United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2014 No. 111

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 16, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

HONORING JUDGE TOM GRAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and exemplary member of our community, Judge Tom Gray.

Judge Gray has led a distinguished career in Sumner County, Tennessee, serving as a judge since 1982 and as a chancellor of the 18th judicial district since 1986. As he will soon step aside from his career in public service to spend more time with his family, I wanted to take this opportunity to highlight just a few of the reasons Judge Gray has been so important to our community.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Gray is a Tennessean through and through. He graduated from Central High School in Shelbyville, received his bachelor's and master's degrees from George Peabody College, and received his law degree from the Nashville YMCA Law School.

During his exemplary career in the Tennessee legal community, Judge Gray served as treasurer and secretary of the Tennessee Judicial Conference. He has served on committees to improve education and domestic relations, as well as to improve work between the bench and the bar. He has hosted student groups at the courthouse and has spoken to local civic clubs and churches.

As a proud Sumner County resident, he has served as the president of the Gallatin Rotary Club. His long resume of community activities includes work with the Sumner County Historical Society, the Rosemont Society, Habitat for Humanity, as well as the Sumner County Museum.

Judge Gray is a proud member of the Hendersonville United Methodist Church and a proud husband, father, and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, my friends and I in Sumner County wish all the best to our friend Tom as he retires from the bench. I look forward to watching Judge Gray begin the next chapter of his life. It is my honor to speak on his behalf here today.

ORCA CAPTIVITY

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, while the documentary ''Blackfish'' ignited a public and passionate debate over whether orcas should be held in captivity for the purposes of display and entertainment, as they are at Sea World and other parks around the world, marine mammal experts have, for decades, been engaged in a longer discussion about the scientific value and morality of keeping killer whales in captivity.

''Blackfish'' documents the history of the captivity of orcas in the United States, focusing on one whale named Tilikum, who figured in the deaths of three of his trainers.

Public displays of animals can engage our children and kindle a lifelong interest in and respect for wildlife. They can sometimes add to our scientific body of knowledge. Indeed, these are often cited as the justifications for keeping animals in captivity. Yet the shows in which these animals are displayed often have more in common with a rock concert than a scientific exposition, and many believe that the psychological and physical harm done to these magnificent animals far outweighs any benefits reaped from their display.

Here are a few facts that call into question the propriety of keeping these animals in captivity.

In the wild, orcas frequently swim 100 miles a day and dive to great depths in search of food. In captivity, they are held in tiny, shallow concrete pools where they often wallow listlessly when not being asked to perform.

In the wild, the average life expectancy for male orcas is 30, and for females it is 50 years; whereas, most captive orcas die before they reach the age of 25. Remarkably, a 103-year-old orca was recently spotted off the coast of Canada.

In the wild, dorsal fin collapse is extremely rare, but all adult male orcas in captivity have collapsed dorsal fins. Many scientists attribute this phenomenon to the condition of their captivity, such as repetitive circular swimming patterns, gravitational pull from spending the vast majority of the

time at the surface of the water, and dehydration.

Marine mammals are some of the most intelligent nonhuman animals on Earth. They are highly social and live in matrilineal pods that can be as large as 40 individuals. Pod members are interdependent. Pods often have their own hunting techniques and communication styles that some argue are akin to language or dialect. Orcas in marine parks do not live in natural pods, and separation of calves and mothers has been documented on multiple occasions.

In the wild, not a single human death has been attributed to an orca, but captive orcas are responsible for numerous injuries and deaths. Because of this, the Labor Department's OSHA office has conducted an investigation and issued new rules aimed at protecting human trainers and handlers of orcas by prohibiting those trainers from getting in close contact with the animals during the shows. These rules have recently been upheld by the court of appeals.

Last month, my colleague JARED HUFFMAN and I advanced an amendment to require USDA to finalize long-delayed regulations pertaining to the captivity of orcas. It is my hope that USDA will do so based on sound science and recognition of the harm these animals suffer in captivity, and not grounded in an effort to placate the interests of the industry that showcases them.

We cannot be responsible stewards of our natural environment and propagate messages about the importance of animal welfare when our policies and practices do not reflect our deeply held principles.

From my own point of view, I believe it is time to phase out killer whale captivity. This means no more captive breeding, no more wild captures. Orcas held in captivity now should live out their lives in their current habitats if they cannot likely survive in the wild. But with the death of this generation of captive orcas, we should draw a line: no more confinement in tiny tanks; no more forced social structures; no more captivity for our entertainment.

High mortality rates, aberrant behavior among orcas, the consistent collapsed dorsal fins, and the tragic deaths of trainers themselves all point in the same direction—an end to the forced captivity of these majestic creatures.

Mr. Speaker, while the documentary Blackfish ignited a passionate public debate over whether orcas should be held in captivity for the purposes of display and entertainment, as they are at Sea World and other parks around the world, marine mammal experts have, for decades, been engaged in a longer discussion about the scientific value and morality of keeping killer whales in captivity.

Blackfish documents the history of the captivity of orcas in the United States, focusing on one whale named Tilikum, who figured in the deaths of three of his trainers.

Public displays of animals can engage our children, and kindle a lifelong interest in and respect for wildlife. They can sometimes add to our scientific body of knowledge. Indeed, these are often cited as justifications for keeping these animals in captivity. Yet the shows in which these animals are displayed often have more in common with a rock concert than a scientific exposition, and many believe that the psychological and physical harm done to these animals far outweighs any benefits reaped from their display.

Here are some very simple facts that call into question the propriety of keeping these magnificent animals in captivity:

In the wild, orcas frequently swim 100 miles in a day and dive to great depths in search of food. In captivity, they are held in tiny, shallow concrete pools, where they often wallow listlessly when not being asked to perform.

In the wild, the average life expectancy for male orcas is 30, and for females is 50, whereas most captive orcas die before they reach the age of 25. Remarkably, a 103-year-old orca was recently spotted off the coast of Canada.

In the wild, dorsal fin collapse is extremely rare, but all adult male orcas in captivity have collapsed dorsal fins. Many scientists attribute this phenomenon to the conditions of their captivity—such as repetitive circular swimming patterns, gravitational pull from spending the vast majority of the time at the surface of the water, and dehydration.

Marine mammals are some of the most intelligent non-human animals on Earth. They are highly social and live in matrilineal pods that can be as large as 40 individuals. Pod members are interdependent and pods have their own hunting techniques and communication styles that some argue are akin to different languages.

Orcas in marine parks do not live in natural pods, and separations of calves and mothers have been documented on multiple occasions. When I watched the Blackfish, I was particularly struck by the description of a mother's visceral reaction when her calf was taken away from her and transported to another park—crying out with long-distance calling sounds—noises not heard previously by marine biologists at the park.

As the film Blackfish documents, several factors lead to severe psychological and physical problems for these animals when in captivity, and in many instances, can result in premature death—not to mention putting the lives of their handlers at risk. In the wild, not a single human death has been attributed to an orca, but captive orcas are responsible for numerous injuries and deaths. Because of this, the Labor Department's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) conducted an investigation and issued new rules aimed to protect the human trainers and handlers of orcas by prohibiting trainers from getting in close proximity to the animals during shows. These rules were recently upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Last month, my colleague Rep. JARED HUFFMAN and I advanced an amendment to require USDA to finalize long delayed regulations pertaining to the captivity of orcas. It is my hope that USDA will do so based on sound science and recognition of the harm these animals suffer in captivity, and not grounded in an effort to placate the interests of the industry that showcases them. We cannot be responsible stewards of our natural environment and propagate messages about the importance of animal welfare when our policies and practices do not reflect our deeply held principles.

From my own point of view, I believe it's time to phase out killer whale captivity. That means no more captive breeding, no more wild captures. Orcas held in captivity now should live out their lives in their current habitats, if they cannot likely survive in the wild. But with the death of this generation of captive orcas, we should draw a line. No more confinement in tiny tanks. No more forced social structures. No more captivity for our entertainment.

High mortality rates, aberrant behavior among orcas, the consistent collapsed dorsal fins, and the tragic deaths of the trainers themselves all point in the same direction—an end to the forced captivity of these majestic creatures.

AMERICA'S DEBT IMPACTS ILLEGAL ALIEN CHILDREN SOLUTION

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, America's deficits have averaged a trillion dollars a year for 5 years. America's total debt has blown through the $17 trillion mark, and our Comptroller General warns America that our financial path is unsustainable.

Last year, America's debt service cost roughly $250 billion—which is five Federal transportation or 14 NASA programs we can't afford because we have to pay debt service.

If not fixed, what do these deficits and debt mean?

On a micro level, America must learn from Detroit and Stockton, where bankruptcy courts battle over pension plan funding. On a macro level, we must learn from Greece and Spain, where unemployment is 26 and 28 percent worse than America at any time during the Great Depression. We must learn from Argentina and Venezuela, where inflation rates were 28 percent and 56 percent in one year, in 2012.

Closer to home, we must learn from Puerto Rico, the home for 3.5 million Americans. In February, Puerto Rico's sovereign debt was downgraded to junk bond status, thereby damaging Puerto Rico's economy for years, if not decades, to come.

This brings me to the taxpayer cost of today's massive flood of illegal alien children surging across America.

According to Customs and Border Protection data, in fiscal year 2012, 24,000 illegal alien children surged across our border. That surge increased by 59 percent, to 39,000 illegal alien children in FY 2013. That surge increased by another 58,000 illegal alien children so far this fiscal year, with an estimated total of 90,000 crossing our borders for all of fiscal year 2014—a startling 132 percent increase.

How should America fix this problem?

First, the Obama administration must stop enticing illegal alien children to America with promises of amnesty and money. America cannot give

free food, free clothing, free shelter, free health care, free transportation, free entertainment, and billions of dollars a year in fraudulent tax refunds to illegal aliens and then wonder why we have an illegal alien crisis.

Second, illegal alien children from Central America and Mexico must be treated equally—prompt returns to parents and homes without costly and time-consuming deportation hearings. All contrary laws must be repealed or amended.

Third, America must immediately fly illegal alien children home by the least expensive means possible. It costs as little as $258 at cheapflightnow.com to fly from Houston to Managua, Nicaragua. United Airlines flies from San Antonio to Guatemala City for as little as $363 and to San Salvador, El Salvador, for as little as $292.

At roughly $300 a pop, it costs less than $20 million to fly 60,000 illegal alien children home. That is everyone so far this fiscal year. If America used C–5 military aircraft and counted flight time as pilot training time, the cost is even less.

Given America's perilous financial condition, the illegal alien children surge issue must be considered in the context of America's debt threat that risks a debilitating American insolvency and bankruptcy.

President Obama demands $3.7 billion to spend in just the next few months on a policy that does not solve the illegal alien children problem. Think about that. The President proposes spending $3.7 billion to not solve the problem. Yet spending $20 million wisely does solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is a no-brainer. It is financially irresponsible—no, financial insanity—to spend $3.7 billion America does not have, must borrow to get, and cannot afford to pay back when we can spend $20 million and get better results and better border security.

23 IN 1—BRACKETTVILLE, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, this morning, as I continue highlighting places in the 23rd District, which comprises nearly 24 percent of the land area of Texas, I would like to talk about the city of Brackettville. With a population of a little over 1,500 people, it is a small town with a big history.

Located as the county seat in Kinney County, Brackettville was once the drive-in movie capital of Texas. It was founded in 1852 as Las Moras, the name of a nearby spring and creek it feeds. The town initially was a supply stop on the old San Antonio-El Paso Road and a supply depot for the U.S. Army's Fort Clark, which was also established in 1852.

The town was later called Brackett, after Oscar B. Brackett, the owner of the first dry goods store in the area. It is a name that still sticks among locals. In 1873, when a post office opened in the town, the ''ville'' was added to ''Brackett'' in order to differentiate it from another town.

The town grew exponentially in the 19th century with the expansion of the garrison at Fort Clark during the Indian wars. During that time, the town's fortune was completely tied to Fort Clark.

□ 1015

For many years, Fort Clark was the headquarters of the famous Buffalo Soldiers, made up of African Americans. At that time, Brackettville had a large proportion of Black Seminoles, who were people of mixed African American and Seminole ancestry, who originated in Florida. The Black Seminoles were recruited by the U.S. to act as scouts for the Buffalo Soldiers, and they settled with their families in Brackettville. During slavery years, the Black Seminoles began living in a settlement in northern Mexico in order to escape conditions in the U.S. Their language, Afro-Seminole Creole, was developed in Florida. Impressively, even today, Afro-Seminole Creole is still spoken by some in Brackettville. After the Buffalo Soldiers moved out to Fort Clark with the waning of the Indian Wars, Brackettville became a cavalry post.

In 1914, the Seminole Negro Indian Scouts were finally disbanded, but these scouts had an amazing history of service. In fact, the Seminole cemetery near Brackettville has the highest number of Congressional Medal of Honor winners resting there per capita than has any other cemetery in the country. Virtually every cavalry unit in the U.S. Army was stationed at or was trained at Fort Clark at one time or another, and many famous soldiers, including John Pershing and George Patton, were there. Others just visited, people like George Armstrong Custer and Phil Sheridan, who nearly lost his life near Fort Clark to a Comanche war party. It was there that he made his famous statement: ''If I owned Texas and hell, I would rent out Texas and live in hell.''

In 1943, during World War II, the U.S. Army activated the 2nd Cavalry, which was the last horse-mounted unit. By 1944, even the 2nd Cavalry had been mechanized. Fort Clark, so long the center of mounted cavalry, was targeted for closure, but before it closed, it was used as a German prisoner of war camp.

Because of the families of soldiers at the fort and the African American veterans and the descendants of those who had settled in Brackettville during the war, the U.S. Government funded the construction of a high school for Black students. The school opened in 1944 so that the children of these veterans could be educated. At that time, Texas was still racially segregated. This high school is believed to have been the only federally built school of its kind between San Antonio and El Paso.

After Fort Clark closed in 1946, it had a variety of uses. It was converted to a resort or a retirement center, and the Historic District of Fort Clark is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. North of the town are the remains of the Alamo Village, built in the 1950s as the set for John Wayne's movie ''The Alamo,'' and scenes of the 1969 comedy ''Viva Max!'' were also shot there.

I invite everyone to visit the city of Brackettville to learn more about the cultures and traditions of the incredible 23rd District of Texas.

THE UNITED STATES—A NATION OF LAWS

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that we are a kind and caring Nation. We have always welcomed those who have come to this country in order to make better lives for themselves and their families. In fact, many of the successes we have achieved in the fields of science, business, and art are directly attributable to individuals coming here with their ideas and ambitions.

But we are a Nation of laws.

Granting amnesty to those who have come here illegally not only erodes the rule of law, but it is unfair to the millions of folks who have respected our legal system and are working to gain citizenship in the right way. Further, undocumented immigration poses a threat to our national security. We have no way of tracking whether these individuals who are crossing our borders have ties to criminal enterprises, terrorism, or whether they are even carrying dangerous communicable diseases.

This is why it is critical we secure our borders.

The recent surge of illegal immigration at the border is a direct result of the Obama administration's failed policies. According to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, over the past year, there has been a 92 percent increase in the number of unaccompanied children crossing over our southwestern border. By usurping the legislative process and changing parts of existing laws while refusing to enforce others, the Obama administration has created an immigration policy that rewards those who have come here illegally.

Now the President has requested $3.7 billion to purportedly combat this immigration crisis. Unfortunately, according to the administration's own proposal, only a small portion of that money—roughly 9 percent—would be used to actually secure our southern border. Rather, if history has shown us anything, it is that, if we give this President a blank check, he will simply squander it on furthering his far-left

agenda. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject the President's request and to, instead, use our resources, including the National Guard, in an effort to strengthen our border security and deport those who have come here illegally.

United States immigration policies are some of the most generous in the world, but we simply cannot condone illegal immigration. To that end, I will continue to support by any means necessary, whether legislative or legal, to ensure our current laws are enforced and to prevent this President from unilaterally implementing policies that circumvent our rule of law.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark an anniversary that has pained the Cypriot and Hellenic communities for 40 years.

On July 20, 1974, in a blatant violation of international law, Turkey violently invaded Cyprus and captured much of the northern part of the island. Since the invasion, Turkey has occupied nearly 40 percent of Cyprus. Settlers were sent to inhabit homes that were previously owned by Greek Cypriots, forcibly relocating 160,000 Greek Cypriots. Religious artifacts and cultural relics have been destroyed in the wake of the Turkish Army's invasion, and after 40 years of displacement, they are now lost to time. Hundreds of churches and monasteries have been shamefully desecrated, losing all sense of their historic and religious significance.

Despite this neglect, the Republic of Cyprus recognizes Turkish Cypriots as citizens of the Republic of Cyprus, and provides numerous benefits to them as they would any citizen. Turkish Cypriots are entitled to official passports, which allow them to enjoy the benefits of EU membership, including the freedom of movement within EU member countries. Turkish Cypriots are recipients of free medical care from public hospitals, and they are eligible for benefits from the Republic's Social Insurance Scheme.

These policies have resulted in Greek and Turkish Cypriots living among each other with little trouble. Indeed, there have been millions of crossings at the Green Line without incident. So why the Turkish troops? Why the continued occupation? Despite the increase in citizen-level cohesion, the ''Cyprus problem'' remains a diplomatic challenge at the highest levels of government.

Greek and Turkish Cypriots deserve an end to this senseless division. In February of this year, it looked like progress was being made for legitimate negotiations that would lead to a real solution based on the rule of law. There is potential for significant economic value from the discovery of offshore gas reserves in the eastern Mediterranean, which stand to benefit a unified Cyprus. By reaping these natural resources, Cyprus' allies—the United States, Greece, Israel, and many European countries—will also flourish.

In the face of the optimism for financial recovery and other incentives to unify, this year, Turkish Cypriot leaders have refused to implement even the simplest of confidence-building measures, which would be a sign of good faith and would foster an atmosphere of honest negotiation. The failure to enact the most basic, practical steps continues to impede a process for reunification that is long overdue. Words lose their meaning when inaction is all that follows.

Today, the United States stands in a unique role as a friend of both Cyprus and Turkey. As an honest broker to both sides, we can help them see that a unified future is far more promising than the present. The United States' relationship with all of its allies, Turkey included, must be based on shared values and mutual respect. At the core, the rule of law must be respected above all else. It is our duty to continually reinforce this message that 40 years of illegal occupation is 40 years too long.

It is time for Turkey to engage in sincere negotiations and in concrete confidence-building measures instead of going through the motions and creating more obstacles when tough decisions are on the table. Both sides know a solution will demand compromise and cooperation. The time to talk is nearing its end. The time to act is here. Cyprus has long been a strong and faithful ally of the United States, and we owe our support for both peace and the end of this illegal occupation.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 16, 2014 at 9:51 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 517.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The following proceedings were held before the House convened for morning-hour debate:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2014 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Barbara Kennelly, vice president of Former Members of Congress Association, at 8:05 a.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God of history, when former Members return to Congress, it offers an opportunity to reflect upon the great heritage of representative government that is America's historical legacy.

The record of Congress holds old and familiar stories, strong exhortations, repeated corrections, and consoling confirmations of hopes made real through difficult but persistent compromise in the forming of enduring programs and legislation.

May the presence here of former Members bring a moment of pause, where current Members consider the profiles they now form for future generations of Americans.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Bless all former Members who have died, as we especially remember today Robert Roe of New Jersey, who passed only yesterday. May their families and their constituents be comforted during a time of mourning.

And bless those here gathered, that they may bring joy and hope to the present age and supportive companionship to one another. Together, we call upon Your holy name, now and forever.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Barbara Kennelly 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.

Ms. KENNELLY. We will be visited by some Members of Congress, and as they come in, I will recognize them.

Right now I recognize the chair, the Honorable Connie Morella.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Barbara. It is always a distinct privilege to be

back here in this revered Chamber and we appreciate so much the opportunity to present today the 44th annual report of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. I will be joined by some of our colleagues in reporting on the activities and projects of our organization since our last report to Congress in May of last year. But first of all, I would like to ask the Clerk to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of Congress, as follows:

Ms. Byron of Maryland
Mr. Carnahan of Missouri
Mr. Carr of Michigan
Mr. Clement of Tennessee
Mr. Costello of Illinois
Mr. Coyne of Pennsylvania
Mr. Delahunt of Massachusetts
Mr. de Lugo of the Virgin Islands
Mr. Frey of Florida
Mr. Glickman of Kansas
Mr. Hertel of Michigan
Mr. Hughes of New Jersey
Ms. Kennelly of Connecticut
Mr. Kolbe of Arizona
Mr. Konnyu of California
Mr. Kramer of Colorado
Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina
Mr. LaRocco of Idaho
Ms. Long of Louisiana
Mr. Lungren of California
Ms. Morella of Maryland
Mr. Nelligan of Pennsylvania
Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut
Mr. Skaggs of Colorado
Mr. Smith of Florida
Mr. Stearns of Florida

Ms. MORELLA. The Chair announces that 26 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

I want to thank you all for joining us today. Our association, as you know, was chartered by Congress, and one requirement of the charter is for us to report once a year to Congress about our activities.

Many of you have joined us for several years on this occasion, and there will be numerous programs and projects with which you now are quite familiar. This is a sign of our association's stability and purpose. We are extremely proud of our long history, of creating lasting and impactful programs that teach about Congress and representative government, and of our ability to take long-standing projects and expand them and improve them.

In addition, you will hear today about a number of new endeavors, ones that either were implemented during the last year or are now in the planning stages for implementation in the near future. We will report on our programming in just a minute.

Those of you who have been with us on previous occasions for this report know that we traditionally bestow on a former Member our association's highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award. During this presentation in the House Chamber we traditionally have done that. For a number of reasons, we will have the ceremony later today during a special luncheon, and I certainly hope that all of you in attendance here this morning can join us for the luncheon also.

Our 2014 distinguished service honoree is former Indiana Representative Lee Hamilton, who has been an inspiration and a mentor to so many of us. While the ceremony is not going to take place right now, I do want to read into the RECORD the inscription of the plaque that he will receive:

The 2014 Distinguished Service Award is presented by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress to the Honorable Lee H. Hamilton.

Congressman Hamilton has devoted his professional life to public service and the advancement of our national prosperity and security. In serving for over 30 years as a Member of Congress representing the Ninth District of Indiana, cochairing numerous Presidential Commissions tasked with making our Nation more secure, directing the invaluable work of the Woodrow Wilson Center, and creating a Center on Congress at Indiana University to improve public understanding of Congress, Lee Hamilton has approached every test with the utmost integrity, insight, and good judgment. For half a century, Congressman Hamilton has served our Nation with honor by forging bipartisan solutions to our world's complicated problems. Colleagues from both sides of the aisle salute him as a distinguished and dedicated public servant.

Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

Maybe we should just give him a round of applause, and again, join us later for the luncheon honoring him.

Now back to our report.

Ms. KENNELLY. Madam President? Excuse me, our leader is here.

Ms. PELOSI. Good morning, everyone.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you for joining us, Leader PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Hi, Connie. We see each other so often. We really do. Say hi to Tony.

Good morning, everyone. My pleasure to welcome you once again to the Capitol, to take the occasion to thank you all very much for your service to our country, for the contributions that you have made over time. Many of you, as I look around this room, served at a time when it was a little more collegial atmosphere here. We hope to return to that.

But so much of the work that we do is built on foundations that you all have laid. And we thank you for that. Your legacy will live into the future. I saw in the paper this morning that our former Chairman Roe passed away. The paper called him ''Mr. Jobs,'' and I thought, what a wonderful title. Wouldn't we all like to be having that as what people remember us by? But that's what our thrust is going to be.

I just might add, Madam Chair and Madam President, that this morning on the steps of the Capitol Members will be going out there to talk about jobs, about how to keep America number one. And all that we have in there is stuff that we worked for in a bipartisan way, which is to recognize the productivity of the American worker, the most productive in the world, so to recognize that and have policies that help people, as STENY would say, make it in America. That is A, American-made.

