has served as the Chairman of the Arts Council of Fairfax County and as the President of the Fairfax Symphony. He currently serves as the President and CEO of the Lorton Workhouse Arts Center, where he oversees all aspects of the art center's planning and operations. He is also the founder and president of Fairfax Spotlight on the Arts, an annual three-week festival that showcases artists in local venues. And of course, many of the region's music patrons are familiar with John and Jeanette's active support of the City of Fairfax Band Association, Fairfax Symphony Orchestra, not to mention many other orchestras across Northern Virginia.

John and Jeanette's marriage is a testament to the durability of a loving relationship, and our community continues to benefit mightily from the local contributions from their partnership. John would happily admit that his many accomplishments would not be possible without the love and support of Jeanette. Her care, love, and support during John's battle with cancer assured his return to vigor, ensuring a healthy retirement spent with their children, John Jr., Joanna, and Jeffrey, and their grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating John and Jeanette Mason on their 50th anniversary and in wishing them many more years of happiness.

IMPROVING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1412, the ''Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2013.'' There are over 800,000 veterans unemployed, or unable to find work in the United States, and the number is rising every year. If our brave men and women are to serve at home and abroad, it is our moral obligation to help ensure they can successfully transition into the workforce. For this reason I support the legislation before us.

H.R. 1412 would extend for one month an expiring provision of law that limits pensions paid to certain veterans who are receiving Medicaid coverage in Medicaid-approved nursing homes. The bill also would modify the conditions for veterans to receive education benefit payments from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for participating in on-the-job training and require VA to enter into agreements with other federal agencies to promote on-the-job training opportunities for veterans.

The Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act will reduce the final OJT/Apprenticeship salary requirements that employers pay of the normal wage from 85% to 75% to encourage employers to offer more OJT/Apprenticeship training for an additional 4 years. The bill also requires other Federal agencies to enter into agreements with the Department of Veterans Affairs to hire veterans using the OJT/Apprenticeship benefit and extends reduced pension benefits for certain veterans in Medicaid funded nursing homes.

If enacted, CBO estimates that, on net, the bill would decrease direct spending by $14 million over the next five years and by $12 million over the next ten years. Because the bill would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. Enacting H.R. 1412 would not affect revenues. In addition, implementing H.R. 1412 would have an insignificant effect on discretionary spending.

Mr. Speaker, instead of returning home to their loving families, friends, and loved ones, 12 percent of veterans—about 1 in 8—are returning home to find unemployment lines. We owe it to these men and women who selflessly served our nation to help them change their condition for the better. The legislation before us, H.R. 1412, is a step in the right direction for veterans across the country and for many of the 35,000 veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars who live in the Houston metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join in me in supporting H.R. 1412, the ''Job Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2013.''

RECOGNIZING NEW MEXICO STATE REPRESENTATIVE NICK SALAZAR

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor New Mexico Rep. Nick Salazar who received the ''Lifetime Achievement Award'' from Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Rep. Salazar is one of the most distinguished members of the New Mexico Legislature, having represented his district, which encompasses Colfax, Mora, Rio Arriba and San Miguel counties, since 1973. Incredibly, Rep. Salazar has worked for Los Alamos National Laboratory for 63 years. In both roles, Rep. Salazar has been an effective leader who has had a profound impact on his community, his state and a thankful nation.

During his distinguished career at LANL, Rep. Salazar was responsible for ensuring that the lab was a responsible and productive

partner to the communities of northern New Mexico. He played a key role in expanding opportunities for research and development, the development of small and minority-owned businesses, technology transfer initiatives, math and science programs, and job training and development. He promoted these programs while advocating for stringent environmental regulations that protected the public. He also served as a member of the Los Alamos National Security Board of Governors.

Rep. Salazar honorably served his country as a Sergeant in the United States Air Force and his community as a County Commissioner from 1964 to 1968.

Rep. Salazar is one of the longest-serving members of the state House of Representatives, having been elected 20 times and serving 40 years. He has been a champion for working class families. Rep. Salazar sponsored legislation to create Northern New Mexico College in Espanola, and led the effort to broaden the mission of the school to allow for four-year degrees. He has also served as chairman of the North Central New Mexico Economic Development District for decades. Rep. Salazar is one of New Mexico's foremost advocates for the state's senior citizens. In 1991, he led the effort to establish the nation's first Indian Area Agency on Aging, and in 2003, he sponsored legislation that created the New Mexico Aging & Long-Term Services Department, elevating the agency to Cabinet-level status.

Rep. Salazar's colleagues in the Legislature have turned to him through the years as a trusted mentor, known for his erudition and his principled approach to the most important issues facing the state. He is a quintessential leader who cares deeply for his family, his community, the Labs and the institution of the New Mexico House of Representatives.

Rep. Nick Salazar is a resident of San Juan Pueblo. He is married to Maria Ana and has three adult children, Yvonne, Earl and Gregory.

IN HONOR OF THE LITERACY COUNCIL OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to extend my heartiest congratulations to the Literacy Council of Montgomery County, Maryland ("LCMC") on its 50th anniversary.

In 1963, Elizabeth Kilgore, a county resident who recognized serious literacy deficiencies in her community, began working with community leaders, educators, clergy, and other concerned residents to develop an organizational plan and charter to create the LCMC. Utilizing only volunteers, and because 96% of Montgomery County residents spoke English as their first language, LCMC initially focused on improving the literacy skills of native-born citizens. In 1967, LCMC offered its first English as a Second Language (ESL) tutoring program to serve the growing immigrant population in Montgomery County.

Fifty years later, LCMC, based in Rockville, Maryland, has developed into an organization of more than 800 volunteers, teachers and staff. Now with 12 full- and part-time staff members, LCMC's programs include intensive classroom-based instruction taught by professional instructors, conversation classes, independent computer-based instruction, short-term "life-skills" classes, an online GED preparation program, and a workplace literacy program. In its 50 years of service, LCMC has provided literacy instruction to approximately 15,000 adult learners and has trained nearly 8,700 volunteer tutors. Its programs currently serve 1,500 adults each year.

In Montgomery County, where approximately 40% of the current population speaks a language other than English at home, the success of this program is critical. Nearly 15% of Montgomery County residents over age 5 speak English less than "very well." Twelve percent of children in Montgomery County public schools are enrolled in ESOL classes and are likely to have parents with limited English proficiency. LCMC also serves native-born adults who are able to speak English, but are unable to read and/or write.