Build the infrastructure of our country and build small businesses. It is about building. It is about recognizing that that entrepreneurship and that innovation to keep America number one begins in the classroom.

So our investments in education, especially making higher education affordable, is a critical part of our agenda and recognizing also that education begins at the earliest time. That is the childhood education.

But what I am excited about is to say the central core of what we are about is, when women succeed, America succeeds. That is the title of our economic agenda for families and the middle class. But it is not just a title; it is a statement of fact. When women succeed, America succeeds. The best thing we can do to grow our economy is to unleash the power of women, increase the involvement of women, and that is with fair pay, with paid sick leave, with, again, getting back to the affordable child care, children learning, parents earning.

So we are very excited about helping that in the debate and the coming elections—that it is not just about who wins, it is about how the debate centers on family, American workers, our productivity, their productivity, our economic success to keep America number one—anything that we all haven't worked together on in the past.

So it's wonderful to see all of you. Congratulations.

Did I hear Lee Hamilton was getting the award? How lovely. Congratulations to him and you, he bringing luster to your award, you bringing honor to him.

But again, on behalf of all of our Members, I extend the warmest of welcomes back to you, and in friendship and in love of our great country. So good morning, good luck in your conversations and your deliberations. I look forward to seeing you in the Halls of Congress as you do your work here on this visit. It is always a very special treat to see. I am looking at each and every one of you and having very happy memories about it all.

And thank you, Madam Chair, for your leadership; Connie, for yours. Thank you all very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Madam Leader.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Leader PELOSI, for your inspiring words, for coming here to greet us, your former colleagues, and for explaining the initiative on jobs and elevating women.

Leader PELOSI, I hope you noticed that this will be my last time as president of the association. But you know, I am succeeded by another woman.

Ms. PELOSI. All right.

Ms. MORELLA. So you see, we are moving ahead. This association is progressive.

So now back to our report. Our association is bipartisan. It was chartered

by Congress in 1983. The purpose of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is to promote public service and strengthen democracy, abroad and in the United States. About 600 former Senators and Representatives belong to the association. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are united in this organization in their desire to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy.

We are proud to have been chartered by Congress. We are also proud to receive no funding from Congress. Well, I don't know. But nevertheless, we receive no funding from Congress, which gives us the independence. All our activities, which we are about to describe, are financed via membership dues, program-specific grants and sponsors, or via our fundraising dinner. Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, and our most recent audit by an outside accountant confirmed that we are running our association in a fiscally sound, responsible, and transparent manner.

It has been a very successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring. We have developed new projects. We are expanding others. And we again sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to teach about public service and representative democracy at universities and high schools, both in the United States and abroad.

When this organization was created over 40 years ago, the former Members who founded our association envisioned this organization to take the lead in teaching about Congress and encouraging public service. They were hoping that former Members could inspire the next generation of America's leaders. Over the years, we have created a number of programs, most importantly the Congress to Campus program, to do just that.

We continue to work with our great partner, the Stennis Center for Public Service. We thank them for their invaluable assistance in administering the Congress to Campus program.

It is now my pleasure to yield to a former president of our association, Larry LaRocco of Idaho, who, along with Jack Buechner of Missouri, cochairs this great program.

Larry.

Mr. LAROCCO. Thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to report on this outstanding program. As most of you know, the Congress to Campus program is FMC's flagship domestic program, and the one that can engage former Members from all over the country.

Congress to Campus sends former Members in bipartisan teams to colleges, universities, and high schools across the country and around the world to educate the next generation of leaders about the value of public service. The former Members volunteering their time communicate with the students and faculty about their personal experiences and knowledge about Congress. During each visit, our bipartisan teams lead classes, meet one-on-one with students and faculty, speak to campus media, participate in campus and community forums, and interact with local citizens.

Institutions are encouraged to market the visit to the entire campus community, not just to those students majoring in political science, history, or government. Over the course of 2½ days, hundreds of students from all areas of academic studies are exposed to the former Members' message of public service and civility.

For the 2013–2014 academic year, the association visited over 20 college campuses, including visits to the United States Naval Academy, Louisiana State University, Millersville University Miami of Ohio, New York University, and University of Hawaii. More than 30 former Members participated during the calendar year and academic year, and I want to thank all of you who donated your time—pro bono—to this vital program.

I also want to encourage our newest former Members and those who have not yet had the opportunity to go on a visit to consider doing so, and to encourage a friend from across the aisle to join you. It is an excellent opportunity to continue your public service after Congress. You can also make a pledge to connect with a host school, for example, your alma mater, a college in your old district, or a university your children or grandchild attends. Our staff will then follow up with you to make the arrangements. Sharon Witiw runs the program and has all of the information you need.

We are also thrilled to have continued our excellent partnership with the Stennis Center for Public Service in the administration of the program, and we owe a special debt of gratitude to Brother Rogers, the associate director of the Stennis Center, for his fine work. Our staffs work very closely together to make the program such a success.

The Congress to Campus program's international outreach sends delegations to other countries. This past year we again sent two delegations to the UK for 1 week to meet with several universities and hundreds of British students studying foreign policy and the United States.

And just a heads-up to my colleagues: former Member participation in these overseas trips is based on how actively you participate in the domestic visits. The visiting former Members become quasi-ambassadors on behalf of the United States and really get to engage with these foreign students.

This year we piloted a new concept within the Congress to Campus program. Our pair of former Members was joined by two former German Bundestag Members, who were also from opposing parties, for a weeklong Congress to Campus visit to seven different college campuses. While continuing to promote the role of public service, the former legislators also spoke of the strong bilateral and multilateral relationship between the United States and Germany, and Europe. The program was well received, and we hope to replicate the program and possibly expand it to include other international former legislators.

This fall, because of a grant award we received from iCohere, we will be trying a new concept and will be hosting a virtual Congress to Campus seminar program. This seminar will take place over 3 days and will reach hundreds of community college students throughout the country. In two of the three sessions, the former Members will focus on a substantive topic, and the third session will incorporate those topics with the upcoming midterm elections and the impact of the results.

We also continue our relationship with the People to People programs, an organization that provides hands-on learning opportunities for elementary school, middle school, and high school students visiting Washington, D.C. On each visit, former Members meet and speak with students about the importance of public service, their personal experiences in Congress, and the value of character and leadership.

In the spring of 2014, two speaking engagements were held in ''Congressional Panel'' format. The events take place on Capitol Hill, and not only feature a former Member speaker, but also several Hill staffers and interns. This gives students the opportunity to learn what it is really like to work in the U.S. Congress.

People to People visits are oftentimes in the middle of the business day, and we are grateful to those former Members who take time out of their schedules to connect with students touring our Nation's Capital. It is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Finally, I would like to take a moment to thank former Member Matt McHugh, who has retired as cochair of the Congress to Campus program this year. Matt, who held that position for over 7 years and was also the association's president, provided thoughtful and considerable leadership to this program. His insight and guidance to the staff can be directly associated with the success of the program. I want to say again how grateful I am personally and on behalf of all of our membership for his dedication and support of our principal and longest-standing program. I have big shoes to step into by replacing Matt as the cochair of the Congress to Campus program, but I know that, along with Jack, I will continue Matt's good work and hope to help the program grow.

We are grateful to Matt, Jack, and all former Members who have participated over the years to help make the Congress to Campus program such a

success in its 37 years. I strongly encourage all of my friends and colleagues to participate in the program, either by making a visit to a school or by recommending a school to host the program. It is easy. My alma mater, the University of Portland, has had a program. My other alma mater, Boston University, is hosting a program this year. So all you have got to do is pick up the phone and contact them. It will work, believe me.

As you know, a democracy can prosper only if its citizens are both informed and engaged, and as former legislators, we have a particular opportunity and responsibility to encourage such involvement. This program gives us the opportunity to do so, particularly with our young people.

Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Larry. As a matter of fact, we have the same alma mater, Boston University. We are doing a Congress to Campus program very soon. We appreciate the great work that you and Jack do on behalf of this very important undertaking.

And let me associate myself with your remarks about Matt McHugh. He has been an invaluable and a much-appreciated leader of this organization, whether during his time as president or, more recently, as cochair of this program. Matt, this entire organization thanks you for your sage counsel and outstanding governance for so many years. Let's hear it for Matt.

As you may recall from our last report to Congress, the association has put some energy and focus into the question of bipartisanship and civility in our political dialogue. We are furthering this important work via the Common Ground Project. The purpose of the Common Ground Project is to involve citizens in a dialogue about the issues of the day, have a vigorous debate that is both partisan and productive, and benefit from the experience of respecting a differing point of view. Some of our existing undertakings already fit in very nicely with this objective, for example, the Congress to Campus program that we just had Larry LaRocco report on.

And to give you more background about the Common Ground Project, I invite my colleague from Tennessee, former Member Bob Clement, to share a report.

Bob.

We interrupt this about-to-be report for the Chair.

Ms. KENNELLY. And we are really very honored to be able to welcome the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Good morning.

Good morning, and let me just say welcome back to all of you. It has been a long year since you were here last, but over the course of the year I think you all know we lost former Speaker Tom Foley. We lost our good friend Bill Young. And over the course of the last 6 months or so we have had a number of retirements, from HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER, to DAVE CAMP and DOC HASTINGS, BUCK MCKEON, and my good friend TOM LATHAM.

And so the institution, the institution is actually doing pretty well. I know from the outside people don't quite see that, but I think a lot of you know I am committed to an open process on the floor, amendments from both sides of the aisle. We have had a much more open process, and I think the result of that is we are beginning to see more bipartisan legislation.

Last week we came to an agreement with the House and the Senate in a bipartisan, bicameral way on a job training and retraining bill to consolidate programs and make it easier for people to get the kind of training they need for the jobs that are out there today.

And then when it comes to the appropriations process, we have been trying to restart this process over the last 3 or 4 years. Today on the floor I think we have got our seventh appropriations bill of the year. Of course, you know, our challenge is always across the Capitol, because they have done exactly none, no appropriation bills. But I do think it is important for us to get this appropriation process up and running in the way it should. It hasn't happened for the last 6 or 7 years, and I think we here in the Congress lose our ability to really direct spending as a result of that.

But by and large, I feel pretty good about where we are. You know, it is an election year, so you all have a pretty good idea of what that means in terms of what happens around here. My big job is making sure we avoid all the potholes between now and election day, and there are some out there.

But anyway, my job this morning is to just say hi to all of you, and welcome you back, and hope that you all have a nice visit here in your old home, the U.S. House.

Thanks.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Speaker BOEHNER.

The program will continue.

Mr. CLEMENT. Well, thank you, Connie.

My report is about the Common Ground Project. One of the many joys of being active with this wonderful association is that it brings together Republicans and Democrats for our many programs, such as during our annual meeting and charitable golf tournament and for panel discussions, as well as other presentations. Everything we do is bipartisan. Our board is divided evenly between Republicans and Democrats, and our leadership rotates between the parties.

As we all know, currently, our Congress—and indeed our country—is going through a period of great polarization and partisanship. While we certainly don't leave our political beliefs at the door when participating in association activities, we pride ourselves in creating an environment where an across-the-aisle dialogue not only is possible, but also the norm. We have institutionalized this approach in a program that we call the Common Ground Project.

The purpose of Common Ground is to create venues and events where our bipartisan approach can involve the public in a dialogue on the issues of the day. Our long-standing programs, most importantly the Congress to Campus program, already fit neatly into the vision of the Common Ground Project. Other undertakings were created specifically by us to further this project.

For example, we are extremely proud of our partnership with the National Archives, which has brought dozens of former Members from both sides of the aisle together with the public for panel discussions and a productive, as well as a respectful, political dialogue.

Our most recent panels include a look at the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act and their impact 50 years after passage. Another discussion focused on women in politics and political leadership, which included Leader PELOSI. Even though she is not a former Member, we let her participate.

Just last month, we brought together former Members John Tanner, Chris Shays, and Speaker Denny Hastert, with Washington Post journalist Bob Woodward and former Clinton press secretary Mike McCurry for a conversation about the role Congress plays in our foreign policy and international crises.

We also try to involve current Members in our Common Ground Project. One thing you will hear quite often from former Members is that we were able to spend more time with our colleagues from either side of the aisle and had more of an opportunity to get to know each other on a personal basis. For a number of reasons, current Members no longer have that time and the luxury of building personal relationships. It is awfully hard to negotiate with someone and to trust someone when you don't have a foundation that is rooted in knowing one another.

One small way of bringing current Members together was accomplished again in partnership with the National Archives. We invited freshman Members from both parties to bring their families to the National Archives for an open house around Christmastime. While the Members and their spouses had a chance to view some of the documents and treasures at the Archives, their kids were able to explore the great learning center the Archives created for research and treasure hunting. The Members then learned from Archives staff about congressional papers and the responsibility Members have making their personal papers part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are quite a number of other activities that contribute to our Common Ground Project, and the list is too long to include. I know and you know that a lot of us attack the issues rather than our fellow colleagues, whether they be Democrat or Republican. We knew how to compromise. We knew

how to work together to get things done, and I think the time has come when we need to identify all the problems associated with this Congress, how we can help them, how we can support them, and how we can show them where we have gotten off track.

This is something Common Ground can do because the fact is that Common Ground is an opportunity for us to solve a lot of problems that have not been solved, and it is time for us and for this Congress and future Congresses to start solving problems, and there is nothing wrong with the word ''compromise.''

I know my Aunt Anna Belle Clement O'Brien was in the State senate, and she used the expression—and you all sent me to the U.K. recently, and they don't call it political science. They call it politics. They don't call it political science. When you ask a student what they major in, they say: Oh, I major in politics.

Well, I picked up on that because my Aunt Anna Belle in Tennessee would always end her speeches:

> Politics builds roads. Politics builds schools. Politics builds mental hospitals. Politics is compromise.

Maybe we can all work together on Common Ground Project and make it happen again because this is too great of a country for us to be wandering.

Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you very much, Bob.

I am glad you listened to your aunt. We appreciate also the work you have done on this very important project and also the fact that you are on our board of directors, and that is very helpful.

A great example of how productive and powerful bipartisan can be is our annual congressional golf tournament. It is chaired by our immediate past president, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, and fellow board member, Ken Kramer of Colorado. I would now yield the floor to Ken Kramer to give us a brief report about the charitable golf tournament.

Ken.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I note the adjective ''brief,'' and I will try to comply.

Seven years ago, we took a 35-year tradition, our annual golf tournament which pits Republicans against Democrats, and we gave it a new and bigger mission. We converted it into a charitable golf tournament to aid severely wounded vets that are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. Our beneficiaries are Warfighter Sports, which is a program of Disabled Sports USA, and Tee it up for the Troops, which use golf and other sports to help our wounded veterans readjust to life after sustaining very severe injuries. They involve the entire family in the sport. They provide equipment. They provide training.

Our seventh charitable event will be held in 2 weeks, July 28th, at Army Navy Country Club in Arlington. All together, these tournaments are closing in on raising almost a half a million dollars for these outstanding programs, and I might add that, since this statement was written, recent receipts would indicate that we have now hit that half million dollar mark.

During each of our past tournaments, we have had several dozen current and former Members from both sides of our aisle come together to support these troops, and they have met in the process with dozens of these warriors, many of whom play with us in our foursomes, and I might add some of our double amputees are much better than our Members. It is an incredibly humbling, rewarding—and I mean humbling—rewarding and memorable experience to spend the day in the presence of these outstanding men and women.

I want to thank everyone at the association, particularly Sharon Witiw, as well as Dennis Hertel, our tournament's cochair, for all that they have done to make our tournament such a success, and equally important, I am happy to report that we again have secured the leadership of our two outstanding current cochairs from last year, Congressman MIKE MCINTYRE of North Carolina and Congressman JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee.

Their leadership has really energized our event and contributed big time to its success. I also want to thank our many sponsors for their generous contributions, and many of these sponsors have come back year after year to support this worthy cause.

It is an honor to help such an incredibly deserving group, and again, our tournament is on July 28th. For those of you who have not signed up, we hope that you will do so.

We now call this tournament The Members, by the way, but unlike The Masters, you don't need to play at that pro level to have an enjoyable day. All you have to do is show up and help raise some much-needed funds, and you don't have to worry about your skill set to be able to participate. It is 100 percent about helping these warriors. Your handicap is not really that important. Your individual score is not kept. We play a scramble format, and this event can only be successful if you out there will give it your time and attention.

If you only golf once a year, this is the day to do it. Please let us know if you can either help or you know any people that we can recruit as sponsors, and thank you for your time and attention, and I hope I met the instruction of brief.

Ms. MORELLA. Congratulations to you, Ken, on the success of the program. It is patriotic, it is humanitarian, it is very moving. We are very honored that the association can play a small role in the rehabilitation of these amazing young men and women.

In addition to the domestic programs that we have described so far, our association also has a very active and far-reaching international focus. We conduct programs focused on Europe and Asia. We bring current Members of Congress together with their peers in legislatures that are overseas. We work with our Department of State to talk about representative democracy with audiences overseas, and we partner with former parliamentarians from other countries for democracy-strengthening missions.

Some of these programs involve former Members as active participants. Others focus on current Members who benefit from the input and contributions of former Members in Congress' international outreach.

I want to yield right now the floor to a former president of our association, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, to report on these international projects that are predominantly former Member driven.

Dennis.

Mr. HERTEL. Well, thank you, Madam President.

I like the sound of that. Maybe we will see that soon in our future for our country.

You know, we have this great privilege of being able to come on the House floor and to bring groups on the House floor, and one of the first things that I tell the students that I am able to take here is what a great—one of the greatest changes I have seen take place in the last 30 years is the number of women in Congress and in the House and the Senate. It is just amazing.

My wife says we still have a long way to go because women are 51 percent of the population, but we have made tremendous strides, and it was a great honor to have former Speaker PELOSI here this morning, the first woman Speaker, and have her talk about women in the economy and what they are proposing, the changes that we are making.

In our association, you know, recently, we lost Lindy Boggs, who was our first woman president, and she was just such a wonderful mentor and example for all of us, and now, we have been privileged to have President Connie Morella of our association, who has achieved so much and expanded our reach in so many areas—in all areas, really, internationally with more contacts and more visits by our former Members, more exchanges, and more education because of that.

As far as being able to strengthen our association as far as raising funds, nobody has made the strides that Connie Morella has made for us, especially by bringing in the international community because of her experience as an Ambassador, and I have always said, as I saw it here in the legislature and then in Congress with my experience, women were able to accomplish more.

They have this network, but more than a network, they have this attitude of let's get it done, and I think they have been bipartisan leaders in the Congress, in the House, and in the Senate, and are an example for our entire Nation.

So it is my great privilege to thank, on behalf of the association, Connie Morella for all she has done.

Connie, would you please come up here for a minute?

We have a plaque, which can never capture all that she has done, but from the United States Association of Former Members of Congress, it says:

To the Honorable Connie Morella, in recognition and appreciation of her strong leadership as president of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. Her tremendous enthusiasm and effectiveness will always be remembered by her grateful colleagues.

Washington, D.C., July 16, 2014.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you very much. Thank you, Dennis. This is a great surprise. It reminds me of something that Will Shakespeare—and I think really it was his wife who wrote it—who said:

For these great blessings heaped upon me, I can nothing render but allegiant thanks.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HERTEL. I echo what Connie said about continuing now with a woman vice president becoming our president today, Barbara Kennelly.

Let me talk about the international programs briefly. I am going to try to move through it because I know the Members have heard this information before. I already got rid of two pages here.

They are more or less divided into two types of projects. One is composed of international projects that include former Members in democracy-strengthening missions, such as election monitoring. The other is composed of international projects, where our association serves as a bridge between current Members and their peers in legislative branches overseas.

During my time as president, I always felt it was this international work that really gave our association an opportunity to make a very important contribution that was unique. Because our Members, unlike the dropping in for a meeting today and going to another country, as current Members have to do, and getting back here for session—which is the biggest difference between our Congress and the other Parliaments, since our Congress has more power, the power of the budget, the power of the purse under the Constitution, and it is not from the top down.

Our Members are so independent. They are so busy on their schedules and never able to attend the international conferences as much as the former Members are, who are also able to hang around the country and do some actual democracy building and not just drop in on election day for monitoring, so that is what I have been most proud of what we have been able to accomplish, and I think that there is a much wider area for us to go in.

I know, Pete, I haven't been anyplace in the last 4 years, and I think a lot of Members here haven't, and we are looking forward to more opportunities for our Former Members Association because of that difference that we can make in so many ways.

We have internationalized the outreach of the Global Democracy Initiative and have worked in a wonderful partnership with our Canadian and European colleagues on that to strengthen democracy abroad. This has always been some of the most rewarding work that we have done as an association, and I think we can do more.

Frankly, we have had a problem of funding. The Canadians were able to get us some international funding to keep us going from their government, but we have to reach out to do more monitoring in foreign nations, and we have to convince international and national charities and foundations that we are the ones that can do it better than others.

When we put you guys on the ground, you will know the first day what the politics of the situation is. Other people, you know, can't be trained to have those kinds of instincts and knowledge that you have, so, you know, I know that our people can make a greater difference if we can have more opportunities.

We also have numerous groups of legislators from emerging democracies come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government and our form of democracy. These conversations and meetings are always two-way streets.

I learn so much more, and I have to sometimes explain the elections of Ohio and Florida to our international visitors and contacts because all the questions aren't just in foreign countries.

Our voting percent in this country is only 50 percent, and 100 years ago, that percentage was 85 percent. If we look at our primary elections, which we just saw in Virginia as a prime example, we are seeing less than 20 percent of the people vote. When you divide that into two political parties, it is less than 12 percent of the people are electing a candidate in the way the gerrymandered districts are. That is only of registered voters. If you talk about the total population, we are down to about maybe 8 percent of the population of those districts electing people to Congress.

So we have a lot of reform to do in our country, and I think we can be the leaders in that, also in showing not only what we can do internationally, but nationally.

Our most recent group from the Middle East and North Africa was composed of young professionals from Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, and included young men and women working in the private sector or in their governments and coming to Washington for a monthlong fellowship that we facilitate with offices on Capitol Hill.

Larry LaRocco has been a great leader in this, and these are young people, for the most part, that can learn from our experience and programs. We promote a positive relationship between the United States and north Africa, which in light of the Arab Spring and all the crises we see today—and tragedies—is more vital than ever.

Our association connects the fellows with former Members, who they meet with several times over the course of their stay. The former Members act as a kind of mentor to these young men and women through one-on-one meetings, roundtable discussions, and by attending program discussions and events.

I have been very impressed at how much time our former Members spend and how much personally they are able to make connections with these people, and these ongoing relationships that can last for years, and many of these people will be in areas of leadership in the future in their country.

The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. It is a unique opportunity to create a constructive political and cultural discourse between the United States and north Africa, and we are very proud of what the association has accomplished.

In addition to hosting visiting delegations, our association organizes former Member delegations to travel overseas, and we are hoping to increase that and engage overseas audiences—students, government officials, NGOs, and corporate representatives—in a dialogue about the many challenges that are global in nature and require across-border communications.

You already heard that our Congress to Campus program has a very active international component and that we've brought the program to numerous universities and countries, such as Turkey, the U.K., and Germany. Other overseas delegations—we call them ExDELs—have traveled to countries where dialogue is often difficult—we have to get a better term than ExDELs—but it is also an incredibly important one.

Of the major ones that we have been able to start a few years ago is with China, and we are privileged to have Mark Gold with us here on the House floor here today, who really set up this program for our association.

It has been one of the most extensive that we have because we have a group of former House Members go, but also an additional group of former Senators go, and again, it is always bipartisan. Lou Frey has been one of the leaders in this and was on our first trip.

Since our inaugural delegation, we have sent six additional delegations to China over the past three years. Just last month, five former Members—Jim Slattery, Tim Roemer, Steve Bartlett, Jon Christensen, and Don Bonker—made up our seventh China delegation.

This bipartisan delegation traveled to Beijing, Chengdu, and Shanghai. They met with an incredible array of people, including Chinese scholars, the American Chamber of Commerce, China's Foreign Ministry, students at Beijing University, the National People's Congress, and, of course, the U.S. Embassy.

The delegation arrived in China the day after our government announced pursuing an indictment against the Chinese military for hacking our computers, so you can imagine what the main topic of conversation was. For a while, it looked like the Chinese were going to cancel all our meetings, but thankfully, cooler heads prevailed, and the delegates had a very open and very productive exchange with the Chinese on a number of important topics, including energy policy, the South China Sea, North Korea, and trade relations.

In my mind, there is no better and no more powerful exchange than one that is face to face and builds a network of contacts. I think the China project is an excellent example of the great contribution our association can make.

We have now sent seven ExDELs to China over the past three years. We serve as an American voice overseas while in China, and we debrief both Congress and the State Department upon our return.

I should make sure to thank your partners for this project, who have worked with us to make all seven ExDELs possible. We really appreciate the great partnership we have with the China-United States Exchange Foundation and the China Association for International Friendly Contact.

It pains me when I see current Members of Congress get beaten up in the press for traveling overseas. There really is not a single issue that does not have global implications or could not benefit from the point of view of someone who has dealt with the same issue in their country.

One of the great liberating aspects of being a former Member is that we can travel and explore and have discussions without having to worry how the press may misconstrue our journeys in some cynical way, and in addition, I greatly enjoyed getting to know my fellow travelers from both sides of the aisle, so there is some real bipartisan camaraderie that comes from having this common experience.

I am very glad that our association can support Congress' international outreach in such a meaningful, productive, and bipartisan way.

Thank you.

Thank you, Connie. While I appreciate very much the opportunity to report on our international programs, I would first like to invite Connie Morella back to the dais please, and I'd also like to have Barbara Kennelly come down to the dais for a second. I think we're ok without a Presiding Officer for a quick moment. Connie Morella has done a tremendous job as our Association's President, and Barbara has been an excellent Vice President. Let's please give the two of them a round of applause. Thank you! Connie is now moving into the Immediate Past President position on our executive committee and Barbara will take over as President. I just wanted to take a moment to thank Connie for her tremendous leadership, which has elevated our organization to new heights and we have taken yet another leap forward thanks to Connie's energy and commitment. On behalf of our membership, board of directors, and our staff, I would like to present to Connie this plaque as a small token of our appreciation. It reads:

"To the Honorable Connie Morella in recognition and appreciation of her strong leadership as President of the US Association of Former Members of Congress. Her tremendous enthusiasm and effectiveness will always be remembered by her grateful colleagues. Washington, DC July 16, 2014."

I'd like everyone to please join me in a well-deserved round of applause for Connie Morella.

Thank you! And now let me continue our report by telling you about our many international programs, which are more or less divided into two types of projects: one is composed of international projects that include former Members in democracy strengthening missions such as election monitoring; and the other is composed of international projects where our Association serves as a bridge between current Members and their peers in legislative branches overseas. During my time as President of this Association, I always felt that it was this international work that really gave our Association an opportunity to make an impactful and important contribution. As a matter of fact, we institutionalized this outreach in what is now the Global Democracy Initiative, and have worked in wonderful partnership with our Canadian and European colleagues to strengthen democracy abroad. This has always been some of the most rewarding work I've done with our Association, and I am thrilled that we continue to put so much effort into this aspect of our programming.

Via the former Members Association, I have met with numerous groups of legislators from emerging democracies who have come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government and our form of democracy. These conversations and meetings are always two-way streets, and I learn as much—if not more—from our visitors as they do from me. In addition to elected officials, our Association has had an active project—in partnership with a great NGO called Legacy International—bringing young professionals from the Middle East and North Africa to the United States. Our most recent group was composed of young professionals from Egypt, Libya and Tunisia, and included young men and women working in the private sector or in their governments and coming to Washington for a month-long fellowship that we facilitate with offices on Capitol Hill.

Our program promotes a positive relationship between the United States and North Africa, which, in light of the Arab Spring is now more vital than ever. Our Association connects the Fellows with former Members, whom they meet with several times over the course of their stay. The former Members act as a kind of mentor to these young men and women through one-on-one meetings, roundtable discussions, and by attending program discussions and events.

The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. It is a unique opportunity to create a constructive political and cultural discourse between the United States and North Africa, and I am very proud that our Association can be a part in such a vital dialogue.

I had the opportunity to meet wonderful young women and men through this project. They are inspirational and impressive, and I benefited greatly by having spent some time with them.

In addition to hosting visiting delegations, our Association organizes former Member delegations to travel overseas and engage overseas audiences—students, government officials, NGOs and corporate representatives—in a dialogue about the many challenges that are global in nature and require across-border communication. You already heard that our Congress to Campus Program has a very active international component, and that we've brought the program to numerous universities in countries such as Turkey and the UK. Other overseas delegations, we call them ExDELs, have travelled to countries where a dialogue is often difficult but nonetheless incredibly important.

I had the privilege to participate in our very first ExDEL to China a number of years ago. Some of my travel companies, for example Lou Frey, are here today, and they can attest to what an educational and impactful experience that China ExDEL was. Since our inaugural delegation, we have sent six additional delegations to China over the past three years. Just last month, five former Members—Jim Slattery, Tim Roemer, Steve Bartlett, Jon Christensen, and Don Bonker, made up our seventh China delegation. This bipartisan delegation traveled to Beijing, Chengdu, and Shanghai. They met with an incredible array of people, including Chinese scholars, the American Chamber of Commerce, China's Foreign Ministry, students at Beijing University, the National People's Congress, and, of course, the U.S. Embassy. The delegation arrived in China the day after our government announced pursuing an indictment against the Chinese military for hacking our computers, so you can imagine what the main topic of conversation was! For a while it looked like the Chinese were going to cancel all our meetings, but thankfully cooler heads prevailed and the delegates had a very open and very productive exchange with the Chinese on a number of important topics, including energy policy, the South China Sea, North Korea, and trade relations.

In my mind there is no better and no more powerful exchange than one that is face-to-face and builds a network of contacts. I think the China project is an excellent example of the great contribution our Association can make. We have now sent seven ExDELs to China over the past three years. We serve as an American voice overseas while in China, and we debrief both Congress and the State Department upon our return. And I should make sure to thank your partners for this project, who have worked with us to make all seven ExDELs possible. We really appreciate the great partnership we have with the China U.S. Exchange Foundation and the China Association for International Friendly Contact.

It pains me when I see current Members of Congress get beaten up in the press for traveling overseas. There really is not a single issue that does not have global implications or could not benefit from the point of view of someone who has dealt with the same issue in their country. One of the great liberating aspects of being a former Member is that we can travel and explore and have discussions without having to worry how the press may misconstrue our journeys in some cynical way. And in addition, I greatly enjoyed getting to

know my fellow travelers from both sides of the aisle, so there is some real bipartisan camaraderie that comes from having this common experience. I am very glad that our Association can support Congress' international outreach in such a meaningful, productive and bipartisan way. Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thanks, Dennis.

I particularly liked the tribute you gave me. Thank you very much. Thanks for your leadership and your active involvement in the international programs. I am very acutely aware of the power of personal interaction and people making an effort to bridge the cultural divide. The examples that you mentioned, the China ExDELs and the north African Legislative Fellows Program, certainly are important contributions we can make.

Actually, not all of our programs focus exclusively on former Members. As was mentioned earlier, we have a number of projects that benefit from former Member leadership that involve primarily current Members and their peers overseas. We call these programs Congressional Study Groups. Our focus is on Germany, Turkey, Japan, Europe as a whole.

To give you more background about the Congressional Study Groups, which are working so satisfactorily, I want to invite former Member Russ Carnahan of Missouri to the dais.

Russ.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Connie, and thank you for your leadership of the association. I also want to thank the staff of the Former Members that really back up and make these programs work for all those who participate.

Just on a personal note, I want to recognize and acknowledge the passing of our friend and former Member, Ike Skelton of Missouri this past year.

It is really a great pleasure to work on, to report on the four Congressional Study Groups for Germany, Japan, Turkey, and Europe, the flagship international programs for the Former Members of Congress over three decades.

The Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members and their senior staff and serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding.

We have great leadership from both Houses that are bipartisan. The Study Group model focuses on high-level dialogue on pressing issues surrounding security, energy, trade issues that affect our key bilateral and multilateral relationships with our partners abroad.

Highlights from the past year include our inaugural Member delegation to Japan in February, and also here in Washington hosting the Study Groups. They welcomed several groups of legislators and executive branch members throughout the year from Germany, Japan, Turkey, and the EU Parliament.

Looking ahead to the fall, we want to continue our longstanding Congress-Bundestag Seminar by welcoming a group of Bundestag members to Washington and Pennsylvania in September.

The work of the Congressional Study Groups is complemented by our Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially focused on European nations, the Diplomatic Advisory Council is now comprised of three dozen ambassadors from six continents who advise and participate in our programming.

Finally, I would like to thank the institutions and foundations and companies which support our mission. We would like to give particular thanks to Admiral Dennis Blair and Ms. Junko Chano of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, Mr. Friedrich Merz and Ms. Eveline Metzen of Atlantik-Brucke, Ms. Karen Donfried and Ms. Maia Comeau of the German Marshall Fund, and Ms. Paige Cottingham-Streater and Ms. Margaret Mihori of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission for their support as our Study Group Institutional Funders.

And finally, a shout-out to the international business community here in Washington, and the list of those supporters is much too long to mention here in my formal remarks. Those will be submitted for the RECORD here today, but it is because of their financial support, our activities not only helped to build vital bilateral relationships between legislators, but also bipartisan relationships with our own Congress.

This mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are critical to solving pressing problems both here and abroad. As former Members, we are proud to bring the important services provided by the Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues still in office and are proud to play an active role in their continued international outreach.

Thank you.

It gives me great pleasure to report on the work of The Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, Turkey and Europe, the flagship international programs of FMC for over three decades. The Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members of Congress and their senior staff and serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding and cooperation between the United States and its most important strategic and economic partners.

Each Study Group is led by a bipartisan, bicameral pair of Members of Congress. I would like to acknowledge the service of all of our co-chairs for their hard work and dedication to these critical programs. The Congressional Study Group on Germany, celebrating its 31st anniversary of bringing Members of the U.S. Congress together with their counterparts in the German Bundestag, has been led over the past year by Senator JEFF SESSIONS, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, Representative CHARLIE DENT, and Representative TIM RYAN. Our Japan Study Group celebrates its 21st anniversary this year led by Senator MAZIE K. HIRONO, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Representative SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, Representative DIANA DEGETTE, Representative BILLY LONG, and Representative JIM MCDERMOTT.

Representative GERRY CONNOLLY and Representative ED WHITFIELD continue to lead The Study Group on Turkey. And Senator CHRIS MURPHY, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, and Representative PETER WELCH chair our Study Group on Europe, our newest and fastest growing Study Group. Finally, The Study Groups would also like to extend special acknowledgement to its Honorary Co-Chairs, former Speaker Dennis Hastert and Secretary Norman Y. Mineta, who remain active in our programming.

The Study Group model focuses on high-level dialogue on pressing issues surrounding security, energy, and trade issues that affect our key bilateral and multilateral relationships with our partners abroad. Instead of lengthy speeches, an informal atmosphere has proved to better promote relationship building and understanding among international legislators. Over the past year, topics of conversation have included TTIP and TPP trade negotiations, natural gas exports, and security concerns in the East China Sea and Eastern Europe among others. The cornerstone of our programming is periodic roundtable discussions on Capitol Hill for Members of Congress and visiting foreign and U.S. officials and dignitaries. In addition, The Congressional Study Groups on Germany and Japan offer travel opportunities for Members of Congress in the form of Annual Seminars both at home and abroad, and all four Study Groups conduct bipartisan study tours abroad for senior congressional staff.

Highlights from the past year included our inaugural Member delegation to Japan in February, which included in-depth meetings with Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, U.S. Ambassador Caroline Kennedy, and the Ministers of Agriculture, Defense, Foreign Affairs, and Economy, Trade, and Industry. Here in Washington, The Study Groups welcomed several groups of legislators and executive branch members throughout the year from Germany, Japan, Turkey, and the EU Parliament. Looking ahead to the fall, we look forward to continuing our longstanding Congress-Bundestag Seminar by welcoming a group of Bundestag Members to Washington and Pennsylvania in September.

The work of The Congressional Study Groups is complemented by our Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially focused on European nations, the Diplomatic Advisory Council is now comprised of three dozen ambassadors from six continents who advise and participate in our programming. Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogue is a valued addition to The Congressional Study Groups and provides a valuable outreach beyond our four core Study Groups.

Finally, I would like to thank the institutions, foundations, and companies which support our mission. We would like to give particular thanks to Admiral Dennis Blair and Ms. Junko Chano of Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, Mr. Friedrich Merz and Ms. Eveline Metzen of Atlantik-Brücke, Ms. Karen Donfried and Ms. Maia Comeau of the German Marshall Fund, and Ms. Paige Cottingham-Streater and Ms. Margaret Mihori of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission for their support as our Study Group Institutional Funders.

The Congressional Study Groups are also grateful for the support of the international

business community here in Washington, D.C., represented by each Study Group's Business Advisory Council. Companies of the 2014 Council include Allianz; Airbus Americas; Honda; B. Braun Medical; Central Japan Railway Company; Cheniere Energy; Daimler; Deutsche Telekom; DHL Deutsche Post; Eli Lilly and Company; Fresenius; Hitachi; Lufthansa German Airlines; Marubeni America Corporation; Mitsubishi International Corporation; Mitsui; Representative of German Industry and Trade; Sojitz; Toyota Motor North America; United Parcel Service; and Volkswagen of America.

Because of your financial support, our activities not only help to build vital bilateral relationships between legislatures, but also build bipartisan relationships within our own Congress. Mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are crucial to solving pressing problems, whether at home or abroad. As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided by The Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues still in office and are proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach. Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Russ. And I know you abbreviated some of your comments, which will be in the RECORD. Our Association certainly has a very active and impressive international portfolio, and we appreciate your leadership in these endeavors.

And while our focus is on international relations, let me welcome our special guests from other former legislators associations.

We have a wonderful and very productive partnership with our Canadian colleagues, and we are thrilled to welcome from Ottawa former parliamentarians Andy Mitchell and Gerry Weiner. And for having traveled the furthest goes to former parliamentarian Hamish Hancock, who represents the New Zealand Association.

Gentlemen, thank you for joining us today. We are honored by your presence.

In addition to the programs that you have heard about so far, we are also tasked with highlighting the achievements of former Members and providing former Members with opportunities to stay connected with their former colleagues after leaving Capitol Hill. One of our premier events which achieves both these goals is our Annual Statesmanship Award Dinner.

In April of this year, we hosted our 17th dinner, and like the preceding 16, it was chaired by our good friend Lou Frey of Florida. Imagine 17 dinners he has chaired. Lou was supported by a number of cochairs, including me, former Members, Dennis Hertel, Martin Frost, and our Association's CEO, Pete Weichlein.

I would now like to invite Lou Frey to report on the highly successful 17th Statesmanship Awards Dinner.

Lou.

Mr. FREY. Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you very much.

I don't know who got this idea and where those 17 years go, but I guess we are going right ahead with the 18th. The dinner is our biggest fundraising event, and it reaches out to a whole number of people at all different levels, and it also shows what can be done when you can work together and work and achieve a goal.

We have brought, I think, with the dinner, focus on what this group is. There is frankly more intelligence in this group than anyplace you want to put it together. It is an incredible bunch of people that we have here who have given back to this country and continue to give back. And as I look around and see the different friends who worked on it and made a difference, all I can say is thank you. It was never a one-person deal. It was always a deal, a partnership deal.

The partnership has grown a lot bigger for us, and this dinner itself is becoming not easier, it is just bigger. As a matter of fact, Madam President, this was the most productive dinner that we have had. I think we raised, Pete, over—what?—$500,000, give or take a penny here and there, but never lost its focus.

In a great country, we have a problem because nobody knows what we have. We have a country where everybody knows basketball terms and so forth and that and knows how to play the game, but we have a question of people understanding. For instance, in my home State of Florida, your home State of Florida, we know that 40 percent of the people can't name the three branches of government and 42 percent can't explain separation of powers, and 73 percent of our fourth graders—our fourth graders—can't pick the Constitution out as our leading legal document.

This dinner and the people that work on this dinner have a desire to make a change, and we can make a change. We are making a change. We are making a big change. It is sort of fun to be along for the ride, for watching what has happened in that. Look where we were; turn the clock back. It was a total different deal.

It was a social organization when it started. It wasn't going anywhere, bouncing along; and thanks to the leadership we have had presently and in the past, it is a different organization. It is one that I am certainly proud of, and it is nice to look out here and know there are going to be a lot of cochairmen. When I call on the phone and say: Hey, Larry, you know, here we go. There is a dinner on March 25, put that on your calendar, because you are going to get a call. You are going to get a call from me and from the other people, and, Madam President to be, I am sure that you will be right there continuing to help us with what we are doing.

So thanks for everything you have done. Five hundred tickets sold, more than the 16 preceding dinners, tremendous honorees that we have had.

Gentleman, former—well, a Member of Congress, but also the Corporate Statesmanship Award of former Secretary Gutierrez. And we also have, who came up the hard way literally, in terms of what he was doing as a kid, became our third honoree with Operation Homefront, represented by the CEO, Jim Knotts.

And we had a return this year by Gary Sinise, who came back. He had been given the honor. He came back and spent an hour working with the former Members. You know, you give people an hour, they don't come back ever in this thing, but he came back and did it and that.

So we are really proud of what we have of the dinner. We are proud of all the help that went into it. We look forward to a more successful dinner this time and with the people here who will all get involved in it. Thanks so much. It was a privilege to be involved with you all. I appreciate it

Ms. MORELLA. Keep it going, Lou. You are doing a great job.

You know, all of the programs that we have described of course require both leadership and staff to implement. Our association is blessed to have top people in both categories.

I want to take this opportunity to thank our board of directors—these are 30 former Members divided equally between parties—thank them for their advice and counsel. It is really appreciated.

I also want to thank the many partners and supporters we have that have made our programs possible. We are truly lucky to have assembled a group of corporations and foundations that believe in our work and make our success possible, and we very much value their partnership.

I would also be remiss if I didn't thank the other members of our association's executive committee: our vice president, Barbara Kennelly; our treasurer, Jim Walsh; secretary, Bill Delahunt; our past president, Dennis Hertel. They have all made this association a stronger and better organization than it had ever been before, and we want to thank them for their time and their energy. Let's hear it for all of them.

And to administer these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals. Actually, I used to say to my staff: My rod and my staff, they comfort me and prepare the papers for me in the presence of my constituents. And so again, our staff has done the same for us.

Sean Pavlik is our newest staff member. He joined us as a legislative fellow focused on our Japan program, and he has done such a terrific job. We had to hire him full-time. He even speaks Japanese.

Rachel Haas joined our association as office manager a little over a year ago, and she has by now become indispensable for a great number of reasons. Many of you met her this morning. We need to think of a better job title for her because the current one does not describe at all the many different levels that she contributes.

Andrew Shoenig, who is our international programs manager. He makes all the international programs that you have heard about possible. He truly does. He started as an intern and has now been with us full-time for over 2 years. We are really very fortunate to have him.

Sharon Witiw, she is our member services manager. You probably have gotten emails from her. She takes exceptionally good care of our 600 association members and all their various requests, needs, and inquiries. Also, without her, our most important domestic program, the Congress to Campus Program, would not be in as good a shape as it is.

Sabine Schleidt is our international programs director and oversees all the current Member programs which are so impressive and important. In the 3 years that she has been with us, she has transformed all the Study Groups into substantive and incredibly productive exchanges that now involve more current Members than ever, including a Diplomatic Advisory Council, which now has about 30 ambassadors from the region that belong.

Pete Weichlein, he is our CEO, and he has been with the organization for 15 years. Pete, I call him the renaissance man because he does so many things and does them all so well: managing, extending our services to other programs, finding synergy in places we never even thought existed. He is there every step of the way, and we very much value his leadership.

And so I would like to have you give a round of applause. It is amazing, so few people can do so much. You heard about the programs, just think, these are the people who help it happen.

In addition to our wonderful staff, we benefit greatly from volunteers who lend their talents and their expertise pro bono. None deserve more appreciation than Dava Guerin. She has taken on the role of our communications director. She tells our story and connects us with the media.

Thank you, Dava. We really appreciate all that you do also. And I hope you are watching this program, although we will see the minutes.

Every year at our annual meeting, we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. I therefore now will read to you the names of the candidates for board members and officers. They are all running unopposed. I have never run in an election unopposed. They are all running unopposed, and I therefore ask for a simple ''yea'' or ''nay'' as I present to you the list of candidates as a slate.

For the association's board of directors the candidates are:

Mary Bono of California
Vic Fazio of California
Martin Frost of Texas
Bart Gordon of Tennessee
Jim Kolbe of Arizona
Steve LaTourette of Ohio
David Scaggs of Colorado
Cliff Stearns of Florida
Jim Walsh of New York
Albert Wynn of Maryland.

All in favor of electing these ten former Members to our board of directors, please say, ''yea.'' I hear it unanimously. All opposed? Hearing no objection, the slate has been elected by the membership.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. The candidates for our executive committee are: Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut for president, Jim Walsh of New York for vice president, Martin Frost of Texas for treasurer, Mary Bono of California for secretary.

All in favor of electing these four former Members to our Executive Committee, please say, ''yea.'' I hear it. All opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership. I shall join the executive board in my capacity as immediate past president. And let's have a round of applause for all those newly elected members of our board and our officers.

Well, now it is my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former and current Members who have passed away since our last report. I ask all of you, including any visitors, to rise as I read the names, and at the end of the list we will pay our respects to their memory with a moment of silence.

We honor these men and women for their service to our country, and they are:

Howard Baker, Jr. of Tennessee
Ben Garrido Blaz of Guam
Lindy Boggs of Louisiana
Harry F. Byrd, Jr. of Virginia
Howard Callaway of Georgia
William Coyne of Pennsylvania
Butler Carson Derrick, Jr. of South Carolina
Alan Dixon of Illinois
Thomas Foley of Washington
John Gilligan of Ohio
Rod Grams of Minnesota
Kenneth James Gray of Illinois
William Gray of Pennsylvania
William Hathhaway of Maine
Jack Hightower of Texas
Donald Irwin of Connecticut
Andy Jacobs, Jr. of Indiana
Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey
John McCollister of Nebraska
Jim Oberstar of Minnesota
Major Owens of New York
Otis Pike of New York
Robert Roe of New Jersey
William Roy of Kansas
William Scranton of Pennsylvania
E. Clay Shaw of Florida
Ike Skelton of Missouri
David Michael Staton of West Virginia
Michael L. Strang of Colorado
Arlan Strangeland of Minnesota
Barbara Vucanovich of Nevada
George C. Wortley of New York
Charles Young of Florida.

Thank you.

That concludes the 44th report to Congress by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress.

We thank the Congress, the Speaker, and the minority leader for giving us the opportunity to return to this revered Chamber and to report on our association's activities. We thank them also personally for their comments to us and encouragement. We look forward to another active and productive year.

Thank you.

Ms. KENNELLY. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 9:19 a.m.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

For all of us, some days are better than others, some tasks more difficult than others, but You have shown grace and favor to our country since its inception. Please guide our Nation's leaders to make wise decisions in the best interests of citizens everywhere.

For those who feel called by You to serve, let them say, ''Here I am. Send me.'' Grant all of the Members of this House integrity of action so that they act not for their own honor and glory but, rather, for the welfare of all of their constituents.

Lord, we also pray for all former Members of Congress, many of whom are gathered here at the Capitol today. Continue to guide them along their way, revealing to them the truth and bringing them to the fullness of life. May their examples of heroic statesmanship be an inspiration to all.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

BORDER TRIP

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the immigration crisis taking place on the southern border of my home State of Texas demands our undivided attention as well as immediate action.