Thanks to LCMC's outstanding work, many members of our community have been able to overcome the challenges posed by illiteracy, allowing them to participate more fully in the community and to improve their quality of life. In short, LCMC has transformed the lives of thousands of adults and families.

I am proud that LCMC is located in Maryland's Eighth Congressional District, and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating LCMC on its extraordinary accomplishments and extend to it all good wishes for continued success.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL STEVEN RUDDER

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, Brigadier General Steven Rudder is a man for whom I have great respect. During his time in Washington serving the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, I have gotten to know BGen Rudder in his efforts to work with me to clear the names of two Marine pilots who were killed in a V22 crash.

Because of this issue, I have had many opportunities to meet with BGen Rudder over the past two years and have found him to be a man of great integrity and reason. He is a man who does all he can to help someone else.

He has served as a knowledgeable advisor to me and my staff and I believe our country is better protected because of leaders like him.

I will always be grateful for BGen Rudder's assistance and I wish him and his family all the best in their move to Japan. I know he will continue to serve our country with honor.

May God continue to bless the Rudder family, our men and women in uniform, and the United States of America.

IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF MARINE PFC OSCAR A. MARTINEZ AND NAVY MASTER-AT-ARMS 2ND CLASS MICHAEL J. BRODSKY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two American heroes, Marine PFC Oscar A. Martinez and Navy Master-at-Arms 2nd Class (MA2) Michael J. Brodsky, who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their country. They are the first residents of the City of North Lauderdale, Florida to be killed while serving in the Armed Forces since it was founded 50 years ago, and I am truly honored to have had the privilege to represent them in Congress. My heartfelt condolences go out to the families and friends of these two young men for their loss.

PFC Oscar Martinez was born in Dallas in 1984. Originally from El Salvador, his family settled in South Florida in 1987. Oscar's mother died when he was a child, leaving him and his three younger siblings to be raised by his uncle, Rene Martinez, and the children's grandmother, Maria Marta Mendez. According to his sister, Morena Martinez, Oscar dreamt of being a Marine ever since he was little, and was determined to be the best at what he did.

Oscar joined the Marine Corps in 2003, shortly before graduating from North Lauderdale High School, and was assigned to the I Marine Expeditionary Force based out of Camp Pendleton, California. Sadly, he was killed on October 12, 2004 when a mortar fired by insurgents exploded at a U.S. base where he was eating with his unit in the Iraqi province of Anbar. He was just 19 years old.

MA2 Michael Brodsky, of Tamarac, Florida, enlisted in the Navy in 2001, following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. He was stationed in the security department at Sasebo Naval Base in Japan from 2002 to 2005 before earning the award of Distinguished Graduate from the Military Working Dog Course at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas. Mike also served at Naval Support Activity (NAS) Bahrain. In December 2010, he was assigned to Navy Region Southwest Security Detachment in San Diego, California.

On July 7, 2012, Mike was on patrol in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom when his unit started taking fire. He rushed to protect his dog Jackson by putting him back in the truck as he was trained to do, and then returned to the fight. It was then that Mike stepped on the pressure plate of an improvised explosive device (IED), and the blast took both his legs. In critical condition and unresponsive, he was flown to Germany where doctors tried to save him. On the morning of July 17, 2012, Mike was awarded the Purple Heart. Tragically, the 33-year-old died from his injuries on July 21, 2012 at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany. He is survived by his daughter Natalia, parents Debra and Steven Brodsky, younger brother Corey Brodsky, and grandfather Stanley Brodsky.

Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 2013, the City of North Lauderdale will be dedicating a fallen soldier statue in memory of PFC Oscar Martinez and MA2 Michael Brodsky, who gave

their lives in order to protect freedom and democracy around the world. As we recently observed the 10th anniversary of the Iraq War and over 11 years of U.S. involvement in Afghanistan, we must remember all those who have fallen in service to our great country. Our nation owes them, as well as the millions of brave servicemen and women who have served and continue to serve, an eternal debt of gratitude. Their service will not be forgotten.

HONORING DEBBIE ZELMAN

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Debbie Zelman, a truly inspiring woman from South Florida. Five years ago, Ms. Zelman was a successful attorney, wife, and mother, when she heard those life shattering words that she was diagnosed with Stage IV stomach cancer. The doctor gave her only a 50/50 chance to live after one year and only a four percent chance to live after five years. It's been four years now, and I am proud to say Debbie is with us today, beating the odds every day.

Debbie is not alone in her struggle against stomach cancer. This terrible disease is the most common form of cancer in the world. Every year in America, 21,000 Americans are diagnosed with stomach cancer, and it is the second leading cause of cancer deaths for women in this country.

After receiving her diagnosis, Debbie was frustrated to find little information on her disease and fewer options for treatment and support. Fortunately, she persevered and got treatment. Today, she is not only a cancer survivor, she is an advocate.

In 2009, she founded Debbie's Dream Foundation: Curing Stomach Cancer, which provides a voice for the victims of this under-recognized and under-funded disease. Initially working in South Florida, Debbie's Dream has grown into a national organization that provides support and awareness for patients and their families. During their 4th Annual Night of Laugher, Debbie's Dream raised $21,000 for stomach cancer research.

In honor of her inspiring fight against cancer and her tireless advocacy, I am pleased to recognize Debbie Zelman and wish her continued success in this important endeavor.

RECOGNIZING MS. SHIRLEY ISON-NEWSOME

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Shirley Ison-Newsome, the departing Assistant Superintendent of the Dallas Independent School District. Ms. Ison-Newsome will retire after after 37 years of dedicated service.

Ms. Ison-Newsome has a long history as an educator and administrator within the Dallas ISD. She first began her work with the Dallas ISD during the 1970s, helping to lead further efforts to desegregate schools. Ms. Ison-Newsome's role within the Dallas ISD evolved quickly, as she assumed the role of principal of the Harry Stone Middle School, and then later as Area 2 Superintendent.

Ms. Ison-Newsome has contributed substantially to building Dallas ISD's academic program. She has frequently been recognized by her colleagues and outside organizations for her extensive work in education.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Ms. Ison-Newsome for devoting much of her life to the students of the Dallas ISD. I wish Ms. Ison-Newsome well in her retirement and her future endeavors. Public education is absolutely critical for our future generations, and having devoted educators as part of the public education system is an asset for the sound development of our youth.

HONORING FAITH ORAKWUE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share these with my House colleagues.

Faith Orakwue is a senior at Lamar Consolidated High School in Fort Bend County, Texas. Her essay topic is: In your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

What role should the government play in our lives? This is an issue that I have often mulled over during my years as a young adult, and, at different times, I offer varying answers regarding this particular issue.

The American government was an institution created by the people and for the people, so it seems logical that the people should maintain ultimate control over the government, right? However, the Articles of Confederation helped to disprove this theory quite a bit—without the strong backing of a central government (ultimately acting as a backbone), the states acted according to their whim and the nation was weak and in ultimate disarray. The Constitution later came in and created a stronger central government, which helped to establish a more cohesive structure to the nation.

The point I am trying to make is that government should be resilient and diligently involved in the welfare of its people in order to create a nation that works to promote the well-being of all of its people. In order to do this, the government has to be involved, and that means being present in all issues, even personal and moral ones. The thing is, once a person is sworn into a public office, they are there to promote the well-being and advancement of the American people. In order to do this, government has to temporarily put aside their own views and beliefs and truly work towards the choice that is best for the American people. For example, had Lyndon B. Johnson listened to other Southern governors who despised African Americans and allowed their thinking to cloud his judgment, African Americans may not have received their rights until much later in history, because, at that time, integration was not a favorable idea/belief. Or, if the government had not ruled in Roe v. Wade, women would not have total control over their bodies. And, although I may not necessarily agree with abortion, it is definitely not in my place to dictate whether a woman should have a baby or not, and it is not in the government's place to tell the American people they cannot do something (that does not hurt others) simply because it goes against their moral beliefs.

The United States is an amalgamation of different cultures, viewpoints, and ideas that works to create the nation we call America. And, in order to preserve that order and openness that we are famous for, the government has to be both strong and involved in the issues that concern us. However, in order to be truly effective, a country's government has to be both strong and unbiased, an institution truly working for the betterment of its people.

THE CLAIMS LICENSING ADVANCEMENT FOR INTERSTATE MATTERS ACT (CLAIM) ACT

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Claims Licensing Advancement for Interstate Matters Act, known as the CLAIM Act to help consumers save mil1ions of dollars in insurance costs and create more jobs.

Under current law, independent claims adjusters face a hodgepodge of inconsistent state regulations that only serve to delay the prompt adjustment of claims for natural disasters, car accident victims, and other tragedies in life. Independent claims adjusters must take a license examination in each state in which they work. This requires adjusters to take time off from their job and travel to each state in which they seek a license. This is a costly burden on the claims adjusters, the companies that employ them, and ultimately, the consumer. Sadly, it is the consumer who currently pays for these costs in higher premiums.

Today, it is my pleasure to re-introduce a bill that would end this costly burden. The CLAIM Act would lead to a process that would provide independent claims adjusters licensing reciprocity so their home-state license is valid in any other state.

The CLAIM Act would also provide specific relief during a natural disaster. In areas designated by the President of the United States as a "Disaster Area," independent claims adjusters who meet certain criteria would be eligible to adjust claims for losses notwithstanding the state where the adjuster is licensed.

To be clear, the CLAIM Act does not create a new federal law and does not "federalize" the insurance industry. The CLAIM Act respects states' rights to continue to regulate insurance. Rather, the CLAIM Act would urge the National Association of Insurance Commissioners to adopt a model licensing standard for state regulation for independent claims adjusters that each individual state would adopt. The CLAIM Act would make sure that

each state keeps its independence to adopt rules as they see fit and recognizes that state insurance regulators are best situated to address insurance licensing standards.

In the 112th Congress, I sponsored H.R. 6415, the CLAIM Act, a bill very similar to what I am introducing today. After working with stakeholders, I added a new Section 4 that clarifies the CLAIM Act will not interfere with State insurance regulation. I made this change at the request of State insurance regulators who felt the previous bill did not go far enough to protect State insurance regulation. Mr. Speaker, I am confident the CLAIM Act will further protect the State insurance industry and regulation.

The goal of this bill is to streamline the claims adjustment process so that individual claims adjusters can respond in the fastest possible and most cost-effective manner possible. I look forward to further discussing the issues of uniformity and reciprocity and the CLAIM Act as we move forward in the Committee process.

AGAINST CUTS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN THE 2013 FARM BILL

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today appalled by proposed cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in the 2013 Farm Bill. This program provides crucial support to families in New Mexico and across the country that continue to struggle to make ends meet.

SNAP benefits help many households lift themselves out of poverty, and prevent families from falling even deeper into poverty. With SNAP benefits already averaging less than $1.50 per person per meal, any reduction in a family's monthly benefits or eligibility would be devastating. We cannot keep expecting poor working families and senior citizens to shoulder the burden of misguided deficit reduction.

In my state, over 78 percent of SNAP participants are in families with children. Instead of taking food out of the mouths of the one in five New Mexicans who depend on these benefits for their basic nutrition and economic security, Congress should focus on creating jobs that will grow the economy. New Mexico's farmers and ranchers deserve a Farm Bill, but it's wrong to harm our children, seniors and veterans in the process.

I urge the House of Representatives to oppose any short-sighted cuts to this vitally important program.

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AGENTS, OFFICERS, AND COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the mission of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is broad and diverse. The men and women of DHS protect our borders and modes of transportation; they guard our waterways; they protect U.S. and foreign leaders; they prepare for and respond to disasters; they manage our immigration process; and, they defend us against cyberattack. DHS employees provide selfless service to their nation and they do so with honor and distinction under an ever-present threat.

I would like to pay tribute to the Department of Homeland Security's agents, officers, and Coast Guard personnel who lost their lives in the service of our nation in 2012. I would like to enter into the record the names of all sixty-one courageous men and women of DHS who have died in the line of duty since the Department's inception in 2003. We owe them more than a tribute on this day, but our gratitude begins with that.

LORENZO R. GOMEZ, Immigration Enforcement Agent, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, El Paso, Texas, End of Watch: November 8, 2003.

JAMES P. EPLING, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: December 16, 2003.

NATHAN B. BRUCKENTHAL, Damage Controlman Third Class (E–4), U.S. Coast Guard, Iraq, End of Watch: April 24, 2004.

TRAVIS W. ATTAWAY, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Harlingen, Texas, End of Watch: September 19, 2004.

JEREMY M. WILSON, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Harlingen, Texas, End of Watch: September 19, 2004.

PHILIP C. LEBID, Special Agent, U.S. Secret Service, Tampa, Florida, End of Watch: November 22, 2004.

GEORGE B. DeBATES, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Casa Grande, Arizona, End of Watch: December 19, 2004.