That is why, unlike the President, I will head to the Rio Grande Valley on Friday. This area covers over 320 river miles and 19 counties, equating to over 17,000 square miles. Knowing this, there is no way to fully grasp the scope and depth of the crisis through a simple briefing in Washington.

The President and HARRY REID just don't get it. Last night, HARRY REID declared, ''The border is secure.'' That blew my mind. If he and the President spent any time at the border, they would see just how out of touch they are.

Mr. President, Americans, particularly Texans, have been waiting 5½ years for a secure border. It is time to secure our border. It is time to enforce our immigration laws.

ACCESS TO BIRTH CONTROL FOR WOMEN

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped we would have settled this debate decades ago. Yet here we are in 2014, and we are still arguing over access to birth control for women.

According to the five-man Supreme Court majority in the Hobby Lobby case, it wasn't enough for politicians to have a say in women's access to health care. Apparently, their employers should have a say, too. This decision is yet another example of the constitutional rights of individual Americans being trumped by the apparent rights of corporations. So a woman is entitled to her own religious beliefs as long as they don't get in the way of the religious beliefs of the corporation she works for.

The Court's ruling in Hobby Lobby allows for for-profit companies to interfere with the personal health decisions of their employees, opening the door for employers to discriminate against women who are simply seeking practical medical care.

Justice Ginsburg said it best in her scathing dissent: ''The Court has ventured into a minefield.'' Now it is up to Congress to find a way out.

ISRAEL

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with full and unwavering support that I stand beside our greatest friend and ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

We condemn the violent terrorist attacks that have been executed in the name of jihad, and the resolution we passed in the House reaffirms Israel's right to defend herself.

When 5 million innocent Israelis wake up every morning to the threat of deadly rocket attacks, they have the right to protect themselves.

When Hamas, a terrorist organization that has fired more than 600 rockets from Gaza in the last month alone, calls for the destruction of the State of Israel, the people have the right to respond.

This Congress will stand beside them as they do.

Our resolution reaffirms Israel's right to defend herself, and it calls on Hamas to immediately cease its deadly rocket attacks.

We must come together as a Congress and as a country to condemn the terrorist attacks against the people of Israel. Furthermore, we urge this administration, as it moves forward in its nuclear negotiations with Iran, to take a somber look at Iran's support of Hamas.

#BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago, over 200 Nigerian schoolgirls were abducted and a hashtag went viral—#bringbackourgirls.

While talking about the girls may no longer be trendy, it is more important now than ever to bring them home. Every moment they are gone is a moment they are in danger.

Mr. Speaker, 3 months without our girls means that the time is now to keep pressure on the Nigerian Government. We must tweet with a fervent passion that extends beyond the glamour of a breaking news story. We cannot slow down. We cannot lose momentum. We cannot rest until our girls are home.

Every morning between 9 and 12, tweet ''Bring Back Our Girls'' with a hashtag—#bringbackourgirls, #bringbackourgirls, and #joinrepwilson, #joinrepwilson. Tweet, tweet, tweet. Keep tweeting until we bring back our girls.

AMERICA WILL STAND WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the continued attacks by Hamas on our Middle East ally Israel causes innocent Israelis to live under the daily threat of rocket attacks from Hamas at any given moment.

Our closest ally in the region must defend itself against vicious attacks aimed at its civilians. Each rocket attack that Hamas launches to kill civilians in Israel is an act of war. The United States must not underestimate how serious these attacks are and how crucial it is that we continue to support Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the Obama administration intends to continue funding the Palestinian Authority. Their decision to form a new government with Hamas is appalling, and we must respond appropriately.

How can we possibly continue funding a foreign government that has embraced a terrorist group currently attacking one of our closest allies and that has refused to acknowledge its right to even exist?

Our message to the world must be clear: America will always stand with Israel, and America will always punish acts of terror.

#BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark over 3 months since Boko Haram kidnapped over 270 girls from a school in northeastern Nigeria.

Abducting innocent young girls and forcing children into marriage or slavery is unconscionable, and no child in any part of the world should live in such fear. These kidnappings are not just a concern for Nigerian students but an issue that impacts all nations that respect basic human rights, including a person's right to pursue an education.

I stood with my colleagues in Congress in support of a resolution, sponsored by my friend and colleague Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON, condemning Boko Haram and their heinous acts. Boko Haram relies on the tactics of fear and intimidation to make their victims feel helpless, and will try to convince these girls that the world has forgotten them and that no one cares about them.

The United States and the international community must continue to send a loud message that we have not forgotten about these girls and that we

will continue to work with Nigeria and all of our allies in the region to bring back our girls.

OBAMA'S FAILED FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today deeply disturbed by the failed foreign policy of President Obama's—a policy of collapses, defeats, failures, and fiascoes. With every day of Obama's Presidency, the safety of Americans abroad deteriorates.

Desperate for anything that may seem like a foreign policy success, President Obama and Secretary Kerry are steaming full speed ahead toward another foreign policy calamity with Iran. Sunday is the deadline for nuclear negotiations with Iran. Let me remind you who we are dealing with. The rockets falling into Israel today were largely supplied by Iran. Hezbollah, Iran's proxy in Lebanon, is supporting Assad, Syria's genocidal dictator, and thousands of Iranian-supplied bombs have killed and maimed Americans in Iraq.

Mr. President, as you, yourself, have said, a bad deal is worse than no deal at all. A deal that allows Iran to continue enriching uranium and pursuing a military nuclear program while supporting terrorism around the world is a bad deal, and we in Congress will oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

FIRST SHILOH HOUSING CORPORATION

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the First Shiloh Housing Corporation for its efforts in transforming the Ellicott Town Center and its surrounding neighborhood.

Two decades ago, the 14-acre former public housing property was abandoned and was the center of an unsafe, high-crime area. Today, the Ellicott Town Center is an almost fully occupied, mixed-use development with a diverse community of residents in patio homes, town houses, apartments, and a senior citizens center. This past Saturday, I was honored to attend the First Shiloh Housing Corporation's ''celebration of ownership'' to reflect on how far this neighborhood has come and to mark the beginning of its next chapter.

Mr. Speaker, the Ellicott Town Center is the result of public-private partnership, including Federal low-income housing tax credits, and it has stimulated new private sector development and economic opportunity. This is the type of work that the Federal Government should be involved in doing.

Congratulations to the First Shiloh Housing Corporation, its board of directors, and its church members on their success in taking back a neighborhood and rebuilding a community.

BORDER CRISIS REQUIRES IMMEDIATE AND DECISIVE ACTION

(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, the crisis on our southern border is one of the President's making.

His policies and failure to secure the border have encouraged tens of thousands of unaccompanied alien children to attempt to enter the United States. On the way, they are exposed to exploitation, violence, sex trafficking, health risks, and other dangers.

The situation on the border is a humanitarian crisis, and it requires our Chief Executive's immediate and decisive action. Rather than leading from behind, President Obama should convene a meeting with the leaders of Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras and demand their cooperation in finding a solution. He should work with our border State Governors and deploy the National Guard to provide security and humanitarian relief.

President Obama should work with Congress to actually solve the problem. That would include changing the law to allow for the prompt repatriation of those coming from Central America and providing the administrative and social service resources needed to reunite the children with their relatives in their native countries.

The President bears responsibility for the chaos on the border and in these children's lives. It is time for him to lead.

□ 1215

IN MEMORY OF OFFICER MELVIN SANTIAGO

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, my district endured a tremendous tragedy. Early Sunday morning, Jersey City Police Officer Melvin Santiago was shot at close range and killed in the line of duty by a madman with a gun.

At the young age of 23, Officer Santiago had his whole life ahead of him. He recently graduated from the police academy and had performed his job with such dedication. Neighbors and family members said that he was an angel who was proud to say he was a Jersey City police officer.

To me, to the people of Jersey City, and the people of the 10th Congressional District, Officer Santiago was a hero.

Mr. Speaker, this is yet another reminder that we, as leaders of this country, must take action to address the growing gun violence.

Parents, children, and families are living in fear to walk to school, to shop at the corner store, or go to the movies. In the greatest country on Earth, fear of gun violence should not consume our daily lives.

I want to offer my condolences to Officer Santiago's family.

ENCOURAGING INTERNATIONAL ADOPTIONS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, there is a loving family in my congressional district who has a safe home for a little boy who needs a lot of love and care.

The Rieglers, who live in Muncie, adopted their son, Chiza, last August. This adorable little boy is stuck in the Congo for political reasons that have nothing to do with his specific situation or his health.

As a Nation, we should refuse to accept the continued separation of Congolese children from their adoptive American parents, especially children like Chiza with urgent medical needs.

All children, regardless of where or the circumstances into which they are born, deserve loving families. I will continue working to make that dream a reality for Chiza and the Rieglers and other families like them who simply want to love and care for their adoptive children who desperately need both.

THE MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Marketplace Fairness Act.

States and cities have seen a dramatic decline of sales tax revenue due to the increase in online sales, where a sales tax that is already owed is not collected. This means that potholes go unfilled and streets go unpaved, and it is unfair to the brick-and-mortar stores that do collect it, but this can be changed.

When my home State of California changed the law to require the collection of this already owed online sales tax, it brought in $260 million in its first year. The potential for future growth is even greater, with $1 billion more that could be collected in California alone.

Last night, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced a bill that combines the Marketplace Fairness Act, which would require this collection, with a 10-year extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

With this act, we can stop the closing of businesses on Main Street and have a fighting chance to keep the jobs they provide our communities.

We cannot wait to pass legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act.

LIBERAL NATIONAL MEDIA HELPED CAUSE BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the crisis at the border is a result of the President's allowing half a million illegal immigrants to stay in the country, and the national liberal media also are responsible for creating the crisis.

The Media Research Center found that, from June 8 through July 1, 89 percent of news stories on ABC, NBC, and CBS failed to mention that President Obama's policies have encouraged the surge of illegal minors at the border.

Accuracy in Media editor, Roger Aronoff, pointed out that another story ignored by the media are the hundreds of thousands of adult illegal immigrants who have crossed the border since April.

He also said that the media push a pro-amnesty agenda and have dropped the term ''illegal'' from their vocabulary, but there is a huge difference between legal and illegal immigrants. The national media should give the American people all of the facts, not tell them what to think.

THE TRAGIC LOSS OF OFFICER MELVIN SANTIAGO

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the tragic loss of Melvin Santiago, a young police officer from Jersey City, New Jersey.

Melvin Santiago, at just 23 years old, made the ultimate sacrifice and gave his life to protect his community. Officer Santiago served as a role model for both his family and his community, working hard to set a positive example for his brothers and cousins.

He knew from an early age he wanted to become a police officer, to follow in the footsteps of his uncle, a retired detective of the Jersey City Police Department.

His death is a deep loss, not only to his mom, Cathy; dad, Melvin, Sr.; stepfather, Alex McBride; his brothers, Jordan and Alex, Jr.; but to the entire city of Jersey City.

We depend on our police officers such as Melvin and the men and women of the Jersey City Police Department to protect us and give us trust that there is order in the world. It is a sacrifice too often taken for granted.

I would like to express my condolences and gratitude to the family of Melvin Santiago and thank all the public safety personnel, police officers, fire, and EMS on the daily sacrifices that they make to protect us.

OBAMACARE IS A THREAT TO JOBS

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, Montanans have long known that ObamaCare's taxes and mandates are a direct threat to thousands of jobs, and this fact is becoming all too clear for in-home care providers.

ObamaCare's burdensome employer mandate would force in-home care businesses to cut jobs or employee wages and, in turn, hurt the elderly, the disabled, and low-income Montanans who rely on them for critical services.

The Ensuring Medicaid and Medicare Access to Providers Act protects Montanans' access to care by exempting their health providers from ObamaCare's oppressive employer mandate, and it protects health care workers from losing their jobs or getting their hours or their pay cut.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5098 and help ensure that disabled and vulnerable Americans can continue to receive critical health services in the comfort of their own homes.

ATTACKS AGAINST ISRAEL

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with Israel in its fight to defend itself and its people against Hamas, a known terrorist organization.

The recent rocket attacks from Hamas have proven it is dedicated to the destruction of the State of Israel. We must stand by Israel during this time of conflict and continue to demand that Hamas stop firing rockets and accept the Egyptian proposal for a cease-fire.

We must stand by Israel during this time of conflict. I hope that the people of Israel and Palestine will soon find peace and security in their homes. Hamas has made it clear that they do not share this goal.

Until peace does come, it is vital that we continue to work toward strengthening our military partnership with Israel, as well as offer our support and solidarity in these trying times, and continue to push for a path of a two-state solution, so Israel citizens and Palestinian citizens may live in peace.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN SEIGENTHALER

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, America lost a giant this week. John Seigenthaler, the longtime editor of the Nashville Tennesseean, was buried on Monday, but his life transcended Nashville, Tennessee, and became literally a part of American history.

Born to humble beginnings in Nashville, Tennessee, he was first a star reporter, then a confidant of Bobby Kennedy, then a defender of the Freedom Riders, then the crusading editor of a Pulitzer Prize-winning Southern newspaper, then founding editor of USA Today, and then the founder of the First Amendment Center at Vanderbilt University.

John Seigenthaler had the Irish gift for friendship and words. He epitomized the best of journalism, and he was always on the right side of history because he helped everyone, including politicians, listen to the better angels of their nature.

Because of John Seigenthaler's leadership, Nashville is one of the most dynamic and welcoming cities in the world today.

Over 4,000 people from Nashville and around the country attended his visitation. The Catholic Church was packed for his funeral. It was broadcast on local television.

Mr. Speaker, a truly great American has died and will never be replaced.

HOW LONG? TOO LONG

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a mother and a parent. I could offer that I am a Congresswoman, but I think we need to embrace those mothers whose girls are still missing.

How long? Too long. How long? Too long.

Next Wednesday will be 100 days since they have been gone. I join to say #bringbackourgirls.

I also want Shekau, the leader of the Nigerian terrorist group, Boko Haram, to be brought to justice. I want you to know that they are attacking girls and women.

I want President Goodluck Jonathan to establish the victims fund that he says he has established, but to utilize it for the victims that already exist. He announced that he established a victims fund after we, women of Congress and myself, pleaded with him to establish it when we went to Nigeria with my colleagues, Congresswoman WILSON, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Ms. FRANKEL.

We must do as Malala has done. We must hug them and know them and love them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have to bring the girls back. Hauwa Mutah, Hauwa Takai, Serah Samuel, these are the names. Bring the girls back.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, sadly, 3 months ago this week, 300 girls were abducted in the middle of the night from their beds in a school in rural Nigeria. As time passes, we cannot allow ourselves to forget these girls. Kummai, Kwanta—these girls are our daughters, our granddaughters, our sisters—Rebecca, Esther, Aisha.

The militant terrorist group, Boko Haram, aims to end the education of girls in Nigeria through fear and intimidation. They have publicly stated their plans to sell these young girls into sex slavery for $12 a girl—Ruth, Naomi, Rhoda.

As a mother and grandmother, I cannot imagine the pain the parents of these girls are experiencing, and we as a Nation are praying for the immediate and safe rescue of these young women to bring this awful nightmare to an end.

I support our President's effort in helping the Nigerian Government bring these girls home and return to school where they belong—Christie, Solomi, Tabitha.

As a Nation, we must continue to do everything in our power to bring back our girls.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been three long painful months since nearly 300 schoolgirls were kidnapped from their classrooms in Borno State, Nigeria, by the terrorist group Boko Haram.

Since the kidnapping, these terrorists refer to these girls as slaves and threaten to sell them in the market.

Congresswomen WILSON, JACKSON LEE, and FRANKEL were brave and bold enough to visit Nigeria, and I thank them for continuing to beat the drum to bring our girls back.

While some of these girls have escaped, tragically, more than 200 are still missing, and Boko Haram continues to terrorize villages across northern Nigeria and surrounding countries.

Today, I stand here, as a mother and as a grandmother, to reaffirm our demand to bring our girls back and to make it clear that mass kidnapping and threat of human trafficking are human rights violations that cannot be ignored.

Every child has a right to live. Every child has a right to receive an education in a safe and protected environment.

Maifa Dame, Ruth Kollo, Esther Usman, Awa James are but a few of these girls being traumatized and terrorized by Boko Haram.

We call on the international community, especially African nations and the African Union, to work together to find these girls and bring our girls back.

□ 1230

3 MONTHS SINCE THE KIDNAPPING OF NIGERIAN GIRLS

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to stand with my colleagues in sending a clear message that we will not tolerate the hateful terrorism and deplorable actions of Boko Haram. The denial of respect for human life with which this group operates is deplorable.

I am honored to stand with my dear friend and colleague from Florida, FREDERICA WILSON, and I admire her and honor her for her tenacious pursuit of justice for the 300 Nigerian girls that were captured by Boko Haram 3 months ago. We stand in solidarity with these girls, their families, and every other victim of this hateful group's wrath.

As the days turn into weeks, the weeks into months, and the months have now turned into 3 long months, the international outcry has faded. But make no mistake about it, these girls are still captive, and they are still lost, and they are still suffering.

Dr. King taught us that ''injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.'' These girls are our daughters. We must continue to galvanize pressure to obtain freedom of the kidnapped girls and remain ever-vigilant. We must bring back our girls.

APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Committee has been busy doing the hard work the American people expect, working in a bipartisan way to pass the needed appropriations bills required to fund the various agencies and programs in our Federal Government.

We have focused on reducing and reforming spending, while prioritizing funding for important programs—for job training, cancer research, and veterans' programs—while holding the line on out-of-control government waste.

With the passage this week of the House Financial Services Appropriations bill, led by Chairman CRENSHAW, we will have passed seven of the 12 required appropriations bills across the House floor. We will continue our work to finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, as my House colleagues on both sides of the aisle do the hard work to control spending and reform government programs, sadly, the Senate has yet to take up one spending bill. As the September 30 deadline approaches, I thank my House colleagues, and hope springs eternal that the Senate someday may take up a spending bill under regular order.

BOKO HARAM

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, 3 months have passed since Boko Haram kidnapped nearly 300 schoolgirls in northeastern Nigeria. Today, as the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I join my colleagues to say that the girls have not been forgotten, and we remain committed to getting them home safely—#bringbackourgirls.

I want to commend, particularly, our colleague Ms. FREDERICA WILSON of Florida, who has led the charge in this regard, and we are united in not stopping until our girls are brought home.

This year, Boko Haram has killed more than 2,000 people in nearly 100 attacks. They have kidnapped more women. They have terrorized villages in northeastern Nigeria and have launched attacks on the capital of Abuja and Lagos, Nigeria's commercial center. Their leader has demanded that Boko Haram militants be released in exchange for the schoolgirls, and he has called for the murder of Christians. He must be brought to justice.

My prayers remain with the kidnapped girls and their families and all Nigerians who live under the shadow of Boko Haram. We must continue to push back against this group and work for the safe return of the kidnapped schoolgirls.

Bring back our girls.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark 40 years that Turkish troops have unlawfully occupied the Republic of Cyprus, an occupation that undermines stability in an already volatile eastern Mediterranean, weakens the NATO alliance, and defies the European Union's peace project.

For 40 years, Turkey has frustrated every meaningful attempt to advance a just solution in Cyprus. Instead, its program has been one of systematically dismantling the religious, cultural, and ethnic identity of the island. The sad irony of Turkey's forced division of Cyprus is that it separates two communities, Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot, that are, themselves, ready and willing to seek reunification.

This Congress, this administration, our Nation must insist that Turkey act in good faith to achieve what the people of Cyprus—all the people of Cyprus—so deeply desire: an end to this tragic occupation.

BOKO HARAM

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last month, I joined colleagues on a trip to Nigeria. The focus of our journey was the kidnapping of 270 innocent

young girls at the hands of the Boko Haram terrorists.

It has been 90 days since their taking from their school, their families, off to conditions unimaginable. So I once again rise and urge the Nigerian Government to do everything possible to negotiate the return of these beautiful children of humanity.

We have not forgotten. We will not forget. Bring the girls home.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. 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 the further consideration of H.R. 5016, and that I may include tabular materials on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1237

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. LUCAS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 15, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. STIVERS. Chairman CRENSHAW, I rise today to address a proposed amendment I was going to offer related to the Securities and Exchange Commission's Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative, or the MCDC. This is a program that was announced by the Securities and Exchange Commission in March, which is related to the issuance of municipal securities.

Under the MCDC, the SEC is asking municipal bond issuers and underwriters to self-report potential technical inconsistencies associated with the financial information recording practices of State and local governments.

On its face, this seems to be reasonable. However, the States and localities that the SEC is trying to protect do not support this program and feel it is very punitive.

In fact, the Government Finance Officers Association, or GFOA, which represents the Nation's State and local government finance directors, supports my proposed amendment because the MCDC initiative is both costly and unreliable for government issuers, taxpayers, and underwriters. In addition, the proposal changed rules midstream, applying one standard when the regulators' reporting apparatus was not even operable.

I appreciate the chairman's time and his willingness to agree to work with me and the Financial Services Committee to find a resolution to this problem should the SEC not choose to curtail this program on their own. We want to make sure it is fair and equitable to our States and local municipalities.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this initiative to my attention.

As he said, the SEC recently announced that issuers and underwriters of municipal securities are required to self-report violations of the Federal securities laws relating to representations and bond offerings. I understand the gentleman's concern that this is a massive undertaking, and to identify all the series of bonds sold and to make sure that all disclosures are made accurately and timely is a huge undertaking.

So I look forward to working with you regarding your concerns and to find some solutions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles—such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel—by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Financial Services Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

This amendment has been supported by the majority and minority on appropriations bills eight times over the past few years, and I hope it will receive similar support today.

Our transportation sector is, by far, the biggest reason we send $600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them.

If they can do this in Brazil, then we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide what is best for them.

And let me say, my amendment, cosponsored by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), would demand and mandate that all cars produced in America be flex fuel cars. It would cost less than $100 per car to do that. And we are foolish, in my opinion, not to do that as well.

But here in the Federal fleet, expanding the role that energy resources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil market.

So I would ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with Mr. WENSTRUP from Ohio, and I yield to him.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The IRS has admitted to paying politics with our Tax Code, going as far as singling out certain groups for having ''patriot'' in their name. Unfortunately, much of the targeting that occurred happened in my district's backyard, in the IRS field office in Cincinnati. Americans have the right to be outraged, and they deserve better.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for ensuring that free speech rights are protected in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wrote to you in April asking that we prohibit funding to implement proposed rules on 501(c)(4) organizations, and my constituents are appreciative that you acted. By prohibiting funding for certain IRS activities, this bill would prevent these IRS abuses from becoming law. Importantly, this bill is designed to make sure the government works for its citizens, not against them.

While the House continues its efforts to get to the bottom of the IRS political targeting, this is a meaningful action we can take now to make sure the behavior isn't repeated. Every American has the right to participate and engage in civic debate and must be protected from partisan bureaucrats.

IRS targeting isn't just an affront to the Constitution, but a threat to all Americans seeking to exercise their First Amendment rights. I thank the chairman and his committee again for their diligent work on this bill.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I share his outrage over the Internal Revenue Service giving extra scrutiny to certain 501(c)(4) groups based on their political ideology.

This bill includes numerous, but necessary, provisions in response to their numerous inappropriate activities. These activities must not be tolerated, and voting for this bill will go a long way toward making Congress' and the public's displeasure felt.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) designate any nonbank financial company as ''too big to fail'';

(2) designate any nonbank financial company as a ''systemically important financial institution''; or

(3) make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of such company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

Mr. GARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in an attempt to prevent government regulators from expanding the corrupt doctrine of ''too big to fail'' into even greater parts of our economy. You see, under Dodd-Frank, FSOC, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, has the power to designate companies as SIFIs, systemically important financial institutions.