DAVID G. WILHELM, Assistant Special Agent in Charge, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Atlanta, Georgia, End of Watch: March 11, 2005.

CHRISTOPHER J. SMITH, Assistant to the Special Agent in Charge, U.S. Secret Service, Atlanta, Georgia, End of Watch: March 25, 2005.

NICHOLAS D. GREENIG, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Tucson, Arizona, End of Watch: March 14, 2006.

JESSICA E. HILL, Lieutenant (0–3), U.S. Coast Guard, Arctic Ocean, End of Watch: August 17, 2006.

STEVEN DUQUE, Boatswain's Mate Second Class (E–5), U.S. Coast Guard, Arctic Ocean, End of Watch: August 17, 2006.

DAVID N. WEBB, Senior Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Ajo, Arizona, End of Watch: November 3, 2006.

RAMON NEVAREZ, JR., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Lordsburg, New Mexico, End of Watch: March 15, 2007.

DAVID J. TOURSCHER, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Lordsburg, New Mexico, End of Watch: March 16, 2007.

RONALD A. GILL, JR., Port Security Specialist Third Class U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, Puget Sound, Washington, End of Watch: March 25, 2007.

CLINTON B. THRASHER, Air Interdiction Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, McAllen, Texas, End of Watch: April 25, 2007.

RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Indio, California, End of Watch: May 11, 2007.

ROBERT F. SMITH, Air Interdiction Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, El Paso, Texas, End of Watch: May 22, 2007.

ERIC N. CABRAL, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Boulevard, California, End of Watch: July 26, 2007.

JULIO E. BARAY, Air Interdiction Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, El Paso, Texas, End of Watch: September 24, 2007.

LUIS AGUILAR, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: January 19, 2008.

JAROD C. DITTMAN, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, San Diego, California, End of Watch: March 30, 2008.

THOMAS G. NELSON, Captain (0–6) U.S. Coast Guard, Oahu, Hawaii, End of Watch: September 4, 2008.

ANDREW C. WISCHMEIER, Lieutenant Commander (0–4), U.S. Coast Guard, Oahu, Hawaii, End of Watch: September 4, 2008.

DAVID L. SKIMIN, Aviation Survival Technician First Class (E–6), U.S. Coast Guard, Oahu, Hawaii, End of Watch: September 4, 2008.

JOSHUA W. NICHOLS, Aviation Maintenance Technician First Class (E–6), U.S. Coast Guard, Oahu, Hawaii, End of Watch: September 4, 2008.

NATHANIEL A. AFOLAYAN, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Artesia, New Mexico, End of Watch: May 1, 2009.

CRUZ C. McGUIRE, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Del Rio, Texas, End of Watch: May 21, 2009.

ROBERT W. ROSAS, JR., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Campo, California, End of Watch: July 23, 2009.

CHE J. BARNES, Lieutenant Commander (0–4), U.S. Coast Guard, San Clement Island, California, End of Watch: October 29, 2009.

ADAM W. BRYANT, Lieutenant (0–3), U.S. Coast Guard, San Clement Island, California, End of Watch: October 29, 2009.

JOHN F. SEIDMAN, Aviation Maintenance Technician Chief Petty Officer, U.S. Coast Guard, San Clement Island, California, End of Watch: October 29, 2009.

CARL P. GRIGONIS, Avionics Electrical Technician Second Class (E–5), U.S. Coast Guard, San Clement Island, California, End of Watch: October 29, 2009.

MONICA L. BEACHAM, Avionics Electrical Technician Second Class (E–5), U.S. Coast Guard, San Clement Island, California, End of Watch: October 29, 2009.

DANNY R. KREDER, JR., Aviation Maintenance Technician Third Class (E–4), U.S. Coast Guard, San Clement Island, California, End of Watch: October 29, 2009.

JASON S. MOLETZSKY, Aviation Maintenance Technician Third Class (E–4), U.S. Coast Guard, San Clement Island, California, End of Watch: October 29, 2009.

MARK F. VAN DOREN, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Falfurrias, Texas, End of Watch: May 24, 2010.

SEAN D. KRUEGER, Lieutenant (0–3), U.S. Coast Guard, La Push, Washington, End of Watch: July 7, 2010.

ADAM C. HOKE, Aviation Maintenance Technician First Class (E–6), U.S. Coast Guard, La Push, Washington, End of Watch: July 7, 2010.

BRETT M. BANKS, Aviation Maintenance Technician Second Class (E–5), U.S. Coast Guard, La Push, Washington, End of Watch: July 7, 2010.

CHARLES F. COLLINS II, CBP Officer, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Anchorage, Alaska, End of Watch: August 15, 2010.

MICHAEL V. GALLAGHER, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Casa Grande, Arizona, End of Watch: September 2, 2010.

JOHN R. ZYKAS, CBP Officer, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, San Diego, California, End of Watch: September 8, 2010.

SHAUN M. LIN, Maritime Enforcement Specialist Third Class (E–4), U.S. Coast Guard, Portsmouth, Virginia, End of Watch: October 13, 2010.

BRIAN A. TERRY, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Naco Cochise, Arizona, End of Watch: December 15, 2010.

JAIME J. ZAPATA, Special Agent, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Mexico City, Mexico, End of Watch: February 15, 2011.

HECTOR R. CLARK, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: May 12, 2011.

EDUARDO ROJAS, JR., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Yuma, Arizona, End of Watch: May 12, 2011.

DALE T. TAYLOR, Lieutenant Commander (0–4), U.S. Coast Guard, Point Clear, Alabama, End of Watch: February 28, 2012.

THOMAS J. CAMERON, Lieutenant Junior Grade (0–2), U.S. Coast Guard, Point Clear, Alabama, End of Watch: February 28, 2012.

FERNANDO JORGE, Aviation Survival Technician (E–7), U.S. Coast Guard, Point Clear, Alabama, End of Watch: February 28, 2012.

ANDREW W. KNIGHT, Avionics Electrical Technician (E–4), U.S. Coast Guard, Point Clear, Alabama, End of Watch: February 28, 2012.

JAMES A. HOPKINS, Electronics Technician (E–6), U.S. Coast Guard, Kodiak, Alaska, End of Watch: April 12, 2012.

RICHARD W. BELISLE, Civilian Employee (WG–8), Chief Boatswain's Mate (E–7), Retired, U.S. Coast Guard, Kodiak, Alaska, End of Watch: April 12, 2012.

LEOPOLDO CAVAZOS, JR., Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Fort Hancock, Texas, End of Watch: July 6, 2012.

JAMES R. DOMINGUEZ, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Cline, Texas, End of Watch: July 19, 2012.

JEFFREY RAMIREZ, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Laredo, Texas, September 15, 2012.

NICHOLAS J. IVIE, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Bisbee, Arizona, October 2, 2012.

DAVID R. DELANEY, Border Patrol Agent, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Big Bend National Park, Texas, November 2, 2012.

TERRELL E. HORNE III, Senior Chief Boatswain's Mate (E–8), U.S. Coast Guard, Marina Del Ray, California, End of Watch: December 2, 2012.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE CITY OF CARROLLTON, TEXAS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize and celebrate the centennial of the City of Carrollton, Texas, which sits fourteen miles north of downtown Dallas at the intersection of Collin, Dallas, and Denton counties. The rich history of Carrollton is a quintessential American story.

Long before it was the city that it is today, the region around Carrollton was home to Wichita natives as well as the French and Spanish who sought to claim east Texas. The modern history of Carrollton began in the 1840s when Sam Houston, president of the Republic of Texas, made an agreement with the Peters Colony Company to offer free land to new settlers. The Larner, Myers, Nix, Witt, Lee, Rainwater, and Perry families were among the original founders who came to the area—some from Carrollton, Illinois, from which Carrollton, Texas, may have gotten its name. Families from England, including Jackson, Furneaux, Morgan, and Rowe also settled in the area.

In 1846, the first Baptist church was established in Carrollton and ten years later the Union Baptist Church opened the first community school. Small homes and businesses began to grow in this rural environment and in 1878 the railroad arrived, with the Dallas and Wichita line being the first of three that would eventually intersect and form a hub in the community. That same year, on May 16, Carrollton's first Post Office opened, giving the unincorporated town its name. Built on grain and gravel industries, Carrollton had a population of 150 by 1885 and the town square began to take shape in 1901 after land purchases by George and J.S. Myers.

The City of Carrollton was incorporated one hundred years ago, on June 14, 1913, by a vote of 52 to 23. The City Council was elected the next month and William Forest Vinson was elected as the first Mayor, though he actually declined to serve and the first mayorship was held by Junius Tribble "J.T." Rhoton. In the following decades, Carrollton would grow into a thriving and modern city. Yet a simple gazebo, built in 1921, would become the landmark and centerpiece of the town square. In the 1920s, a volunteer fire department was established and the police department followed by the 1940s. Bringing a distinct attitude to the area around that time was "Colonel" C.W. Josey, an oilman who bought expansive land in Carrollton on which he hosted annual rodeos as well as elaborate parties. Carrollton was also the first city in Dallas County to integrate its schools, in 1963.

Carrollton has truly blossomed into a prosperous and exemplary city. From a population of 1,610 in 1950, it has now grown to over 121,150 residents, with the most rapid growth occurring in the 1970s and 1980s. The city features thirty-five schools, two libraries, the Baylor Medical Center hospital which covers 36 specialties, two other long-term acute care hospitals, and over 1,200 acres of park land. True to the railroad heritage that first brought new life to Carrollton, the city is now connected to the DART commuter system. Landmarks today include the Plaza Theater and the A.W. Perry Homestead Museum. Carrollton's vibrant success is evident in its strong education system and quality of life. The city has been ranked twelfth in Forbes Magazine's "America's 25 Best Places to Move", as well as fifteenth in MONEY Magazine's "Best Places to Live" in 2008. Just this month, Carrollton was also named one of the top ten "Best Texas Cities for Young Families" by a financial website, based on its public education, affordability, and opportunity for growth.

I am proud to say that the Marchant family has been an important part of Carrollton's story. It was my privilege to serve on the city council for four years and then as Mayor from 1984 to 1986. Ronnie Marchant was a member of the city council for several years. The present Mayor is Matthew Marchant, who also served several terms on the city council and as Mayor Pro Tempore. Nothing in those roles, however, can compare to the character and qualities that the people of Carrollton have brought to it for over a century and that will propel it into the future.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the City of Carrollton, Texas.

HONORING MINNESOTA STATE REPRESENTATIVE KAREN CLARK

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Minnesota State Representative Karen Clark. Representative Clark grew up on a small farm in southwest Minnesota. She moved to South Minneapolis in 1967 and was elected to the Minnesota House of Representatives in 1980. She is the longest-serving openly gay state legislator in the country.

Representative Clark has long worked for the civil rights of all Americans, including LGBT Americans. She led the effort to add sexual orientation to the categories protected by the Minnesota Human Rights Act of 1993. The law now bans discrimination based on sexual orientation in employment, housing, public services, public accommodations, education, credit, and business contracting. In addition, the law defines sexual orientation broadly to include gender identity, providing important protections for transgendered Minnesotans. Representative Clark has also sponsored successful legislative initiatives to strengthen enforcement of hate crime laws in Minnesota. Her efforts on behalf of LGBT Minnesotans have earned Representative Clark numerous awards, including the Minneapolis Commission on Human Rights' first Martin Luther King Award, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force's Leadership Award for antiviolence legislation, and the International Network of Gay & Lesbian Officials' Founding Member Service Award.

Representative Clark's work for LGBT rights has culminated in the passage of the Minnesota Freedom to Marry bill that will legalize same-sex marriage in Minnesota. Representative Clark was the chief author of this historic legislation and helped shepherd it through the Minnesota House of Representatives, where it passed by a vote of 75 to 59 on May 9, 2013. In a public ceremony on May 14, 2013, Governor Mark Dayton signed the bill into law, legalizing same-sex marriage for all Minnesotans. For her decades-long fight for LGBT equality, the Obama Administration rightly honored Representative Clark as a Harvey Milk Champion of Change.

Representative Clark makes Minnesotans proud. I urge this Congress to recognize her extraordinary efforts on behalf of the rights and freedoms of all Minnesotans and Americans.

IN HONOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA'S GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Central Florida on the occasion of its golden anniversary. Located in Florida's 7th Congressional District, UCF is one of America's great education institutions.