I have heard people say that SIFI status does not mean too big to fail, but that is a ridiculous claim—on par with the reassurances we used to get that there was no implicit guarantee with Fannie and Freddie, the GSEs.

In the real world, everyone knows that the Federal Government will never allow a SIFI to fail. It is basically the government's stamp of approval, if you will, that says that we really care about this company. And every time FSOC designates a SIFI, it exposes all of us, the American taxpayers, to literally billions and billions of dollars in potential losses.

You see, first FSOC designates the megabanks as being too-big-to-fail SIFIs. Now they are claiming that nonbank firms such as insurance companies and asset managers also should be designated as SIFIs, as well. I really don't think that FSOC will be satisfied until every company in this country is a SIFI. So, obviously, this has got to stop.

That is why I am offering an amendment to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury and the chair of the Securities Exchange Commission, both voting members of FSOC, from designating any additional nonbank companies as SIFIs. You see, SIFI status puts nonbank companies under Federal Reserve regulation. And then the Fed, which only understands banks, imposes its bank-type capital standards on them, and it doesn't really seem to care if that makes no sense at all for these companies. I guess basically if all you have is a hammer, then everything else out there looks like a nail.

And so when companies become SIFIs, they cease to be part of the free market. Instead, they become something else. They become protected entities that are spared the costs and consequences that normal companies face. And, so, over time, the combination of this protected status and the Fed's risk-averse regulation will sap the energy and also the competitiveness from these companies.

Do you know what? Creative thinking and management will be seen as too radical, and innovative business structures will be stamped out as too risky. Meeting some G–13's definition of ''safety'' will take the place of building shareholder value. Instead, lobbying and political donations will become the biggest, highest, and best use of capital for these companies. And government will corrupt the private sector and, in turn, it will corrupt government.

You only have to look at the corporate culture over at Fannie Mae to see what sheltering a company from market discipline does to it. What do I mean by that? If you like the GSEs, then you are going to love SIFIs. And so we should not allow too big to fail to take root in the nonbank financial sector. These companies are too important as a counterbalance to the megabanks for us to ruin them with crony capitalism.

You see, Dodd-Frank was based on a faulty premise, and this is it: that the financial crisis was caused exclusively by the greed of large financial institutions and that intrusive government regulation could have prevented all this and prevented the crisis by keeping them from making all these risky investments.

So with these ideological blinders on, it is no surprise that we ended up today with FSOC and SIFIs. Instead of solving the problem of too big to fail, Dodd-Frank basically codified it.

FSOC is not working out as intended. And with every reckless designation of a nonbank company as a SIFI, FSOC steps in and makes our economy more dangerous and makes it more unstable. As they say, if you find yourself in a hole, you should do what? Stop digging.

So I respectfully request that you support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, Dodd-Frank does not designate any entity as too big to fail, as paragraph 1 of the Garrett amendment suggests. Instead, Dodd-Frank provides regulators with the tools to address the risks posed by large, complex, and interconnected financial institutions, both banks and nonbanks alike. This is crucial to addressing one of the main regulatory gaps we witnessed leading up to the 2008 crisis: too many nonbanks were in the shadows and escaped critical regulation that could have prevented the crisis.

The Garrett amendment is an attempt to roll back the critical rules of the road we passed in the wake of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Large financial institutions are fighting the SIFI designation because they know that being identified as SIFI

means being subject to regulation above and beyond current requirements, including living wills that will help regulators plan how to wind down the firms in an orderly fashion in the event they become insolvent.

The heightened regulation also includes the ability for regulators to stress-test the entity to see if it can withstand financial distress, demand more capital, or to demand more stringent reporting.

Former FDIC Chairman Sheila Bair, a Republican appointee, noted in congressional testimony after the passage of Dodd-Frank that ''many institutions are vigorously lobbying against such a designation'' and that being designated as a SIFI will in no way confer a competitive advantage by anointing an institution as too big to fail.

The capacity to designate nonbanks as SIFIs is critical to the U.S. financial system for appropriate regulatory oversight. The designation process already has in place multiple procedural safeguards and opportunities for appeal via a lengthy process. Therefore, we urge you to oppose the Garrett amendment as not necessary.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, obviously the markets have already disagreed with the gentleman by the pricing of their shares.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment points out that you have got to have a thorough review, and if you don't consider the true implications on the U.S. economy and the U.S. taxpayers, then you have got a problem. So it is a good amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

TITLE—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce Revenue Ruling 2012–18 (or any guidance of the same substance).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. As the Chair knows, I find several of the Federal agencies very frustrating, but among the most frustrating is the Internal Revenue Service.

One of the more interesting rulings of the Internal Revenue Service deals with the reclassification of certain gratuities as wages when they were meant to be tips. And having grown up in the restaurant business, I will tell you that there is a tremendous difference—not only to the employer, but to the employee—as to whether a wage is classified as a wage or whether it is classified as a gratuity. I know that firsthand from growing up in a family-run and local restaurant.

Revenue rule 2012–18 has forced businesses to change the way that they have traditionally handled consumer checks, and that has resulted in a burdensome and logistical challenge for small and local businesses across the country.

Mr. Chairman, for over 50 years, restaurants have had a longstanding practice of treating these automatic gratuities as tips. For example, if you have a large party of 50 people, then you want to make sure that your waiter or waitress is well taken care of. And for a while there it was 15 percent, now it is about 18 percent, that is added on as a gratuity. That gratuity is meant to go to the waiters and waitresses who have helped your party.

Yet, the way the IRS would treat that, the IRS would treat that not as a tip, not as a gratuity, but as part of their wage, which means it is counted against the employer for income purposes, and then it is counted again against the employee for income purposes. The revenue ruling clearly, clearly, clearly is against years and years and years of practice by the IRS.

Now, a lot of bigger restaurants may have the ability to forgo the automatic gratuities without experiencing any significant challenges, but for small and local restaurants, that is a big deal. Wait staff are often subject to inadequate tips on large parties. And if restaurants continue to utilize automatic gratuities, if they continue to say, please put an additional 15 percent on here for your waiter or waitress, then they can no longer take advantage of the Fair Labor Standards Act tip credit for employees who serve these tables, even if the restaurants distribute these gratuities to the employees. So even if the employee gets the money in the end, it is still counted against the restaurant as income and taxed in one place, and then it is again taxed as income to the employee.

For many small businesses, an inability to collect this tip is a really big burden. It is very difficult to determine wages for employees when they are simultaneously performing tipped and non-tipped work because you cannot add that gratuity for large parties without it being classified in one direction, but for smaller parties you can do a different thing.

Restaurants have treated automatic gratuities as tips for years, and they have been passed on to the employee. That is very important to the employees. It is a big part of the money that they make. And so as the champion of small and local businesses, I have very real concerns about the implications of the revenue rule 2012–18. I would like the IRS to delay it and reconsider their characterization of these tips and service charges.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me to step forward and raise my concerns, as well as the ranking member. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much for the opportunity.

At this point, because of the point of order, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including amounts made available under titles IV or VIII, may be used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to enforce any provision of the Firearms Registration Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Law 1–388), the Firearms Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19-170), or the Administrative Disposition for Weapons Offenses Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19–295).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would stop the District of Columbia from taking any action to prevent law-abiding citizens from possessing, using, or transporting a firearm.

Despite the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in District of Columbia v. Heller that struck down the D.C. handgun ban, as well as the unconstitutional gunlock provision, it is still difficult for D.C. residents to exercise their God-given right to bear arms.

Congress has the authority to legislate in this area pursuant to article I, section 8, clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the authority to ''exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'' over the District of Columbia.

Through unreasonable regulation, arbitrary time limits and waiting periods, and a ridiculous registration renewal process for guns that have already been registered, the government bureaucrats in the District continue to interfere with the D.C. residents' rights to self-defense.

As The Washington Times reported earlier this year, the District of Columbia has passed the first law ever in the United States that requires a citizen who has already legally registered a gun to pay a fee for re-registration, go to police headquarters, and submit to invasive fingerprinting and photographing.

This is pure harassment. Why would the D.C. government want to punish and harass law-abiding citizens who simply want to defend themselves?

As everyone with even the smallest bit of common sense knows, criminals, by definition, do not follow the law. They will get guns any way they can. Does anyone actually believe that strict gun controls laws will prevent criminals from getting guns?

Strict gun control laws do nothing but prevent good people from being able to protect themselves and their families in the event of a robbery, home invasion, or other crime.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. It is amazing. Like President Reagan once said to President Carter in debate, here you go again.

I rise to oppose the amendment. We often hear people running for office rail against politicians who have gone Washington. This amendment is an interesting representation of that phenomenon. We are part of a group of folks here who would like to treat Washington, D.C., as their own little colony. Back home, they tell the world they want no part of Washington, but over here, they not only want part of it, they want to tell her how to act.

This amendment would limit commonsense gun regulation put in place by the elected representatives of the District of Columbia. Under our Constitution, States and localities, including D.C., have the ability to protect the health, safety, and welfare of their citizens.

Even the Supreme Court has recognized that some level of regulation is necessary in order to uphold those goals. The Republican Party usually stands for states' rights, but not when it comes to the District of Columbia.

Our former colleague, the great David Obey, used to say that if Members of Congress wanted to get involved in the District of Columbia's affairs, then perhaps they should run for the D.C. City Council. That may be an option that the gentleman from Kentucky would like to consider.

I strongly oppose the amendment. I think it continues to be more than just a gun amendment. It is an anti-D.C. amendment, and we should stop this behavior once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. As John Lott, author of ''More Guns, Less Crime,'' says:

> The District of Columbia should have learned the problems with gun control the hard way. There is only 1 year after D.C.'s handgun ban went into effect in 1977 where its murder rate was as low as it was prior to the ban. The D.C. murder rate rose dramatically, relative to other cities after the ban, with its murder rate ranking either number one or number two among the 50 most populous U.S. cities for half the time the ban was in effect and always in the top two-thirds.
>
> However, as soon as the ban and, more importantly, the gunlock regulations were struck down in 2008, the murder rate fell, dropping by 50 percent over the next 4 years. Indeed, every place in the world that has banned guns has seen an increase in murder rates.

This experience can be seen worldwide. Island nations supposedly present ideal environments for gun control because it is relatively easy for them to control their borders, but countries such as Great Britain, Ireland, and Jamaica have experienced large increases in murder and violent crime after gun bans.

For example, after handguns were banned in 1997, the number of deaths and injuries from gun crimes in England and Wales increased 340 percent in the 7 years from 1998 to 2005.

Mr. Chair, I would like to point out that the other side of the aisle, when we talk about voting rights, they are very opposed to voter ID and to photograph IDs for voting. I think they would be very opposed to fingerprinting and photographing in order to exercise that basic fundamental right to vote, which is what they often say.

Well, I would remind them that the Second Amendment says a right to bear arms is a basic right. If they argue that fingerprinting and photographing is invasive and disproportionately disenfranchises minorities from that basic right to vote, how can they not argue the same thing about the basic right to own and bear guns?

In closing, my amendment states that none of the funds made available in this bill to the District of Columbia will be used by the D.C. government to prohibit the activity of people in possessing, acquiring, using, selling, or transporting firearms.

It defunds four laws passed in the wake of Heller that constitute an attempt by the D.C. government to overrule and ignore the Heller decision. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. I would like to first say that we only oppose certain regulations about voting issues when they are meant to suppress the vote.

I would like now to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) who—get this—is the only elected Member from Washington, D.C., who is in this Congress at this time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky is not accountable to the residents of the District of Columbia, but he is offering an amendment to effectively wipe out all of the District's gun safety laws now and in the future.

Even if one were to agree with him, his is an entirely inappropriate amendment on an appropriation bill. A pending bill right now in this House would accomplish this end. He is a Member of the majority. If he wants to end gun laws, he has the authority to bring that bill to the floor.

This amendment is being offered by a Member who claims, at every turn, to support the principle of local control or local affairs, yet he is using the big foot of the Federal Government to overturn local laws.

Turning to the amendment itself, if this amendment passes, every gun law in this big city—which shares the same gun violence issues with other big cities and is also the Nation's capital—would be gone.

While we are still reviewing the full effects of this amendment, it appears to prohibit the District government, including the Metropolitan Police Department, from enforcing almost all of the gun laws of the District of Columbia, making the District perhaps the most permissive gun jurisdiction in the country.

The D.C. government would not be able to stop a person from carrying, openly or concealed, an assault weapon, including a .50-caliber sniper rifle with a magazine holding an unlimited number of bullets on any street and in any building except, of course, Federal buildings, like the one where we now stand.

You want to buy a gun in a private transaction without undergoing a background check? The D.C. government couldn't stop you if this bill passed. Angry, want to buy a gun right now with no waiting period? The D.C. government couldn't stop you.

Want to buy 100 handguns today? The D.C. government couldn't stop you. Want to carry a gun in a D.C. government building, including a polling place or the DMV? The D.C. government couldn't stop you. Convicted of a violent misdemeanor this week and want to buy and carry a gun? The D.C. government couldn't stop you.

Every single Federal court that has ruled on the constitutionality of the District's post-Heller gun laws has upheld them. They have upheld our assault weapons ban, upheld our ban on large capacity ammunition-feeding devices, and upheld our registration requirements.

The Supreme Court only struck down D.C.'s effective gun ban law, holding only that a resident is entitled to have a gun in his home only. This bill goes well beyond the Supreme Court. It is a flagrant abuse of democracy by a Member who comes here with Tea Party principles that says power should be devolved to the local level.

He is playing with the lives of American citizens who are not accountable to him, who live in my city, and he is playing with the lives of the Federal officials and visitors from across the country who we are charged to defend and protect while they are in our city.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses'', and increasing the amount made available for ''The White House—Salaries and Expenses'', by $2.13.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, based on the debates and discussions we have had in this Chamber, I have come to the conclusion that my friends on the other side of the aisle believe that $7.25 is enough to raise a family on in America. That is the current Federal minimum wage.

Since we haven't had any ability to change it, to move it up, I assume that they assume that it is good enough for people, but I can't imagine that they think $2.13 is enough, but that is the Federal minimum wage for tip workers in America today. That is the Federal minimum wage for tip workers, and it is an appalling condition, and it should be an outrage for all of us.

Mr. Chairman, 3.3 million Americans are trying to make it on $2.13 an hour, plus tips; and 75 percent of those, Mr. Chairman, are women.

□ 1315

What does it translate to? What does it all mean? It means that millions of Americans go to work every day and are forced to interview every time they serve a customer for their money. Every time they meet a new customer and take an order, they have to do a tryout or an interview to see if they are going to get paid. It is wrong, and we shouldn't tolerate it in this society. Tip workers are twice as likely as other workers to fall below the poverty line and three times as likely to rely on food stamps to close the gap between what they are paid and what they have to survive on.

Mr. Chairman, the companies that pay them these tip wages in many cases are relying on us, the Federal Government, through the food stamp program, to make up the wages that they will not pay. At least we should make them pay their own freight for their own workers. People don't want to go to food stamps, but they need to, and the Federal Government helps them by setting food stamps.

What if the employers themselves were required to pay a better wage? Tip workers are likely to experience wage theft. From 2010 to 2012, the Department of Labor conducted investigations of full-service restaurants and found violations in nearly all, including tip violations. A tip violation might be when an employer refuses to ''top up'' the pay to ensure that they are getting at least $7.25 when tips are low. Tip violations could also include making employees do work that doesn't earn tips, like cleaning or cooking, but still paying them $2.13 an hour. It happens, and it shouldn't happen.

If we lifted the minimum wage to $10.10 for all tip workers, 700,000 tip workers would be lifted out of poverty—half of whom would be people of color—and $12.7 billion in more wages would be pumped into the economy.

Mr. Chair, in February, President Obama signed an executive order requiring Federal contractors, including those with contracts to provide concessions like restaurants, to pay $10.10.

No one who works full-time should have to live in poverty. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I urge all Members of this body to at least demand that we don't have to make up wages that are not paid in the form of government supports.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think when you look at the amendment, the gentleman wants to take money away from the Supreme Court and give money to the White House. What he had to say didn't seem to bear any relevance to what the amendment said. It was entertaining talk. I know he is free to offer any amendment he wants to offer. He could come down and do a 1-minute and talk about what he just talked about, and he could do a 5-minute Special Order and talk about what he talked about.

I am not sure that the amendment that he offered is serious in the sense of why he is tampering with Supreme Court funding and tampering with White House funding. I just would urge my colleagues to say we enjoyed the chat. I appreciate him bringing that to our attention.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROKITA

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, make, finalize, or implement any rule, regulation, interpretive rule, or general statement of policy issued after the date of enactment of this Act, that is issued pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to rules, regulations, interpretive rules, or general statement of policy excepted under section 553(a) of title 5, United States Code, or that are made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing under sections 556 or 557 of such title.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I understand my amendment is subject to a point of order due to scoring or budget concerns. While I intend to cooperate and withdraw this amendment, I would like to acknowledge that this body has a history of waiving points of order on similar legislation that would result in substantive regulatory reforms, which is exactly what my amendment could accomplish.

One specific example would be the REINS Act, of which I am a cosponsor, passed in this Congress and passed in the last Congress, which would very meaningfully overhaul our rulemaking system, much like this amendment would. Prior to the passage of that bill, we rightfully waived all points of order, including one being applied

against my amendment here this afternoon, presumably.

Mr. Chairman, I would propose that this body should wave points of order on legislation that would significantly and positively reform our regulatory process so that we can significantly help our economy by getting the boots of the regulatory and bureaucratic systems off the necks of those who create jobs in this country.

For too long, the executive branch has continued to build its power through expanding the regulatory state. The agencies that we in Congress have tasked with the execution of the laws we now pass is in contravention of our intent, acting improperly as legislative bodies, with no really direct accountability to the voter.

Whether through ''interpretive rules,'' ''general statements of policy,'' or through regulations themselves, administrative agencies have placed extreme burdens on all Americans without the transparency or electoral accountability that our Founders envisioned.

Today, that process has yielded nearly 175,000 pages of regulations, growing by roughly 1,500 pages per week, written by unelected people who rarely consider the impact on our economy or the lives of the people the rules impact. In fact, the only thing growing faster around here, Mr. Chairman, is our public debt load. This has been a decades-long abdication of duty by Congresses past, and we must correct it.

Currently, informal rulemaking is the method of choice for proposing rules and regulations around here and simply requires: one, publication of a rule; two, an opportunity for public comment, but has no requirement to give weight to those comments from the public. In fact, any time I have questioned an agency witness during my 3½ years here, not one has been able to answer one simple question, and that is: What weight do you give public comments during the rulemaking process? What formula do you use? They can't answer the question because the answer is this: they don't care; it doesn't matter. What everyone wants or what the comment may be, if it stands in the way of the agenda of the rule, it gets no weight.

So I am offering this amendment today to require all new rules and regulations to follow the formal rulemaking process which is already in law—it is in the Administrative Procedure Act—while leaving in place existing emergency exceptions to the rulemaking process, fully recognizing, though, that we have to address the definition of ''emergency'' at some point as well.

Several reforms passed by this House go a long way in providing relief to the end of the regulatory process—at least to improving it. My amendment provides relief at the beginning of the rulemaking process, slows the regulatory state, and increases transparency of this increasingly opaque and secret bureaucracy.

Formal rulemaking requires a trial-like procedure, requiring parties to make their case for or against a rule in public. As a result, the administration, no matter the party, must prove the worth of their rules and regulations on the Record rather than relying on a closed-door balancing of public comments. Again, there is a record made, so we know—just like all of America knows from the proceedings on the floor of this House, we know the reasons for the final makeup of the rule; and, if need be, we can further challenge the rule.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is consistent with the intent of the 79th Congress, which created this law for the agency rulemaking process. In the Judiciary Committee report of the law, the committee stated that:

> Matters of great import, or those where the public submission of facts will be either useful to the agency or a protection to the public, should naturally be accorded more elaborate public procedures.

The formal rulemaking process, Mr. Chairman, does that. So while, Mr. Chairman, I think that, in order to protect the public and the Republic, the rampant regulatory state must be stopped and agencies must afford the public weighted input and transparency during rulemaking.

Out of respect for the chair and its appropriations process, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses'', and increasing the amount made available for ''The White House—Salaries and Expenses'', by $7.25.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment—and I say this in anticipation and hope that the Chair and the gentleman from Florida doesn't think I am tampering. Tampering has a very negative connotation to it. What I would like to think we are doing is legislating today, and I would hope that it is taken in that light.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would decrease part of the bill before us by $7.25 and increase the budget of the White House by that same amount.

Why would I offer this amendment? It is such a small amount of money after all—$7.25. But just ask the millions of Americans who make only $7.25 an hour, otherwise known as the current minimum wage.

What can the executive branch do with this money? They can buy pens, Mr. Chairman. They can buy pens that the President could use to keep signing executive orders focused on raising the wages of hardworking Americans.

Last February, in light of no action from this Republic-controlled Congress, the President took the small but legal step of raising the minimum wage of employees working on Federal contracting projects, such as fast-food employees in Federal buildings and on our military bases.

What has become crystal clear is that the Republican majority has no intention of putting forward an agenda focused on lifting hardworking Americans out of poverty. They have no intention of putting forward a jobs agenda. They have no intention of helping to foster economic growth in our country, but this administration wants to. And where Congress has failed, the administration has not faltered.

Today, let's give $7.25 to the President so he can keep up that necessary work. If Republicans would join us in raising the minimum wage and lifting up American workers instead of putting language in this bill to forbid the President from trying to raise the wages of hardworking Americans, we wouldn't have this conversation today.

That is right. Apparently it is not enough for Republicans to refuse to bring legislation for a vote that would raise the minimum wage; now they are also trying to stop the President from taking the small steps that he can do to raise the wages of Federal contractors, like those in the fast-food industry.

They added sections 203 and 204 to this bill to specifically prohibit an executive order to do just that. I mean, come on, give us a break. Not only won't they allow a vote on the minimum wage, but now they want to tie the President's hands so that he can't help advance the issue either when they won't.

Why are they fighting so hard against supporting working people in American families? No one working full-time should live in poverty. At $7.25 an hour, that is the reality facing 16.5 million Americans.

So, when you hear that Congress is debating another huge spending bill, I want America to know that the Republican majority has snuck in language into this bill that actually prevents working people from getting a raise in their hourly pay. Democrats have a bill to raise the minimum wage and it is

ready to go, but Republicans in Congress refuse to allow a simple up or down vote on that bill.

What would happen if the Congress raised the minimum wage for every American from $7.25 an hour to $10.10 an hour? 16.5 million American workers would see a raise, not just the 2 million workers on Federal contracts.

□ 1330

We would experience a boost to the economy, since more people with more money equals more spending in our economy; and we would be helping families and breadwinners, since the facts show adults make up 88 percent of the low wage workers. The average age of a minimum wage employee is 35 years of age.

Raising the minimum wage helps others as well. It also helps people who earn more by reducing the need for full-time workers to rely on public assistance such as food stamps and Medicaid. So raising the pay of our lowest paid workers is not only good for minimum wage workers, but for all taxpayers.

No one who works full-time should live in poverty. We need to raise the minimum wage, and we need to prevent any and every effort by House Republicans to roll back any incremental increases in pay the President can legally give to workers on Federal contracts.

Let's pass this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's effort in terms of minimum wage legislation, but I would simply remind him that this is an appropriations bill. The Appropriations Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction as it relates to minimum wage.

As he points out, if he has legislation ready to go, I would just encourage him to introduce that at the appropriate place, have the appropriate discussions, and move forward there. But this is not the time or the place. Again, I appreciate his effort to legislate.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to study, promulgate, draft, review, implement, or enforce any rule pursuant to section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act or amendments made by such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a study in unintended consequences.

This body determined that they wanted to have more oversight over people that are called broker-dealers of investment funds. They would be handled the exact same way as investment advisers that handle high-end, large investments from wealthy individuals across the country. So the two are trying to be merged together. The Department of Labor and SEC are both trying to come up with their own version of a set of rules.