Over the past 50 years, UCF's campus has grown from what was once a commuter school with limited academic programs to today having nearly 60,000 undergraduate and graduate students and over 10,000 faculty and staff on 12 campuses spread across the vast footprint of central Florida. Through the tireless efforts of its first University President, Dr. Charles M. Millican to its current President Dr. John C. Hitt, UCF has become the second largest university in the United States. Today's student body is composed of some of brightest minds from Florida, the Nation, and around the world while assembling some of the finest faculty and senior staff professionals in the country. Under the direction of Dr. Hitt, UCF has achieved high admission standards, dramatically increased research funding, built new state of the art facilities and established significant partnerships with major research institutions. The campus now features an on-campus stadium, indoor sports arena, increased and modern campus housing and the impressive development of the UCF College of Medicine at Lake Nona. UCF has been named one of the Nation's top 5 ''up-and-coming'' schools according to U.S. News and World Report while advancing in the annual overall best colleges rankings released each year.

UCF has become a national leader in research with an outstanding academic reputation. Its regional assets include a collaboration of military commands, advanced simulation research coupled with the strength of UCF's renowned Institute for Simulation and Training. Further boasting its commitment to high-tech research, UCF is home to CREOL, The College of Optics & Photonics, a world-renowned graduate college for optical science and engineering education. UCF is also nationally recognized as having the top hospitality management program in the country, residing on the Rosen College campus in the heart of Orlando's entertainment and tourist district.

I join my Florida colleagues and Members of Congress in extending congratulations to the University of Central Florida on reaching this important milestone. I have watched with pride the positive growth and impact of this great institution of higher learning. Central Florida, the State and Nation are richer for the investable contributions of its students, faculty and staff, and outstanding graduates. Looking back over these past 50 years with excitement for the next 50, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to extend my congratulations to UCF and join others in saying: Go Knights!

RECOGNIZING MICHELLE & GIL TRENUM AND THE 3RD ANNUAL TOM McHALE MEMORIAL

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Michelle and Gil Trenum on receiving the Sports Legacy Institute's, SLI, Legacy Award for their role in improving programs for concussion management in Prince William County, Virginia. I also commend SLI on the occasion of its 3rd Annual Tom McHale Memorial for its commitment to improving the prevention and treatment of concussions.

The Sports Legacy Institute is a non-profit organization that uses medical research, treatment, education and prevention to minimize the threat of concussions. Each year the Sports Legacy Institute sponsors the Tom McHale Memorial to benefit its efforts to lower the risks and end the tragic effects of brain trauma. Tom McHale was a collegiate and professional football player as well as a successful business owner. McHale tragically died at the age of 45 and later became the sixth former NFL player diagnosed with Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy, CTE. CTE is a degenerative brain disease linked to a history of concussions and head injuries.

Michelle and Gil Trenum have championed concussion management and CTE education within the Prince William County Public Schools. The Trenums became advocates for more comprehensive concussion education after losing their own son, Austin, to the effects of multiple concussions and CTE. In 2010, Austin was a mature, vibrant, charismatic 17–year-old student at Brentsville District High School. Everyone who knew Austin says that he loved his family, his friends, and football. He played fullback and linebacker on his high school varsity football team. After Austin's untimely death in September of 2010, his parents donated his brain to Boston University, where doctors discovered injuries consistent with CTE.

Since then, Gil, a representative on the Prince William County School Board, along with his wife, Michelle, have pushed for urgent comprehensive changes to the parent and student concussion education laws. As a result of their advocacy, Prince William County Schools implemented concussion education policies an entire year earlier than originally required by the state. Concussion education in Prince William County includes a mandatory one-hour seminar for students trying out for sports and their parents. The policy also has strict return-to-play guidelines and thorough concussion education for school athletic trainers.

I commend the Trenums for transforming their grief into an opportunity to achieve systemic changes that will help local athletes, coaches, and parents make better decisions concerning concussion management.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our appreciation to Michelle and Gil Trenum for making sports safer for our children. The Sports Legacy Institute chose deserving recipients for its Legacy Award. The Trenums have proven to be passionate and effective advocates on behalf of concussion prevention and treatment.

HONORING THE AMERICAN MUSLIM ALLIANCE OF FLORIDA

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the American Muslim Alliance of Florida. This organization does excellent work for so many people around the State.

Foremost among those is its annual scholarship dinner for graduating high school seniors. Now in its sixth year, the scholarship program received applications from 138 students at 56 high schools across Florida, and will present ten winners with an award on June 1, 2013.

Past awardees have enrolled in some of America's most prestigious colleges and universities, as well as continued to excel in their chosen fields of study.

I am very proud of the Alliance, and am privileged to have so many of its members live in my Congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize the American Muslim Alliance, and express my most sincere gratitude for all that they do in our community. I also want to congratulate this year's winners, and wish them much success in their future endeavors.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

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 $16,734,032,974,210.27. We've added $6,107,155,925,297.19 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING EVAN VOSS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share these with my House colleagues.

Evan Voss is a junior at Pearland High School in Brazoria County, Texas. His essay topic is: In your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

A SOCIAL CONTRACT

At the time when the U.S. government was created, the Framers of the Constitution generally believed that all men, though created equal, were naturally greedy and selfish, and that without proper leadership or guidance, the world would be wrought with anarchy and chaos. The political philosopher.

Thomas Hobbes best demonstrated the views of western government officials at the time when he wrote that in its natural state, mankind would instigate a ''war of all against all'', where man would live forever in fear of death, a solitary, isolated, and animalistic life. This being said, the only way to protect mankind from itself was through social contract and the creation of governing body. This body would protect its citizens and in return, its citizens would give up several of their natural rights. This was the original function of the federal government.

This original purpose of the government is the true purpose of the government, that is to say that to keep the social contract established between the governing and the governed valid, the federal government must protect its citizens. This desire to protect, however, has, in recent times, changed the government into an overbearing figure. It has been called ''Big Brother'' for a reason, and, although it does fulfill its end of the social contract, it is to the degradation of the people. Yes, the people agreed to sacrifice several of their natural liberties to be secure, but now, it seems that instead of protection from themselves, the citizenry of the United States require guard against the United States itself The interference of the government in individual personal affairs has led to growing mistrust among the people towards the very thing that originally protected them.

To resolve this issue, the government must simply return to its foundation, its core. In doing so, the people will feel that the social contract conceived between themselves and their protector has been honored and is valid. Because, inevitably, a well liked and well perceived national government holds more power than that of one that is thought to be dishonest and a threat to the very lives it is obligated to protect.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 17, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3791–S3886

Measures Introduced: Fifty-six bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1028–1083, S. Res. 153–158, and S. Con. Res. 17. **Pages S3843–45**

Measures Passed:

Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 129, recognizing the significance of May 2013 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S3878**

Reid (for Hirono) Amendment No. 1143, to amend the preamble. **Page S3878**

Authorizing Production of Records: Senate agreed to S. Res. 158, to authorize the production of records by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. **Page S3878**

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 17, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives. **Pages S3878–79**

Measures Considered:

Farm Bill—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S3797–S3809, S3816–26

Adopted:

By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. 138), Hagan Amendment No. 1031, to authorize the use of the insurance fund to reduce fraud and maintain program integrity in the crop insurance program.