Here is the unintended consequence that is coming at America: those folks on the lower end and the middle end of America are about to lose a lot of people that helped them with investment advisers.

Here is how it works:

Say you have a newlywed couple, just out of school, just getting started, making $26,000 a year combined, as a couple, and determine they are going to do the responsible thing. They are also going to open up a retirement account and get started thinking about decades from now. We encourage that couple to start thinking about their retirement.

Would that couple making $26,000 a year, with what they are going to put into retirement—$15 a month, maybe—are they going to be attractive to an investment dealer? No, they are not going to be attracted to them. It is a very small amount; $15, $20. But one of these broker-dealers, that is what they love to do. They sign up couples just like that.

The rules coming down from Dodd-Frank will put a new set of standards on those individuals that are providing retirement investment opportunities for people at the very beginning of their investment time. This hits exactly the wrong people, and the benevolent thoughts at the beginning are now coming down to unintended consequences across our country that there will actually be a disincentive to provide retirement vehicles for those with lower and middle income.

The middle-income Americans should have every incentive and every opportunity to save. This simply says to the SEC they cannot promulgate that rule. They need to set it aside and keep the same standards that are already in place. This is not an unregulated industry. They are a heavily regulated industry already.

Keep the same standards in place, and do not discourage investments for retirement from going into lower- and middle-income Americans.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman may not remember the financial meltdown of 2007–2008, but one of the causes was lax oversight by the previous administration's financial regulators. Dodd-Frank has addressed many of these issues and restored safety and security in the marketplace. It has increased oversight over the financial sector in order to protect those on Main Street from abuses on Wall Street.

This is not the time or place to change that landmark legislation. Any attempt to do so will create greater uncertainty in the marketplace and among many Americans, including retirees, who depend upon Federal regulators to protect them. We should not undermine the much-needed reforms of Dodd-Frank, let alone in an appropriations bill.

This is yet another example of the other side attempting to add legislative riders to must-pass legislation that they could not pass through their regular legislative process. I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I would remind everyone that we continue to find ways to try to undo either the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, which is already law and approved by the Supreme Court, or Dodd-Frank, which is the law of the land. The sad part of it all is that we seem to have very short memories. We seem to forget that we are still suffering from the effects of 2007 and 2008 and what happened in my city on Wall Street and how it had the effect throughout the Nation.

We have to regulate, whether we like it or not. We don't have to overburden industry; we don't have to harm anyone; but we can't allow people to do what they did before, which is hurt the economy and put us in the bind we are still in.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I think we all believe in commonsense regulation—and we have plenty of that—but the gentleman has pointed out that so often well-intentioned rules and regulations have unintended consequences.

I don't think anybody believes that we don't have enough regulation. Any time there is a problem, somebody suggests that we spend more money, we pass another rule, we pass another law.

What I think we need and what this gentleman is talking about is that we need common sense. We need to protect investors, but we need to do it in a reasonable way.

So this is an amendment that I think makes the point that so often the rules

are bad for investors, they are bad for the economy, and that shouldn't be the case.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would just close by saying the 2008 financial meltdown was not caused because middle-income Americans didn't have access to retirement funds.

This is a way to be able to protect middle-income Americans, protect their retirement, and to encourage them to save in the future, not decreasing the number of options they have out there. I would like to have lots of folks out there encouraging lots of Americans to be able to save in not just the largest investment dealers in the country, trying to go after the largest, highest-income Americans. So this is something that we should support to maintain the regulations that are already in place and not decrease the options for Americans.

I yield back the balance my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to make any changes to its policies with respect to broadcast indecency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, last year, the FCC published a notice that stated they had greatly reduced their backlog of complaints on indecent and obscene language and images on TV and sought comments on whether they should change their policy on enforcement moving forward. However, they reduced their backlog by 70 percent by closing out roughly 1 million cases that seemed too old to pursue or, as they believed, not within their justification to enforce. The end result was that the FCC unilaterally decided to leave complaints of incidents where TV content was offensive or inappropriate to be aired at times children are likely to be in the audience to be uninvestigated and unenforced.

Moving forward, they asked the public if the FCC should make it the official policy of the Commission that they should only investigate the most serious violations of indecency on television. For instance, they wanted to know if a complaint against repeated expletives in a program warrants enforcement, while maybe an incident of one or two expletives does not. To many parents, this is an unreasonable distinction to make.

As Chief Justice Roberts has mentioned in some of his opinions on this, this is not an incidence of only having a brief instance of nudity, that that shouldn't be warranted, when extensive nudity is not.

While the FCC has not acted to formally finalize this regulation, it is in the public's best interest that they not continue down this road. If they do institute it, it will give the FCC the ability to decide, on behalf of the viewing public, what is indecent and what is not based on the rules that they have now.

This is a significant shift away from the standards that have been set, and the American public wants to be able write in and complain about what their children have access to. Many of us as Americans have real concerns about what is happening in television and the enforcement now of existing law.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to even allow your children to watch commercials nowadays, much less the television during the children's viewing hour. This is simply a statement to say to the FCC that they should retain and continue the current enforcement they already have.

I understand that there are some issues with this amendment. I understand full well there are some issues we need to deal with in the FCC in days ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. MEEHAN of Pennsylvania to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the ayes have it and the amendment is adopted.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LUCAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 1411

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

An amendment by Mr. HECK of Washington.

An amendment by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

An amendment by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 236, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—186

Aderholt
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—236

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)
Roybal-Allard

□ 1446

Messrs. HANNA, GARRETT, BUCSHON, YOUNG of Alaska, STOCKMAN, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, GARCIA, RICHMOND, and RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. HALL, Mrs. BACHMANN, Messrs. ROKITA, LABRADOR, DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. ISSA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 138, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—282

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson

Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—138

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Castro (TX)

NOT VOTING—11

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)
Roybal-Allard

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1452

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—193

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
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
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
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
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—230

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

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1457

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 192, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—231

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—192

Aderholt
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1501

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 351, noes 71, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—351

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney

Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—71

Bass
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cummings
DeGette
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Fattah
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hoyer
Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Meeks
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Quigley
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Thompson (MS)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Campbell
Cole
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rogers (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1505

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 157, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—264

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
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
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—157

Amodei
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Veasey
Westmoreland
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1509

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 256, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—168

Amash
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—256

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
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
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1513

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 184, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—239

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

NOES—184

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

Connolly
Conyers
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
Fitzpatrick
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Barton
Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1517

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Chair, during rollcall vote No. 422 on H.R. 5016, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 200, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
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
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
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 (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—200

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
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
Rogers (AL)
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)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

□ 1520

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton

Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
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
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
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 (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
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
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
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
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)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Holding
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1524

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—241

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
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
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—181

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
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
King (NY)
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Holding
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Ruppersberger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1527

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 425, I was unavoidably detained due to my responsibilities as the Ranking Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the last two lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015''.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 661, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1530

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. NOLAN. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nolan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5016 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 62, line 9, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 67, line 16, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 71, line 3, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 88, line 21, insert after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Today, the proposal that I offer is a modest proposal, but it has the potential for great gain for this country. My amendment provides for $5 million additional for the Small Business Development Centers across this country and an additional $5 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The simple truth is that it is small businesses that drive this economy—28 million of them. Half of the workforce in this country comes from the small business community in this country. Two-thirds of all of the new jobs that are created are created by small businesses. We don't want to be a part of having missed the next great idea, because not only do small businesses create jobs and drive the engine of this economy, but they are the genesis of the next great new idea that will revolutionize the world, change and improve and better our lives.

But guess what? I am an old business guy myself. As a matter of fact, I am quite sure I have never had any ideas of genius, but I will tell you what. Even if you do, that doesn't mean you know how to run a business, and that is what the Small Business Development Centers do—they do it for veterans, they do it for women, they do it for minorities. They teach them how to put together a business plan. They teach them how to put together a finance plan that will resonate with a curmudgeonly old banker. They teach you how to put together a sales and marketing plan. They show you how to put together engineering and design and production plans. They show you how to do sales and marketing and export plans to export your products overseas.

I have a woman in my district, Alicia Overby, who created a great little company called Baby Elephant Ears. With the help of the Small Business Administration, in 2 years she grew her company from $12,000 to $1.5 million in income, producing all kinds of wonderfully good-paying jobs, and all she needed to be able to do that was to get a little help from the Small Business Administration.

As a businessperson, I don't mind telling you, when times are hard, when times aren't good, you don't start cutting across the board. You look to where, maybe, you need to spend a little bit more money, to get a little more of an efficient production system, to, maybe, do a little better sales and marketing, to learn how to put together a finance plan so your banker will give you the working capital that you need to grow and expand and create jobs.

My friends, that is what this is all about. The Small Business Administration serves over 500,000 clients. Yes, that is right—500,000 clients. It generates $4.5 billion in private capital that otherwise wouldn't get invested in new business, creating new jobs for people in this country. That is what this motion is all about.

Initially, it provides some additional moneys for Consumer Product Safety. What has that Commission done? Oh, it has only saved hundreds of thousands of lives. It has saved children from poisoning, saved children from dying in crib deaths, saved children from suffocating in refrigerators, and 4.5 million fewer foreign-made consumer products have been denied entry into this country. Is that worth an additional $5 million to save the lives of someone's loved ones and children? You had better believe it is.

This amendment is all about creating jobs, creating business, creating opportunity for women, for minorities, for entrepreneurs. Why? Because it works. That is why. Do you want to know why it also works? I will tell you. It is because, when women and minorities succeed in this country, what happens? When entrepreneurs and businesses succeed in this country, what happens? When workers get good-paying jobs, what happens?

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Florida opposed to the motion?

Mr. CRENSHAW. Yes, I am.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, let me just tell the gentleman that he will be happy to know that we have already taken care of all of his concerns in this bill.

We have a pretty good bill that we have worked on, Mr. Speaker. The bill has been on the floor now for 3 days. This is the first time this subcommittee bill has actually been to the full House since 2007. All of the Members of the House had a chance to look at the bill, and they had a chance to offer amendments. After that process, we now have a good bill that is even better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Minnesota please clear the well while another Member is under recognition?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for clearing the well.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have a good bill that this process has actually made even better. It is a spending bill, and we know that the government needs money to provide services. Government needs something more right now, and we have tried to provide that. The government needs discipline to rein in spending. The government needs the courage to make decisions even when they are hard, and government needs a commitment to make sure that every task of government is accomplished more efficiently and more effectively than it ever has been before, because I will tell you, if life is going to change in America, life has to change right here in Washington, D.C., and this bill takes a giant step forward in making that change.

First of all, we rein in this out-of-control spending that has been going on for so long. We have said for four straight years we are spending less money this year than we spent last year, and that is quite an accomplishment in itself. How do we do that? We do it just like every American business does, like every American family. They sit down. They take the money that they have, and they set priorities. Then they make some tough choices. That is what we have done.

We take agencies and programs that are no longer vital to the operation of the Federal Government or that have a history of wasting taxpayer resources, and in some cases, we get rid of them. Nine agencies are gone under this bill. We also take things like the Small Business Administration, which actually supports small business and assists in private sector job creation, and we add money to it because it is going to help turn the country around.

Another thing we do is rein in this out-of-control administration and out-of-control bureaucracy. How do we do that? Let's just take, for instance, the IRS.

I think most people in this House would say that the IRS has betrayed the trust of the American people and that they have got a long way to go before they restore that trust. So what we have done in this bill is we have said we are going to rein in that out-of-control spending because your funding is going to be reduced. We send you back to the core issues, and we are not going to give any more money until you prove to us that you can be a good steward of the money that we have already given you.

□ 1545

We also say to the IRS no more wasting money on lavish conferences and silly videos. We say no more intimidating individuals and groups of individuals based on their political philosophy. No more.

We say no more drafting rules and trying to shut down freedom of speech, which is guaranteed by our Constitution. We say, listen, we don't want you meddling anymore in our daily lives, much less our health care.

If you are like me and you are tired of seeing taxpayers' dollars go down the drain, if you are like me and you are tired of seeing nameless, faceless bureaucrats invade your life more and more and more, well, then join with me in saying we want responsible spending, we want reasonable regulation, we want to unleash the individual responsibility that has made our country great.

Vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit and vote ''yes'' on the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 225, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—198

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
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
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Huelskamp
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)

□ 1552

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
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
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
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 (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—9

Byrne
Campbell
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Rush

□ 1602

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, VETERANS' ACCESS TO CARE THROUGH CHOICE, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, a conference report on the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Barber moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 701 of the Senate amendment (relating to the expansion of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, VETERANS' ACCESS TO CARE THROUGH CHOICE, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gallego moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to recede from disagreement with section 601 of the Senate amendment (relating to authorization of major medical facility leases).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard so much about the challenges that the VA faces and how it has totally, thoroughly, and completely failed many of our veterans.

This motion to instruct the conferees would be a motion to ask that we essentially recede to the Senate provisions on leases per VA facilities.

What this would do would be to provide and expand 26 VA facilities from across the country and improve access to care for our Nation's veterans, including the 1.7 million veterans from across Texas.

In the district that I represent, as an example, District 23, which comprises about 24 percent of the land area of Texas, it is 800 miles or so from one corner of the district to the other, and in that district are a very large number of veterans. The challenge is, first off, to be able to get the veterans who have served, who are from the rural areas, to get them access to the nearest VA facility.

From my hometown of Alpine, for example, to El Paso, where there is a VA clinic, it is some 220 miles. If you live further south in Brewster County, that distance is longer. If you live here in Eagle Pass, in Maverick County, for example, you have got to go all the way down to the Rio Grande Valley before you find the nearest veterans facility—actually, all the way down to Corpus.

The Senate provisions would allow for an additional 26 facilities, including a new facility in Lubbock and improvements and consolidations to facilities in San Antonio that are critical to veterans and their families. New facilities will help address the wait times for medical care where it is needed for veterans in our communities.

Frankly, these facilities will help open up appointment slots. According to an internal VA audit that has been released, there are more than 57,000 patients who have waited at least 90 days for their first appointment. Unfortunately, some VA facilities in Texas have among the highest average of wait times in the Nation, and that is totally inexcusable. It fails the people who stood up and served their country and did so much to maintain and protect our freedom.

While we need to explore all our options, including more contracted care to address the backlog, we also have to make sure that the VA has the capacity to fill the needs of our vets, and especially for those who have unique health care needs.

I maintain that regardless of where you live in Texas or any other State, you have as much right to health care as any veteran from any other part of the State. And by creating an additional 26 facilities, you would actually be creating more slots and giving more access to more people.

For rural vets who face additional barriers—for example, if you are driving from Alpine to El Paso, that is 220 miles, and you need a driver, and that driver has to take time off from work; you need probably to spend the night in El Paso, that is a hotel room; and you have got to eat while you are there, so that is meals—all of those, additional expenses.

The other thing, frankly, is that many of the rural vets tend to be older, sicker, and poorer than the general population. These additional facilities may very well be lifesavers for that population.

These new facilities will help address wait times for medical care where it is needed, and they are crucial. Frankly, I know there has been a conversation on the House side with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about creating more facilities than 26.

I know that my friends from Oklahoma, for example, would like to see an additional clinic in Tulsa that would serve Oklahoma. Oklahoma veterans, as Texas veterans, as veterans across the board in every State, deserve more access to health care and better access to health care.

This week, in fact, the Acting Secretary of the VA, Secretary Gibson, told members of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee that we need to increase the internal capacity at the VA. And while we need to do a lot more than just that, these additional facilities would help achieve that goal.

One thing is clear. We have a growing demand for care. As we draw down from all of the places where we are right now—Afghanistan, for example—as we change the shape of our military going into the future, we will have more and more veterans entering the health care system. They deserve better treatment than the veterans in our health care system have had.

Frankly, the entire system needs to be upgraded and to provide A–1 quality health care to each and every person who has served in uniform and their families. We must grow the capacity. We must continue to ensure quality and to meet the growing demand for our veterans.

These leases that I am talking about in some 18 States, they will help address some of the underlying problems that lead to treatment delays. If you look at it, we are funneling all of the veterans into a very few health care facilities across the country. If we accede to the Senate's suggestion for additional facilities, we will have community-based outpatient clinics, for example, or primary care clinics or specialty clinics. It will be a huge help to everyone, and that is incredibly important.

As you look at this map, it gives you some idea of just one microcosm in one congressional district in this country what difference additional VA facilities would make.

Look at the distance from the nearest facilities. If you live here along the Texas-Mexico border and you are trying to go up to the nearest facilities, which are either in El Paso or in Big Spring or over here in San Antonio, the distances are enormous. That is so much to ask of a World War II vet or a Korean war vet who is getting older, who is having to ask for help from somebody, for somebody to take time off of work to take them for a basic appointment, and then, frankly, as we have seen, to be unable to get the health care that he or she needs and deserves.

There is no part of the population in this country that is more deserving of health care than our veterans who have served in uniform in any conflict; or, frankly, even if they haven't been in conflict, they have stepped forward, they have put themselves at the Nation's disposal, and they have protected our freedom each and every day that they wore that uniform. They deserve much better than they have gotten over the course of history.

And I would point out, this isn't a new issue. There were more than 15 reports at the VA that have indicated that care was substandard. Congress has known about this for a long time.

The challenge with Congress is that it is a crisis management institution. Whatever the crisis of the day is, that is what Congress responds to. And if there is a subsequent crisis that takes the first crisis off of the front page, then suddenly Congress is reacting to the new crisis and forgets about the old one.

This is too important to forget about. This is too critical to our veterans. It has to be taken care of; it has to be resolved; and it has to be resolved once and for all so that there are not an additional 15 reports out there about problems at the VA, so that we don't hear every day from the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars or any of these other organizations that for years have been telling Congress that the VA has problems.

Let's step forward. Let's fix it. Let's fix it now, once and for all. And we can take that first step, as a body, Mr. Speaker and Members. We can take that first step as a body by making sure that there are at least—at least—26 new leased facilities across the country that will take care of this issue and that will provide additional service to our veterans across the country.

□ 1615

I point out that these additional facilities are in places like Texas, Louisiana, Florida, Puerto Rico, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Missouri, Tennessee, Illinois, Nebraska, South Carolina, Arizona, New Mexico, New Jersey, Georgia, Hawaii, and Kansas.

Whether you are a Democratic Member of this body or a Republican Member of this body, you should be in favor of additional VA facilities. You should be in favor of broadening up that funnel so that it is not so clogged up and we are not trying to put so many people through such a narrow slot and create all of these problems where people don't get the health care that they need and deserve.

New facilities, as I said, will help address the wait times for medical care where it is needed. And as a guy who represents a vastly rural area but who also represents urban areas in El Paso and San Antonio, I will tell you that this helps everybody. It helps every single veteran, whether you are a rural guy or an urban guy, whether you served in uniform in World War II or whether you are a serviceman or -woman from the most recent conflict. You deserve, and America has made a commitment to you, that you will get health care, and you will get quality health care.

This is the first step in that direction. It is incredibly important that, right, left, center, Democrat, Republican, or Independent, whatever you think you are, you ought to be in favor of additional facilities for the VA, you ought to be in favor of better health care for our veterans, and you ought to be in favor of using the Senate language.

Frankly, again, I know that there are some Members, my colleagues who are from Oklahoma, who would like to see additional facilities and who would want one in their State. I agree with that too. The more that we can do to help our veterans and to meet our commitment, the more we ought to do. And, frankly, we ought to do a lot more than we have been doing.

Again, I move that we instruct the conferees on H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, to recede to the Senate provisions on leases for VA facilities under title 6, section 601. It is incredibly important not only to me, not only to the 23rd, but it is important to 435 Members of this body, and it is important to every single veteran in every single one of our congressional districts.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I can appreciate the work that has been done on the other side of this building over in the Senate, I would remind the House that it has been the House committee that has conducted the oversight that has brought this issue to light. The corruption and the arrogance that has taken root at the Department of Veterans Affairs did not, as my colleagues say, did not happen overnight.

But I just want to tell my colleagues a little of the history about what brings us here today. From the 9th of June to July 24, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs will have held 12 full committee hearings highlighting the problems that exist at the Department of Veterans Affairs. But beginning with the 112th Congress, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held 196 hearings, of which 126 were oversight hearings, and in the 113th Congress alone, we have held 96 hearings to date. We are doing our work.

As a result of our work, both the House and the Senate correctly moved to address the problems that exist at the Department. And as is often the case, the bills we pushed through have reflected our good intentions, but there has been a vacuum while waiting for the CBO to score the bills.

It is important to remember that the current scandal at VA really entails two issues: timely access to the health care that veterans have earned, and accountability because of the culture of corruption that exists among far too many senior leaders who have put their own welfare ahead of those they are supposed to be serving.

The CBO finally provided us with a formal score on the Senate amendment on the 17th of July. Since that time, and even prior to that time, my staff has been in daily contact with our Senate counterparts, and we are making progress on the conference report.

There are differences of opinion as to what the final conference report, in fact, is going to say. That is the nature of our work. But to my knowledge, there is no impasse that has been reached at this point. Now, I am confident that the good will on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Hill will present a report that both the House and the Senate can pass before the August recess, so it really makes no sense to take the Senate position on the leases at this time. In fact, some of the provisions in the Senate version are similar to the House bills that have been waiting in the Senate for months, and they could have been sent—any one of them—on to the President for his signature.

That brings me to the specifics of the motion to instruct today. On December 10, 2013, the House passed H.R. 3521 by a vote of 346–1. That bill contained provisions to authorize 27 VA community-based outpatient clinics. It includes the Tulsa, Oklahoma, clinic that my colleague referred to as not being in the Senate bill. And like nearly a dozen other House bills passed in a bipartisan fashion, they are stalled in the Senate. The Senate could pass and send the 27-clinic bill that we sent over to them in December today.

Mr. Speaker, I must point out that on a total of six different occasions, Senator VITTER from Louisiana and others, both Republican and Democrat, have gone to the Senate floor to request a vote on H.R. 3521 and have been blocked by the Democrats in the Senate. Perhaps the motion to instruct today should be revised to instruct the majority leader of the Senate or others in the Senate Democratic Caucus.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are making progress on the conference report, and to recede at this point to the Senate position would be premature at best.

Now, let me spend a few moments talking about the VA budget needs. In each of our annual budget hearings, Members have repeatedly asked the Secretary of the VA: Do you have the resources that you need to get the job done? And every single time, the Secretary has said ''yes.'' And now today, suddenly because of the oversight of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Acting Secretary Gibson testified before the Senate that they will need approximately $17.6 billion in additional resources to meet current demand for the remainder of this year and into 2017.

In his testimony, Acting Secretary Gibson stated that about $10 billion of this money would go to purchase care and to hire 10,000 new clinical staff. He further stated that the purchased care would decline over time with a gradual shift back to reliance on internal VA care. He also said about $6 billion would be spent on new infrastructure.

So, what the Acting Secretary is saying is, give us billions of more tax dollars to continue reliance upon care that will continue to force veterans to drive, as my colleague has said, in far too many cases hundreds of miles for the care that they have earned, and, oh, by the way, give us billions of more dollars to dump into our construction program that has been shown to be so ineptly managed to result in major projects being on average 35 months—not days—35 months behind schedule and at least $366 million over cost.

Now, again, Mr. Speaker, why would we automatically stand up, salute, and write a check when the inspector general and the GAO have both said we cannot trust VA's numbers on multiple occasions? So the Department, which Rob Nabors describes as having a ''corrosive culture,'' now asks for nearly $18 billion.

Look, we can't allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to continue to consider itself a sacred cow above serious oversight on how the already significant resources we provide to the Department have been spent. Decades of a kid-glove approach by Congress to holding VA accountable has led us to the issues that confront us today. So I would urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to instruct.

At this time, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, respectfully, to this motion not because anybody here opposes expanded access to care. I believe we all do. But I oppose it today because it interferes, I believe, with the urgency of getting a clean bill out of conference.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman has done great work. There are bills over there that the Senate could approve tomorrow. But if we encumber our conferees and we encumber this conference committee any more, we risk delaying final passage of a bill that is intended to get health care to the veterans now to clear the wait list now. That is the urgency.