Pages S3817, S3819–20

By 59 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 139), Durbin/Coburn Amendment No. 953, to limit the amount of premium subsidy provided by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on behalf of any person or legal entity with an average adjusted gross income in excess of $750,000, with a delayed application of the limitation until completion of a study on the effects of the limitation. **Pages S3817–19, S3820**

Rejected:

By 27 yeas to 71 nays (Vote No 135), Sanders/Begich Amendment No. 965, to permit States to require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale have a label on indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Page S3797**

By 44 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 137), Feinstein/McCain Amendment No. 923, to prohibit the payment by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation of any portion of the premium for a policy or plan of insurance for tobacco. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.)

Pages S3805–09, S3816–17

Pending:

Stabenow (for Leahy) Amendment No. 998, to establish a pilot program for gigabit Internet projects in rural areas. **Page S3797**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the following amendments be in order: Moran Amendment No. 987; and Coons/Johanns Amendment No. 1079; that at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, June 3, 2013, Senate vote on or in relation to the two amendments in the order listed; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to either amendment prior to the votes; and that there be two minutes equally divided between the votes.

Pages S3825–26

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 4:00 p.m., on Monday, June 3, 2013, Senate resume consideration of the bill. **Page S3879**

Appointments:

Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Republican Leader, pursuant to Public Law 93–415, as amended by Public Law 102–586, announced the appointment of the following individual to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: The Honorable Maura Corrigan of Michigan, vice Steven Jones. **Page S3879**

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that from Friday, May 24, 2013 through Monday, June 3, 2013, Senators Levin and Rockefeller be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions. **Page S3879**

Authority for Committees—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Tuesday, May 28, 2013, from 10:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon. **Page S3879**

Authorizing Leadership to Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President Pro Tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **Page S3879**

Pro Forma—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, and convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, May 24, 2013 at 12:30 p.m.; Tuesday, May 28, 2013 at 12 p.m.; and Friday, May 31, 2013 at 12 p.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, May 31, 2013, until 2 p.m., on Monday, June 3, 2013, unless the Senate receives a message from the House of Representatives that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 17, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives, and that if the Senate receives such a message, the Senate adjourn until 2 p.m., on Monday, June 3, 2013. **Page S3879**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. EX. 136), Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. **Pages S3809–16, S3884–86**

Mark A. Barnett, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

Claire R. Kelly, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

Deborah Kay Jones, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador to Libya.

James Knight, of Alabama, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad.

Michael Kenny O'Keefe, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Robert D. Okun, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

4 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

110 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

30 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S3875–78, S3884–86**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Landya B. McCafferty, of New Hampshire, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire.

Brian Morris, of Montana, to be United States District Judge for the District of Montana.

Susan P. Watters, of Montana, to be United States District Judge for the District of Montana.

Zachary Thomas Fardon, of Illinois, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of four years.

Kara Marlene Stein, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2017.

Michael Sean Piwowar, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2018.

Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2011.

James F. Entwistle, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of

the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador.

Victoria Nuland, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (European and Eurasian Affairs).

Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Communications and Information Policy in the Bureau of Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs and U.S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy.

William Ira Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

Lafe E. Solomon, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2018.

Daniel M. Tangherlini, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of General Services.

Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2016.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

3 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, and Navy. **Pages S3879–84**

Messages from the House: **Page S3838**

Measures Referred: **Page S3838**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S3838**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3838–43**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3843**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3845–47**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3847–66**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3836–38**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S3866**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3874**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—139) **Pages S3797, S3815–16, S3816–17, S3819–20, S3820**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:33 p.m., until 12:30 p.m. on Friday, May 24, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3879.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGENCIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for various agencies within the Department of Agriculture, after receiving testimony from Darci Vetter, Acting Under Secretary, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Ann Mills, Acting Under Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, Doug O'Brien, Acting Under Secretary, Rural Development, and Michael Young, Budget Officer, all of the Department of Agriculture.

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Penny Pritzker, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Commerce, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Durbin and Kirk, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

EXTRACTION OF GAS FROM SHALE

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the extraction of gas from shale, focusing on current practices within the industry and environmental concerns to be addressed, after receiving testimony from Tim Spisak, Deputy Assistant Director of Minerals and Realty Management, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Stan Belieu, Nebraska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission Deputy Director, Sidney, on behalf of the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission and the Ground Water Protection Council; Barry T. Smitherman, Texas Railroad Commission Chairman, Austin; Jack Williams, XTO Energy, Fort Worth, Texas; Chuck Davidson, Noble Energy, Inc., Alan Crain, Baker Hughes Incorporated, and Marc Edwards, Halliburton, all of Houston, Texas; Clay Bretches, Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, The Woodlands, Texas; David L. Porges, EQT Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Mark Brownstein, Environmental Defense Fund US Climate and Energy Program, and Amy Mall, Natural Resources Defense Council, both of New York, New York; Deborah J. Nardone, Sierra Club Beyond Natural Gas Campaign, San Francisco, California; and Donald S. Garvin, Jr., West Virginia Environmental Council, Buckhannon.

NOMINATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Allison M. Macfarlane, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Cardin, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

UNITED STATES-EUROPEAN UNION ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States-European Union economic relations, focusing on crisis and opportunity, after receiving testimony from Robert D. Hormats, Under Secretary of State for Economic Growth, Energy and the Environment; Lael Brainard, Under Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs; and Jim Kolbe, The German Marshall Fund of the United States, and Douglas Rediker, Peterson Institute for International Economics, both of Washington, D.C.