We all have ideas for long-term reforms. This Member has his own ideas for long-term reform. We have to work those through the process. I believe we should consider giving every veteran a Choice Card and let them choose where they want to go. I believe we should consider competitively awarding management contracts for many of our VA health care facilities so that veterans who want to stay in the VA health care system can do so but can rely on more efficient and more responsible management. I think we should consider streamlining DOD health with TRICARE, with the VA, and look for efficiencies there.

But those are all matters for another day, for another committee hearing, for another bill, and for another piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we should not encumber our conferees any more than they already are in having to negotiate with the Senate. The fact is the Senate bill is encumbered with labor provisions and directed projects, and these labor provisions and these directed projects do absolutely nothing—nothing—to get the veterans off the wait list now.

Let's have the conferees agree to what we can agree to, which is, if you live more than 40 miles away from a VA facility, then give them immediate access to private care. If they are on a wait list, give them immediate access to private care. We can pass those now. The conferees can agree to that.

And here is the absolute absurdity to all of this. I am a new Member with a new perspective. I understand how this body works. But we have 2 to 3 weeks left before we go back to our districts for August recess. We have a President who, every single day, demands that this Congress provide funding for expanded health care to those who are coming here illegally right now. We cannot honestly have a dialogue and suggest that we need to immediately fund health care for those who are coming here illegally if we have a VA bill that is stuck in a conference committee and is encumbered by unnecessary provisions.

We should demand that our veterans receive the health care services that they deserve before we begin to have a conversation with the President about how we ever expand health care services to those who come here illegally.

So I appreciate my colleagues' concern for expanded care, and I agree with that. There is a bill that has been passed and is sitting in the Senate. The Senate should pick it up and pass it. But encumbering the conferees is not the right way to do this. Frankly, it complicates the process and delays the process. We need a VA reform bill back here from conference committee as quickly as possible to ensure that our veterans receive the health care that, frankly, this House supported with 390 votes when this bill passed. This is not a controversial measure.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's work on this, and I know that the chairman has the same dedication that my colleague does to expanded care. We will continue to work these issues. But the immediate need is to expand health care choices for our veterans today, and as I mentioned, before we ever begin to talk to the President about expanding health care for those who come here illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

□ 1630

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 18½ minutes remaining.

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

I am in my first term as a Member, and growing up as a kid in Alpine, Texas, I always heard the saying with respect to things that were really, really hard, and that saying was it takes an act of Congress to do that, and for the first time in my life, Mr. Speaker, I finally understand what that means because part of our challenge as an institution is that we are so wrapped up with who goes first, whether it is the House or the Senate.

The House passed a bill by 390 votes. That is great. The Senate version passed by 93–3, and here, we are discussing whether the House version or the Senate version is better, and in the meantime, we are failing our veterans.

My own view is that people across the political spectrum, veterans and nonveterans alike, are tired of the political blame game and the finger-pointing. Notice that not once did I ever really talk about the differences between Democrats and Republicans because, frankly, there are both Democratic veterans and Republican veterans and Libertarian veterans and Independent veterans and apolitical and nonpolitical veterans.

The issue of veterans should not be something that we pound each other over the head on. The issue of veterans is something that should bring us all together in a cohesive fashion, so that we can move forward as a country and show the rest of America that Congress can actually function as intended, that it can actually work its will as a body and move a product forward.

The idea that we would have to wait for a clean bill, that we would have to wait for procedure to take its course and for things to happen is telling people we will get to it.

Along the border, there is a saying, and that saying is mañana. Mañana seems to be the busiest day of Congress' week. Mañana, we will do it tomorrow. Tomorrow seems to be the day that Congress takes action on every single issue, and veterans are too important to be left until tomorrow.

The American people view Congress as an institution that is very full of hot air, and they don't understand why we recess in August when it is hot here because we would fit right in with the rest of the environment in the month of August.

The approval ratings for Congress are lower than they have ever been since the Gallup organization started taking polls, and it would appear to me that there is good reason for that.

I have great respect for the chairman and the other Members of this body. Their work, I admire. I don't admire, though, how much time it takes for this Congress to move forward. Another day, another hearing, another conversation, another headline—all of that while another veteran waits, and another veteran waits, and another veteran waits.

My motion to instruct doesn't touch topside or bottom the rest of the Senate bill. My motion to instruct talks about one particular provision of the Senate bill, and that one particular provision deals with additional space—additional leases for additional facilities.

It doesn't talk about choice cards or private pay or the rates or any of those other things which are crucial issues and important. My motion just deals with this issue that I talked about earlier, which is the funnel. We have such a narrow opening in this funnel that we try to channel all of our veterans through, and there is not enough space.

There are not enough resources there. We don't have adequate health care providers in the mental health fields, for example. We don't have enough specialists. We don't have enough places to put them. We don't have enough facilities. People have to go too far in order to get their health care, and as a result, they are not getting their health care at all.

Mr. Speaker, mañana isn't good enough. Mañana, tomorrow, should not be the busiest day of our week. This is not an issue or question that should be left for tomorrow. This is an issue that Congress can decide now, immediately.

We can instruct our conferees not on the rest of the aspects of the bill because I understand that takes time and negotiation, but we can come together on one part of the bill. We can come together to the one part of the bill that

says we need additional facilities, not only in Texas—although Texas needs them—but in other States as well. That serves all of our veterans well.

This isn't about a Democratic position or a Democratic Senate versus a Republican position and a Republican House. This is about our veterans who served every day in uniform, who sacrificed every day, so that 435 people here in this body and 100 people in the body across the way could serve and do our jobs and vote and participate in the American democratic experiment.

We wouldn't be here participating in this American democratic experiment, but for the service and the sacrifices of our veterans. If we recognized that, if we truly recognized that, then we would step forward now, not tomorrow. We would step forward now and admit that we desperately need additional VA facilities.

We desperately need those 26 additional places. We could put off for the conferees and allow the conferees the latitude to discuss all of the rest of the bill, but we ought to be able to come together on that one thing, and that one thing is those additional 26 facilities.

Waiting for a clean bill, I can't tell you, Mr. Speaker, how many times in meeting with the VA or the VFW or the American Legion or any one of the number of organizations like the Vietnam Veterans, I can't tell you how many times they tell me they have been asked to wait another day—wait, you will get your bill; wait, we will take care of you; wait, we understand you are important.

They don't need a pat on the head. They don't need a pat on the shoulder. What they need is what they have earned, and what they have earned is health care. Those 26 additional facilities would help us get them their health care and help us get them exactly what they need and what our government has committed to them, regardless of party, regardless of rhetoric, regardless of partisanship, regardless of blame, regardless of whatever.

If I started by saying it takes an act of Congress to do this, this is a great opportunity for Congress to step forward and say, through an act of Congress, we understand how important the veterans are, and we are not saving that until tomorrow—you will get your 26 facilities, your 26 additional facilities.

We will broaden that pipeline, so that more veterans across this country will have access to health care, and we will do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is too much to ask.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, who has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close. The gentleman from Florida has 18½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is curious to me that my colleague talks about not waiting, not waiting, not waiting—mañana.

The House passed a bill in December—in December. How much longer do veterans have to wait before the bill that resides in the Senate is passed? That is what we have been waiting for.

I cannot figure out what my colleague has against the veterans in Tulsa, Oklahoma, because that is the clinic that is missing out of the bill that he is wanting to instruct us to accept. Why would we not give access for care to the veterans in Oklahoma? It doesn't make any sense.

So when my colleague says mañana, saying that, for some reason, we are trying to delay access to care, I say, oh, no—oh, no. What this bill actually does is it expands care way beyond what VA has ever purported to be able to do.

The clinics that we are talking about authorizing may not even be necessary in future years—I am not talking about these specific clinics—because veterans will be able to go out into the private sector.

No longer will there be a bottleneck within the Department of Veterans Affairs providing access to care for the veterans. You see, that is what has happened with VA really since the 1940s.

They have been trying to force veterans to drive for hours to facilities to get their care in places that they don't want to have to get their care at, to get their care when VA says they will get their care, not when the veteran says they want their care, so let's change the formula a little bit. Let's give veterans their care where they want to get it and when they want to get it.

So I say to my friend that if we truly want to service the most veterans, you have got to ask the Senate to pass the bill that we passed in December because, for some reason, the Senate doesn't want to put a clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers at this time, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to instruct.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me start by, in all sincerity, saying that I have the greatest respect for Chairman MILLER and the work that he has been doing. I follow his comments and his remarks and his committee regularly because the issue of veterans is an issue that is near and dear to my heart, as it is to so many of us, and I have great respect for his views and his expertise.

While I may differ in my opinion, I certainly would never, ever think that his motives are impure because they are not. He is very sincere and very driven to help, but here is what I don't understand. For veterans across the country, they don't care, in my view, if the first two letters on a bill are H.R. or S.

That makes no difference, topside or bottom, to any veteran that I have ever talked to. I would urge my colleagues to talk to as many veterans as they can and to ask them specifically: Does it matter to you if this is a Senate bill or a House bill? I guarantee you that every veteran across the country will say, no, it doesn't matter.

So the idea that we are stuck here at this point in the process because the House wants a House bill and the Senate would like a Senate bill, frankly, that is ludicrous, and it is offensive to the veterans who have served our country.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEGO. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. It is not a House bill or a Senate bill question because this is a House bill that the Senate amended, so it is not a matter of whether it is a House bill, House resolution, Senate bill, Senate resolution, it is a House bill that the Senate has amended.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1645

Mr. GALLEGO. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield.

I would point out that part of the conversation that we have had is asking the Senate to take action on a bill that the House sent over, when that is even a better argument for this motion, because the House bill is already back from the Senate in the House, and we can settle this question once and for all by instructing our conferees to accept that language.

I would urge that we have 26 additional facilities. I would commit to the chairman that I will do all I can to make sure that it is not just 26 facilities, that if it needs to be 27, I am happy to do that. I have worked in a very bipartisan fashion with the Democratic and Republican members of the Armed Services Committee, particularly the freshman members of the committee, in order to do that.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I am always happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Thank you very much.

The problem we are going to have is that a conference report is a privileged report. It is not amendable. So you will not be able to add an additional clinic in the conference report.

Even if we recede to the Senate position, we will be stuck with 26 clinics. That is why it is critical that the House bill that has been languishing for 7 months that is over there be passed and sent to the President today.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, again, I am always happy. I love the process, and I am a huge believer in the democratic system, but I will tell you that

the idea that we are stuck at 26 and we are stuck at 26 forever is not a credible argument because there are other vehicles in the process that would be just as rapid and just as fast if we would get over this idea, this pride of authorship, and if we would all work together on a bipartisan basis to fashion a solution that all veterans can live with. That is incredibly important. For me, this is a starting point, not an ending point.

It is important, it seems to me—and I hope to do that by example, Mr. Speaker, that we stay away from the finger-pointing and the blame game—that we not be guilty of the fiery rhetoric I have never understood.

As a west Texan, my instinct is always to put fires out. It is never my instinct to add additional fuel. So the partisan fires that rage in this building, it seems to me, need to be put out, and the interest of the American people and, in this case, the American veteran need to be put first and foremost and at the front and center of everything that we are doing.

We shouldn't stand and salute the VA, as the chairman has indicated—I agree with that—but we should stand and salute every single veteran who has served and every single veteran who deserves health care and who doesn't get it.

We should apologize, Mr. Speaker, to every single veteran who has stood in line for those months and months at the VA and not been able to make it through that small funnel, and we should apologize to them if we don't broaden that funnel to allow more people to get more care.

Yeah, there may be changes to the system, but those changes to the system are further down the hall, further down the way, further down the road, further down whatever. Today, here, we are talking about additional VA facilities. That one question we can settle, we can settle tonight or tomorrow, whenever the vote is on this, and we can make sure that we expand that pipeline, so that we don't try to push so many veterans through this really narrow pipeline, so that some of them get squeezed out of the system.

We should make that pipeline bigger so that more people get served, and each of us, each of us—Republican, Democrat, Independent, Libertarian, agnostic—each of us should be proud of that vote.

Stand up and salute our veterans, stand up and salute our people who served, and stand up and admit that they need access to health care. That is what this motion does, Mr. Speaker.

On that note, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

NEW DATA ON MARCELLUS PRODUCTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, natural gas production in the Marcellus and Utica shale formations is projected to grow 36 percent by 2035, according to a recently released industry report from ICF International.

According to the report, which is released quarterly:

> Well data from producers suggests ultimate recovery of gas in the Marcellus will average 6.2 billion cubic feet per well, up from 5.2 billion cubic feet per well in the last report.

According to a recent Energy Information Administration drilling report, gas production in Pennsylvania alone has more than quadrupled from 2009 to 2011.

Today, Bloomberg News reports:

> Record natural gas production from the Marcellus is helping send U.S. output to an alltime high.

Another recent industry report from Morningstar, Incorporated, noted that Pennsylvania is now ranked third in the Nation for natural gas production and that the Marcellus is expected to account for nearly one-fourth of all U.S. gas output by 2015.

Mr. Speaker, natural gas continues to provide jobs and family-sustaining incomes that are much needed in the Nation's slow economic recovery. At the same time, we are moving closer to energy independence.

UNFUNDED LIABILITIES—THE GREATEST THREAT TO OUR FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), I believe it is southeast Illinois.

CELEBRATING THE LIVES OF ALAN DIXON AND KENNY GRAY

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today to celebrate the lives of two extraordinary public servants, both considered from southern Illinois—one from deep southern Illinois—Senator Alan Dixon and Congressman Kenny Gray. Both passed within the last week or so, but our mourning has turned into remembrance and reverence for their undeniable commitment to all of us.

Senator Alan Dixon—or as he was commonly known, Al the Pal, as we from Illinois knew him, and eventually everyone else in this institution and in Washington knew him as that also—was a larger-than-life personality, with a can-do spirit, if you will.

He came to Washington to get things done, particularly for his beloved Illinois. From his beginnings in Belleville and St. Clair County to being State treasurer and secretary of State, he modernized the offices he served in to better serve the people of the State.

Elected to the U.S. Senate in 1980, he soon realized that Illinois lacked a cohesive message in Washington, D.C.

With Senator Chuck Percy, he began a monthly Illinois get-together that continues to this day. It brings together Members of the House and the Senate, downstate, Chicago, Republican, Democrat, conservative, moderate, and liberal. We sit around, and we talk about the Illinois agenda and how we can work together to advance it.

Our prayers and best wishes go out to his wife, Jody, and his family and friends.

I would also like to single out a couple of other people who were very special in his life. One was Gene Callahan and Scott Shearer. Their public service on his behalf is emblematic of that of all those who worked with my friend, Al the Pal.

Just as a side note to my colleague, we have a colleague here who is a Member of Congress, CHERI BUSTOS, who is the daughter of Gene; and there is that great connection of, in essence, a politically active family that continues to serve.

We will miss Al the Pal. He was a great friend and a great public servant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to Kenny Gray. Kenny Gray was a very colorful Member of this Chamber, well known for spending many hours in the chair. He loved this House so much that, after he retired, he ran again and came back.

He was known as really a cult of personality. In a sea of Washington grey suits, white shirts, and red ties, Kenny stormed through this place in a flurry of colors that had never been seen before, but you dare not look away, as the Prince of southern Illinois was here, and he was determined to fight for his constituents.

Kenny made a big difference in southern Illinois. As the coal industry started suffering challenges, he worked hard. He was known as the Prince of Pork and the Prince of southern Illinois.

He worked diligently to bring the interstate system to southern Illinois, and he is also credited to bring a major water conservancy, Rend Lake, which brings and provides much of the needed drinking water to southern Illinois, and I would argue deep southern Illinois.

I am reminded of how he helped young people from southern Illinois come and grow here in D.C. A favorite example is my friend Brenda Otterson of West Frankfort, who came out to D.C. a few years back.

She came here as a Republican—Kenny is a Democrat—but as a Republican. Brenda came from a family of Democrats. Try as he might, Kenny worked hard to convert her.

When he finally realized she wasn't budging, he said, fine, and he helped her get a full-time job with a Republican Member. She served with distinction and never forgot her Kenny Gray roots.

Kenny's wife, Toedy, and their family deserve a special prayer and thanks from all of us.

Mr. Speaker, time comes, and time goes—rabid debates, a flurry of activities. We always take time out to remember those of our colleagues from future generations who are served, served nobly, and then gone home.

I think it is just fitting to remember that we remember those who served selflessly for many years as we take up their call to continue to do the same.

It is also important to remember to enjoy each and every day, enjoy life, work hard—because everything has its time under the Sun and everything is passing. That is why I appreciate the opportunity to serve. I love the Chamber. I love my colleagues.

With that, thank you for this opportunity, my colleague, Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Mr. SHIMKUS.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, I came to the floor and did a bit of a presentation of some of the numbers we were seeing on what was actually happening in our debt, in our future economic growth, why we were so stagnant in today's economy, and the overhang that was, I believe, the very thing that was slowing down future economic growth.

I had a number of phone calls and a number of emails and a few comments on Facebook asking for a little more definition, a little more presentation. So I thought I would come to the floor this evening, take some of this leadership hour, and walk through some of the numbers.

I have to apologize to everyone right now, I am going to throw out a lot of math, a lot of numbers, but you are going to see a theme here of what is coming at us, and it is coming at us very, very fast.

After we do this, I want to do a little talking about a piece of legislation that I have that has made it through committee, and I am hoping, over the next couple of months, we will come to the floor and what that piece of legislation, I believe, means to sort of transparency here in our government with the EPA and hopefully as just sort of the future of how we deal with data in this Federal Government.

The chart alongside me—and I know there are lots of lines in it and it is hard to read, but it has a very, very, very simple theme—I am going to show variations of this on a couple of different boards.

□ 1700

The red you see down at the bottom is what we call discretionary spending. That is what we substantially get to come down and vote on.

That discretionary spending, if you look at the next decade on this chart, basically stays the same. So the military, the Park Service, the FBI, education, and these things that are programatic that we come down and vote for on the discretionary side of the budget are pretty much staying even for the next 10 years.

Do you see the blue lines? They are just slightly shy of doubling. They basically double over the next 10 years. That is mandatory spending. That is Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and now ObamaCare, things that are built in by formula. And they grow and grow and grow and grow, and they consume everything in their path.

That is what is going on here.

When I do meetings back home in Arizona, in the district, you often get this question: Why do you all fight with each other? Why do you all fuss with each other? And my answer is: It is about the money. And you get this look.

You must understand, we come to this floor and we are fighting over, fussing over, in many ways, a shrinking pot of resources, even though today we have actually the highest revenues this Federal Government has ever received.

So where is the money going? It is going to that mandatory spending. We need to deal with the reality that the mandatory spending—the entitlements—are consuming our future. So that is what this chart is basically saying.

We are going to the next chart. The reason I am going to put this one up is this is from 2013. So we actually know it has happened. It is a closed book.

If you look at the blue areas, that is mandatory spending. You will see Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. You will see other income. You have supplemental programs like food stamps, WIC, and some of those types of programs. You will see veterans' benefits down here. And about 6 percent of our budget last year—our money, our spending—went to interest. Thirty-two percent last year is what we, as Members of Congress, got to come down here and do policy on.

Understand that in 9 budget years—and I am going to show you that pie chart in a moment. That is 32 percent. In 9 budget years, that goes from 32 percent of our spending and collapses down to 22 percent. That 22 percent has your military, the FBI, the education, health research. All those types of things are in that remaining portion of the pie.

This was something that I picked up several months ago, and I was shocked it did not get more discussion here on the floor of the House or around here in Washington. Last September, we had the Chief of Staff of the United States Army in discussion before Congress talking about the future of the Army and what was actually going on. In his quote, he basically says that 46 percent of the Army spending today is personnel costs, like salaries, pensions, health care. By 2023, 9 years from now, it is going to be 80 percent.

So get your head around this: 80 percent of the Army's spending in 9 years will be personnel costs. It will not be equipment. It will not be things that fly fast and go kaboom or make our soldiers safer. It will be personnel costs. In 9 years, 80 percent of that Army's budget will be personnel costs.

You have got to understand the demographic bubble our country is in. The fact of the matter is these costs are consuming us. We can have a debate of, well, it's uncomfortable to talk about, it's not politically correct, when you talk about Medicare and Social Security you can get yourself unelected, but if you care about these programs, if you care about the social contract we as Members of Congress have with our constituents, you need to step up and understand the underlying math so you can save them—because it is math.

Think about if I came to you and told you that 9 years from now, for a branch of our service, 80 percent of their money is not equipment, is not things that keep the soldiers safe, but it is just going to be salaries, health care, and retirement. You need to understand that the very thing we are discussing on our overall Federal budget is now also hitting Federal employees and our military.

I am going to rotate to the next board. Remember, this one shows 32 percent of all of our spending was discretionary.

This is 9 budget years from now, so it is 2024. Nine budget years from now, that discretionary portion falls to 22 percent of our spending. And this is still the military; this is still the FBI; it is still health research; it is still education.

So what is happening here? Well, on the previous pie chart, interest was 6 percent of our budget, 6 percent of our spending. In 9 years, we predict it to be around 14 percent. That is assuming that we stay with historic norms on interest rates. If interest rates spike, if we have 1979, 1980, 1981, or 1982 all over again, our interest exposure consumes huge portions of what is left in the discretionary budget.

You must understand what we have done with the explosion of our deficits

in this country. We have actually made this country rather fragile to interest rate exposure, and something you need to understand is we now become more and more subject to the world's interest rate markets and our ability to constantly sell more and more of our debt.

There was something I found sort of amusing, and I didn't bring the actual numbers with me, but 2 days ago this administration was announcing how happy they were with that the deficit numbers and where they were at. The problem was the deficit numbers weren't that different from last year, and they were substantially higher than they were predicting last September, one more time demonstrating here in Washington you can spin almost anything. And if you have a compliant press, complicit press—whatever you want to use—you can make it sound like happy talk.

The numbers are not getting better.

So in 9 budget years, 24 percent of our spending is going to be Social Security.

On occasion, I will have someone on the left who will show up at one of our discussion groups, our working groups, or our town halls and demand a discussion about Social Security, saying Social Security is fully funded. They have all those IOUs in it.

Here is the basic math on Social Security.

Social Security is holding about $2.3 trillion of special Treasury notes from the Treasury Department. Obviously, the Treasury Department, if they were to pay those back—which they will—they have to go borrow the money, because they have already spent the money. That is the asset in Social Security. Understand, Social Security is sitting on about a $24 trillion unfunded liability. So they are holding about $2.3 trillion in special Treasury notes, and they have $24 trillion in unfunded liabilities.

And this is where it ties in. We talked about this a couple of weeks ago.

At the very beginning of the year, George Mason University did a study and put together some data of what would happen if you took the U.S. debt, the U.S. liabilities, and put them on GAAP accounting, just like your business, my business, just like everyone else where you are doing a large public statement and you would have to put them on GAAP accounting—what are your liabilities, what are your assets, and if you offset them.

What would you guess the United States shortfall is? On occasion, I will hear many of my brothers and sisters even here in this body sort of quote the number that you can see at the bottom of the U.S. debt clock on the Web site as it is spinning, and they will say things like: Oh, it's a $120 trillion shortfall.

The study at George Mason University came in at $205 trillion, which is our honest debt, our honest unfunded liabilities, if you actually use GAAP accounting.

Go to the Internet now and take a look at what many predict, estimate, guess is the entire wealth of the world. You are going to find out what we owe, what we are going to owe, what we have promised is greater than the current wealth of the entire world—every asset in the world.

I will make you the argument that even with the chaos we have right now through so many things in this country and so many things I actually hold this administration responsible for, the President's failure to step up and say, This is the systemic risk to my country, to your country, to our country, not dealing with the explosion of the future entitlements consumes our future. And it is in front of us.