IMPROVING RURAL FEDERAL HEALTH CARE

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce concluded a hearing to examine improving Federal health care in rural America, focusing on developing the workforce and building partnerships, after receiving testimony from Robert A. Petzel, Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health, Veterans Health Administration; Yvette Roubideaux, Acting Director, Indian Health Service, and Tom Morris, Associate Administrator, Office of Rural Health Policy, Health Resources and Services Administration, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; Matt Kuntz, National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) Montana, Helena; and Ralph Ibson, Wounded Warrior Project, Washington, DC.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Charles R. Breyer, of California, Rachel Elise Barkow, of New York, and William H. Pryor, Jr., of Alabama, all to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Derek Anthony West, of California, to be Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, and Valerie E. Caproni, of the District of Columbia, who was introduced by Senator Gillibrand, and Vernon S. Broderick, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 89 public bills, H.R. 2122–2210; and 8 resolutions, H. Res. 234–241, were introduced. **Pages H2952–55**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2958–59**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Yoder to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2915**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Pastor Frank Hampton, Jr., Church of God, Jackson, Michigan. **Page H2915**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H2915, H2940**

Smarter Solutions for Students Act: The House passed H.R. 1911, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 198 noes, Roll No. 183. **Pages H2926–40**

Rejected the Sinema motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 194 yeas to 223 nays, Roll No. 182. **Pages H2937–39**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–12 shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. **Pages H2926–27**

H. Res. 232, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 181, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 180. **Pages H2917–26**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow. **Page H2940**

National Council on the Arts—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Democratic Leader, in which she re-appointed Representative McCollum to the National Council on the Arts. **Page H2951**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H2926.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2925–26, H2926, H2938–39, and H2939. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a markup on H.R. 1960, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014''. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

Subcommittee on Subcommittee on Readiness held a markup on H.R. 1960, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014''. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

EXAMINING DRUG COMPOUNDING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Examining Drug Compounding''. Testimony was heard from Janet Woodcock, M.D., Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a markup on H.R. 2052, the ''Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013''. Testimony was heard from Janet Woodcock, M.D., Director, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration; and public witnesses. The bill was forwarded, as amended.

Subcommittee on Commerce Manufacturing, and Trade held a markup on Wednesday, May 22, 2013 on the following bills: H.R. 2061, the ''Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013''; H.R. 568, to amend titled 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; H.R. 1380, the ''Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act''; H.R. 2067, the ''Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau Personnel Flexibilities Act''; and H.R. 1171, the ''FOR VETS Act of 2013''. The following bills were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 2061; H.R. 568; and H.R. 1380. The following bills were forwarded, without amendment: H.R. 2067 and H.R. 1171.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing on discussion drafts of the following legislation: H.R. 1135, the ''Burdensome Data Collection Act''; H.R. 1105, the ''Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act''; and H.R. 1564, the ''Audit Integrity and Job Protection Act''; and legislation regarding Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S.-MEXICO SECURITY COOPERATION: AN OVERVIEW OF THE MERIDA INITIATIVE 2008–PRESENT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''U.S.-Mexico Security Cooperation: An Overview of the Merida Initiative 2008–Present''. Testimony was heard from William R. Brownfield, Assistant Secretary, Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State; John D. Feeley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; Elizabeth Hogan, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development; Clare R. Seelke, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on The Constitution and Civil Justice held a hearing on H.R. 1797, the ''District of Columbia Pain-Capable

Unborn Child Protection Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on H.R. 255, to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes; H.R. 745, to reauthorize the Water Desalination Act of 1996; and H.R. 1963, ''Bureau of Reclamation Conduit Hydropower Development Equity and Jobs Act''. Testimony was heard from Gary Kenney, Superintendent, Mancos Water Conservancy District, Mancos, Colorado; Robert Quint, Senior Advisor, Bureau of Reclamation; Kevin Wattier, General Manager, Long Beach Water Department, Long Beach, California; and public witnesses.

RESTORING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN WEATHER FORECASTING

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled ''Restoring U.S. Leadership in Weather Forecasting''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUILDING AMERICA: CHALLENGES FOR SMALL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTORS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled ''Building America: Challenges for Small Construction Contractors''. Testimony was heard from James C. Dalton, Chief of the Engineering and Construction Division, Directorate of Civil Works, Headquarters, United States Army Corp of Engineers; Jeanne Hulit, Associate Administrator of Capital Access, United States Small Business Administration; and pubic witnesses.

THE PRESIDENT'S AND OTHER BIPARTISAN ENTITLEMENTS REFORM PROPOSALS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on the President's and Other Bipartisan Entitlements Reform Proposals. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities''. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 24, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12:30 p.m., Friday, May 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in pro forma session, unless the Senate receives a message that the House of Representatives has adopted S. Con. Res. 17, Adjournment Resolution.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Friday, May 24

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 10 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bachmann, Michele, Minn., E745
Barr, Andy, Ky., E741
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E728
Boehner, John A., Ohio, E740
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E735
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E743
Bridenstine, Jim, Okla., E744
Bucshon, Larry, Ind., E738
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E740
Camp, Dave, Mich., E746
Capito, Shelley Moore, W.Va., E737, E738
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E754
Carter, John R., Tex., E759
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E734
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E743, E754
Coble, Howard, N.C., E738, E748
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E734, E761
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E736
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E756, E761
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E728
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E735
Duffy, Sean P., Wisc., E747
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E760
Ellmers, Renee L., N.C., E751
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E742
Farenthold, Blake, Tex., E740
Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E758
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E736, E739
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E748, E758
Gardner, Cory, Colo., E728
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E740, E741
Graves, Sam, Mo., E745
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E751
Green, Al, Tex., E730, E732
Griffin, Tim, Ark., E736
Hahn, Janice, Calif., E748, E755
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E742, E743
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E729, E731
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E757, E761
Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E736
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E727
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E750, E756
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E758
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E741
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E757
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E744
King, Peter T., N.Y., E742
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E747, E748, E749, E752
Loebsack, David, Iowa, E747
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E743, E749, E753, E756, E759
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E734
Maffei, Daniel B., N.Y., E742, E745
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E760
Markey, Edward J., Mass., E754
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E746
Mica, John L., Fla., E761
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E729
Miller, Gary G., Calif., E741
Miller, George, Calif., E733
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E746
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E754
Moran, James P., Va., E731, E754
Mullin, Markwayne, Okla., E727
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E732
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E732
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E747
Olson, Pete, Tex., E749, E753, E755, E758, E761
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E729
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E727, E728, E729, E731, E732, E733, E734, E735, E736
Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E750
Poe, Ted, Tex., E730, E744
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E743, E753
Rice, Tom, S.C., E741
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E739
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E734
Rothfus, Keith J, Fla., E753
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E731
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E744
Sarbanes, John P., Md., E754
Schneider, Bradley S., Ill., E744
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E746
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E727
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E737, E738
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E747, E751
Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E735
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E753, E757
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E737
Whitfield, Ed, Ky., E738
Williams, Roger, Tex., E742
Yarmuth, John A., Ky., E741
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E745

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.