We knew baby boomers were going to turn 65 for how long? I remember sitting in a statistics class in 1981 where the professor was putting things up on the board and talking about how much money we would have to have set aside in assets as we started to move into the baby boom retirements.

We are now into year three, and my understanding is a typical baby boomer will have put in around $100,000, $120,000 into Medicare in their lifetime, and they are going to take out $330,000. So they will put in about $110,000 and take out about $330,000. Now, multiply that shortfall times 76 million brothers and sisters. And we are into year three of it now.

We have known this was coming. We have known this was coming for 65 years, but it was politically dangerous to talk about. It was uncomfortable. It is easier, as you watch the debates here on the floor, to talk about today's chaos, today's spending.

Being able to cover these promises, these social entitlements, these social contracts into our future, if you love your kids, if you love your grandkids, if you love your great-grandkids that may not even be here yet, this is the question I beg of you to ask candidates who are running around this country: What are your plans to deal with the crushing future debt, the crushing future promises that we have made that there is no money for?

There is this almost pathologic attitude around here of: We will get to it one day when we have a Senate that is willing to step up and do work. We will get to it one day when we have a President that is willing to be honest about the math. We will get to it one day.

The problem is that every single day that ticks away, the math gets worse. A good example of that is 2 days ago, the Congressional Budget Office came out with their annual data.

Remember, you have heard over and over on the media that things are getting better, the job situation is better, our numbers are getting better. Well, if they are getting better, how did the fiscal scenarios get worse?

Go pull the Congressional Budget Office's numbers that they just put out. Our Congressional Budget Office does two scenarios. One is the standard and one is called an alternative.

□ 1715

The standard is basically based on the concept of: this is the law as it is today. Here are the numbers that it projects. Of course, you have got to understand that the law as it is today has things in it like the common vernacular ''doc fix.'' We refer to it as the SGR. It is this concept that, in a dozen or so years, doctors are going to take 73 percent less money—73 percent less compensation—to see a Medicare patient. It is implausible. It is not going to happen. Yet here is how the scam works here in Washington.

It is the current law that doctors are going to be compensated this much less over the next dozen years, so we are going to calculate that as savings all up and down our future budget projections, our future debt projections. We have things that are woven into those numbers that are fantasy. Go read the last three pages of the Medicare-Social Security actuarial report. The head actuary, whom I have never met but who I hear is just a standup person, basically says, ''Oh, by the way, these numbers are implausible,'' but they are based on current law. You will hear debates here on the floor, saying, ''No, the number is this. The number is this.'' The number often, if they are using the standard projections, is a fraud.

Then there is the alternative scenario, which may overshoot a number on the negative side because it basically makes a projection of: What if GDP isn't what we hope it to be? which, as it has turned out over the last couple of years, is true. We will be blessed if we can break through that 2 percent this year because of what happened in the first quarter.

The alternative scenario is that we hit 100 percent of debt to GDP in 14 years. How many of you remember what you were doing 14 years ago? To help you put it in sort of a perspective, when you get ready to take out that 30-year mortgage, understand that less than halfway through it your government, your country, is going to be at 100 percent debt to GDP. Theoretically, that is when your sovereign debt becomes much more risky, and this net interest figure potentially starts to explode on you because getting sovereign nations, getting individuals and getting investors from around the world to buy our sovereign debt becomes harder and harder because we start to look riskier and riskier. If you say, ''David, I don't want you to use the alternative number. I want you to use the standard number,'' okay. Add 8 years. Add 8 years so that, in 2036, we hit 100 percent of debt to GDP.

We can fix this, and we can fix it in a way that is not terrifying. It will be a little uncomfortable, but you will save the future. If you are a person of the left and if there are programs you

care so deeply about, those programs are on the discretionary side of this budget. If you are a person of the right or a person who cares a lot about the military, that is in this discretionary budget. Every time you talk about those programs, you need to stand behind that microphone and talk about mandatory spending—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and now ObamaCare—because they are all on autopilot, and they are consuming everything in their path.

That is, hopefully, a little more detail of some of the numbers I put up a couple of weeks ago. We traditionally will put these slides up on our Facebook page and on our Web site so that you can analyze them. If you want all of this data and a lot more—I mean, a presentation could go on for hours—it is on the Congressional Budget Office's data sets. This is the issue of our time. It is that we have made as a government, as a people, lots and lots of promises, and we haven't built the mechanisms to pay for them.

With that, I want to move on to one other little thing. Let's take these boards down.

Now, as we get ready to talk about the ''Secret Science'' piece of legislation, I show you all of these debt projections and unfunded liability numbers, and I am actually more optimistic today than I have been at any time in my 3 years here in Congress. Why? If I had gone to anyone out there 10, 12 years ago and had said, ''Hey, in 2015, the United States is going to become a natural gas exporting country,'' you would have laughed at me. Ten or 12 years ago, you couldn't pick up the newspaper—you couldn't pick up The Wall Street Journal, Barron's, financial news—and not hear discussions here on the floor about this thing called ''peak oil.'' The world was running out of energy, do you remember? It wasn't that long ago. The world is running out of energy. Tomorrow, the next incremental barrel of oil and the next incremental unit of fossil fuels that we extract will be less than the day before. You all know the problem with that. It was absolutely wrong. As of today, we have more known fossil fuel supplies than any time in human history, and if we use this the right way, that is one of the legs on the stool that is going to support us as we stand up and start to meet these obligations that we have made.

The second thing is much more ethereal, a little more difficult to talk about, and that is what is happening all around us. There is this hyperefficient economy that is breaking out. How many of you have ever ridden Uber? How many of you have ever done SideCar? How many of you have ever used that handheld computer you call a phone to buy something, to sell something, and to use it in a fashion to do something that is so hyperefficient that you couldn't have done it a couple of years ago? Please understand. The incumbents, as they are often referred to—and it is not competitive businesses. It is competitive businesses and incumbent tax systems. If you have a Web site that allows you to rent someone's townhouse for the week, that becomes a great transaction for you and for that person who owns the townhouse, but the municipality and the hotel are not happy. The municipality is not getting its bed tax, and the hotel with its capital expenditures is not happy, but the fact of the matter is that this is an economic transaction that is efficient.

Over the next couple of years, I believe, in State legislatures, city councils, county councils, and here in Congress, we are going to see the fight over: Do we regulate the new alternatives you have as a citizen to engage in this hyperefficient economy? Do we regulate them out of existence? Do we create some concept of, well, we need them to have additional tort liability shields or we need to have them engage in this part of the tax scheme? A bit of economic chaos is normal. That is how you renew yourself. That is how you create the next generation of economic growth. We need to embrace it because, if we cannot reach escape velocity in the energy renaissance and in the economic renaissance, I do not know, mathematically, how we keep our promises to so many people in this country.

A few months ago, I introduced a piece of legislation, and it has been through the Science Committee. We gave it the title of ''Secret Science.'' I am not sure if I am thrilled with the title, but it is a very, very simple concept. The concept underlying it is: Do you make public policy and not make the underlying public data available? It is a simple concept—public data for public policy. Should your government be keeping the data—the underlying data—secret and then create a bunch of rules and regulations on top of you?

It is almost absurd to think we have to create a piece of legislation to get the EPA to take its data sets and make them public. There is this intense arrogance out there in the world right now, particularly at our agencies, of saying, ''David, you have got to understand. Only real scientists, researchers who we deem qualified should ever see this data. Well, you don't want the unwashed masses to have an opportunity to see how we are developing our science and our regulations.'' It is absurd. It almost borders on Orwellian as to what is going on in our bureaucracies today. They are going to create rule sets that cost hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars and that are going to affect how we live in future decades. Yet there is the arrogance of saying the young man who is a statistics major, the left-wing group, the right-wing research group, the industry group, the activist group—just someone who is nutty enough to have a great stats package on his home computer, who wants to take the data sets and play with them and model them and see what is out in the tails and maybe match them up to other data sets that someone hadn't thought about—is not worthy. They are not worthy?

Now, it is a personal fixation, but I actually believe that transparency is the ultimate regulator in our society. Could you imagine if we had gone into 2008 and if we had had transparency on that MBS, the mortgage-secured bonds, and had known what the impairment was and had known what was actually going on? Would you have had an implosion on a single day, or would you have had a couple of years of, hey, these are having trouble, these are having trouble; we need to mark down the prices? Transparency is the ultimate regulator, the ultimate vetter, but it is also the ultimate exposure to bad acts.

This hit my desk last week. It is a TIME magazine. On the cover it says, ''Eat Butter. Scientists Labeled Fat the New Enemy. Why They Were Wrong.''

Now, how many times have you heard the people at your gym, your wife, or others saying, ''David, you need to be eating less saturated fats. You can't eat that butter. We need to go buy some of that artificial stuff''? Now I am looking at TIME magazine's saying, ''Hey, we screwed up on the data.'' How many times in our lives do we come here and say, ''We knew it except for the small problem that we got it wrong''? Remember, we all knew the world was running out of energy. ''Well, we got that wrong.'' We all knew eating butter was bad for you until we knew the data was different. There are dozens and dozens and dozens of examples like this around us, but we were so arrogant that we thought we understood the data. We thought we understood the methodology. We were so brilliant except for the fact that we weren't. We got it wrong over and over and over.

The fact of the matter is—and go back to my energy example of a dozen years ago and beyond that—our military policy, our foreign policy, our environmental policy, our tax policy was all based on this concept that the world was running out of energy, except we weren't. How much of our health policy is based on things like this: ''David, you can't eat butter''?

I saw a presentation a few years ago that the government was spending this astronomical amount of money to try to keep people from using salt. The researcher was presenting salt as only a problem for you if you have hypertension, but that is different than the folklore out there. How many things have we developed in our folklore that we make policy?

That is why H.R. 4012—it is called the ''Secret Science'' bill—is, I believe, so needed. When the EPA takes data, whether it be from industry, whether it be from a research group, an activist group, a right, a left, an internal—any group—and when they use that data to

make a policy, to make a rule, that underlying data belongs to all of us. It is public policy by public data, and we all as Americans deserve the right, if you are so inclined, if you so choose, to sit there, see it, touch it, calculate it, crunch it, compare it, understand it. Who knows? You may be the researcher who comes out, looks at the data, matches it up against other things, and tells me I can eat butter.

I promise that in a couple of weeks, maybe a month, I am going to come back to this microphone, because I have collected an entire binder of example after example of what we were absolutely positive about—what we absolutely knew—and we got wrong, and how so many of those things we made public policy on, and we got it wrong.

My good friend from Iowa (Mr. KING) has a couple of other things in sort of that same vein that he wants to share, and he may be the best person I have ever seen behind these microphones.

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

□ 1730

A HISTORICAL ASSESSMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for the remainder of the time as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for that outstanding transition that he made here. I actually came down to chide him just a little bit.

I was listening very closely to what he had to say, and it was very valuable, the comments on energy that we need and the direction this economy needs to go. I am going to restrain the chiding because of his outstanding transition that he made and, let you know, Mr. Speaker, that I came down here to address you and to talk with you a little bit about the things that are ahead for us in this Congress, the things that are ahead for us in this country.

When our Founding Fathers shaped this country and wrote our declaration and filed our Constitution and got it ratified, it was an extraordinarily accomplishment, and those documents will live for the duration of civilization, and they will be in our memory, they will be in our heads, they will be in our hearts for the full duration of the time of civilization, whether it is succeeding civilizations thousands of years from now, they will look back on what happened here.

When our Founding Fathers put together this republican form of government, which is guaranteed to us in article IV, section 4 of the Constitution, it also guaranteed protection from invasion.

They set up the House of Representatives to have elections every 2 years, so that we could be the quick-reaction shock force. When the public could see that this country was going in the wrong direction, they wanted to make sure that the House could be restored and filled with people that came from all across the country—the Thirteen Original Colonies or the 50 States that we are now and the territories that send representatives here—and that we could reverse an erroneous course that could be taken by a Congress going in the wrong direction.

That is the reason for 2 years—elections every 2 years. The Senate was set up with elections every 6 years, so they didn't have to worry about reelection for a longer period of time, and they could take the longer view.

Now, that was the theory or a philosophy that was generally untested, at least within the culture and the civilization of the time, and it has proven to be a fairly effective approach.

We saw what happened here in 2010, when I will say an overexuberant, very liberal Democrat majority in the House and in the Senate, essentially a veto-proof majority in the Senate, by hook, crook, and legislative shenanigans, crammed ObamaCare down the throats of the American people.

I remember those dramatic times. Tens of thousands of Americans came to Washington, D.C., from every single State, including Hawaii and Alaska, to protest what was happening to our God-given liberty and our right, our God-given right to manage our health, our skin, and everything inside it.

Well, it was still crammed down the throats of the American people, that policy called ObamaCare. The real name for it is the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I know. If I would say that about six times and you are having trouble going to sleep, Mr. Speaker, that would put you to sleep. It is a substitute for Ambien, to say Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Democrats finally recognized that, and they changed the name and their verbiage that they use. They said, oh, it is offensive to say ObamaCare; and then they realized that the President is the one that coined the term ''ObamaCare.''

He did so on February 25 of 2009 at the Blair House, in that big square seating when they had a conference on health care, and he acted like a professor and interrupted Republicans 72 times that day, but he used the phrase ''ObamaCare.''

Now, when we use it, they said that is pejorative. Don't use that because it identifies what it really is, it is a health care system that is socialized medicine. It is a government takeover of our bodies, our skin, and everything inside it; yet when the President used ObamaCare, then some of the Democrats decided: we will embrace the word ''ObamaCare.''

They did for a while, and they realized that they were adding fuel to the fire of the rejection of ObamaCare, and they decided, well, let's find another way we can name this thing.

So then they insisted that you weren't nice and you weren't polite and it was inappropriate if we didn't use its official name, which they would liked to have changed to the Affordable Care Act, not the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, but the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I get to this because I am thinking about our Founding Fathers and George Washington, who could not tell a lie. So I asked myself the question—this policy that is going to cost over $1 trillion extra for ObamaCare that was promised it was going to cut our premiums, per household, by $2,500 a year, and if you like your doctor, you could keep your doctor, if you like your policy, you get to keep your policy, those promises weren't true.

The big promises of ObamaCare weren't true, and many things that were not advertised as highly as that didn't come true either.

So now they want to say Affordable Care Act. George Washington could not utter those words, Mr. Speaker, because George Washington could not tell a lie. That is why he confessed to chopping down the cherry tree.

I am not certain that the stump exists out there at Mount Vernon yet, but I am convinced that George Washington couldn't say the term ''affordable care act'' in reference to ObamaCare because it is not an accurate term. It is a dishonest term. It is not affordable, and it is less care.

Maybe it is an act, Mr. Speaker, so that is my commentary on going down that path with our Founding Fathers.

They also had this vision and they hoped that—and they had a long-term vision. It was a wonderful long-term vision of what kind of a country you could build if you just laid down God-given liberties, timeless principles, and laid out the pillars of American exceptionalism, articulate them, sell them to the American people, get them to support your Declaration of Independence, get them committed to doing what they knew they had to do, fight a war against King George.

They had to go through the winter at Valley Forge, and they had to a march up and down the coastline and in the interior part of the United States, at least the Thirteen Colonies, and take on the redcoats wherever they where. They won that Revolutionary War, learned some lessons from that about how you field the Continental Army.

You have to have a Commander in Chief, and you have to have a centralized government if you are going to defend yourself against the global powers of the world. They set up a Constitution to do that.

They envisioned and anticipated a lot of things in this Constitution, one of them was a means to amend it, and they believed that the President of the United States would be a man of honor who would give his oath of office, and they wrote his oath of office into the Constitution, to ensure that the nobility, the integrity, the statesmanship,

the character that was part of the culture at the time would flow forth forever, or as long as the United States might exist, through our Presidents.

I noted the 210th anniversary of the duel that took place between three-time Vice President Aaron Burr and the Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. It was just last week—about a week ago.

They met on an island, and they shot it out. They fought to the death. It turned out to be the death of Alexander Hamilton because Hamilton had insulted the integrity of Aaron Burr.

Aaron Burr would defend his integrity, and Alexander Hamilton would not retract his allegations, so the two of them met in a duel. Think of that, that their word was so important, their integrity was so important that the two of them faced each other with dueling pistols, knowing that one of them was likely to die in that duel, all over their word.

They had already by then written into the Constitution for the oath of the President of the United States and ratified. I do solemnly swear to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United, States—later on added—and to protect against all enemies foreign and domestic—and later on added—so help me God.

In the Constitution is—they call it the Take Care Clause in the Constitution, and the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. It is not actually the oath, but it is a component of the oath.

I don't want to say the word ''implied.'' It is specific in the Constitution that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, Mr. Speaker.

So we had men of honor, statesmen, men of dignity, men of an attitude, that their word and their integrity was more important to them than their very life itself.

When they wrote the oath for the President to take into the Constitution and when they wrote in the Constitution that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, they never imagined that we would have a President who didn't have that same sense, didn't have that same sense of nobility, that sense of integrity, that sense of statesmanship.

They never imagined that we would have a President that didn't think his word was worth more than his life itself.

We come to this place in time and history, Mr. Speaker, Alexander Hamilton went to his grave over a principle like that, and Aaron Burr lost his political career because he sent Alexander Hamilton to his grave over that principle of your word is your bond, and when you get to a challenge like that, your word is more important than your life itself.

Now, we are at a place where a President gives his oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed and, instead, simply executes the law itself, wipes it out, ignores it, immigration law, in particular, Mr. Speaker, where the President, with his Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, the DACA program—DACA, which really stands for deferred action for criminal aliens, that policy and a number of other policies where the President has announced that he is going to ignore the law—and he constantly hides behind this phrase: prosecutorial discretion.

He says he has prosecutorial discretion to decide not to enforce the law against people that are breaking it.

Now, he has a prosecutorial discretion, Mr. Speaker, but it is on an individual basis only, and his lawyers knew that. That is why when they wrote the DACA memos—well, we call them the Morton Memos—when they were written, and we had Janet Napolitano, then the Secretary of Homeland Security, testifying before the Judiciary Committee, and I announced to her, if you go forward with this, you will be in court, and you will be sued because the President of the United States' job is to stick with his article II authority, and that is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and he is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. This is a limited government, but all legislative powers belong here in this Congress. That is article I, all legislative powers.

The President doesn't get to write the laws. He is compelled to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is his constitutional obligation.

Instead, the President has said, well, I don't like these immigration laws. If a law requires our immigration authorities, ICE—Immigration and Customs Enforcement—when they encounter someone who is unlawfully present in the United States, the law requires that they place them into removal proceedings. That is the law.

The President has issued an order that says to ICE, thou shalt break that law and never apply the law to remove people from the United States who are here unlawfully, unless they have committed a felony or three mysterious misdemeanors that are vaguely identified.

I don't know that they actually have ever executed that particular provision, although I would say it is likely that they have, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness.

So the President has created four different classes of people with his Morton Memos and his DACA language, and by grouping people into classes of people, he has got a number of those who he has exempted from the law, some number approaching 600,000 people who came into the United States or were in the United States illegally, who are exempted from the very application of the law that requires our law enforcement officers, particularly ICE, to place them into removal proceedings. That is what the President has done.

So he sent the message out, as far as back as 3 years ago, in midsummer—actually, June—sent the message out to everybody in the world, if you can get into America, and you don't commit a felony—and that is a little bit of a shorthand for the technicalities—then you get to stay.

He has acted upon that. He has executed that all right. He has executed his executive edict, but he hasn't taken care that the law itself be faithfully executed. He has defied the law, and his oath is to uphold the law, to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Now, I have to put into the list the pillars of American exceptionalism, so we are thinking about it, Mr. Speaker. What makes America the unchallenged greatest nation in the world, and it is the composition of the pillars of American exceptionalism, and you find most of them in the Bill of Rights, freedom of speech, religion and assembly, and the right to keep and bear arms, and no double jeopardy, the property rights in the Fifth Amendment. You get to face a jury of your peers, quick and speedy trial.

The Ninth and 10th Amendments devolve the powers not granted specifically in the enumeration in the Constitution to the Federal Government devolve to the States or, respectively, to the people.

Those are many of the pillars of American exceptionalism, but there are others. We have a free enterprise economy, the ability to invest capital and sweat equity, and buy, sell, trade, make gain and get rich if you can, and we like to cheer you when you do because it helps all of us when that happens.

Free enterprise economy is another pillar of American exceptionalism, along with the root of this culture and civilization being in Judeo-Christianity, the work ethic that came from it, the values system that allowed that work to be prosperous and profitable and trustworthy, so that we could do business with people in a way that we didn't have to always be checking up on them because we knew that God is looking over our shoulder.

That is shorthand for one of the reasons why this is such a great country.

□ 1745

Another one would be when the Statue of Liberty went up. The image and the inspiration of that statue said to the world that if you can come here, to America legally, you can achieve all that you are capable of achieving. All of the things that you might imagine that you are capable of achieving anywhere in the world, you can achieve in America because you have all of these other rights. And these rights aren't rights that the government confers upon you.

As in every other country in the world, the government confers any rights you might have. These are God-given rights, and God has given them to us. And our Founding Fathers articulated that and put that down on

the parchment, and we have fought and defended it all of our years.

So if our rights came from government, government could take them away. The reason that they can't take them away is because they are God-given. And the inspiration comes from all of these pillars of American exceptionalism, which send that message and beam it across the world in National Geographic magazines that show up everywhere around the world or in encyclopedias or through cyberspace today—that picture of the Statue of Liberty, of the Washington Monument, of the Lincoln Memorial, of the United States Capitol, the White House itself. American success across the world and all of the places where it has been, this record of achievement, this record of sacrifice of Americans to expand the nobility of the human race everywhere around the world has inspired people in every country.

And the people that came here, Mr. Speaker, were inspired by that image and those ideas and those ideals. So we didn't just get a random selection of people that came to America legally. We got the cream of the crop. We got the vigor of the planet.

If there were 10 siblings in a family and only one of them had enough inspiration to find a way to come legally to the United States of America, we got the superachiever. We got the can-do. We got the cream of the crop. We got the vigor of the planet from every donor nation on the planet to come to America because they were attracted to the God-given liberty that was established here. They came here, they achieved, and they embraced those principles. And America embraced them.

And in each generation from that, we taught our children the same thing. So it has descended down through the generations, and it has brought in more, and America has gotten stronger.

But we are not a stronger nation if we erode those pillars of American exceptionalism. We are not a stronger nation if we lose faith with those things that have been the core of the success of this country. And we can't be sacrificing the pillars of American exceptionalism for the sake of having our hearts overrule our heads.

Our Founding Fathers didn't let that happen. The principles that came through from the work that they did, the God-given rights and liberties that are there, they are timeless. And they index into human nature, all of human nature, but they are embodied here.

And, by the way, one of the other things I left out of that, another reason for American exceptionalism is that all of that settlement arrived here. And a lot of it, it arrived here on a continent with—at the time, at least, unlimited natural resources. And at the dawn of the industrial revolution, we settled this continent from sea to shining sea.

And here we are today, Mr. Speaker, with a President who wouldn't agree with what I have just said. I mean, if he had the time or took the time, he would seek to rebut the principles that I have laid out. And he would say, instead, well, let's see. We really don't need to have borders in America. We don't have to have that. There is no reason for America to be as successful as we are. We are using a disproportionate share of the planet's resources. We are pumping CO_2 into our atmosphere. That is turning the Earth's thermostat up, even though for 17 years there is not any evidence of that happening.

And we have watched as he has diminished America. He has diminished it in foreign policy. He has diminished it economically. He has diminished it socially and culturally. And today we are watching as he has established this policy of amnesty. He is pushing hard for the Senate Gang of Eight bill.

The Senate Gang of Eight bill is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker. It is instantaneous amnesty for the people that are here illegally, whether they overstayed their visas 40 percent or whether they came across the border illegally 60 percent. Or it is instantaneous amnesty for them.

For anyone that would come into America in the future, it is silent, which means it is an unspoken promise that if you can get here—we haven't demonstrated the will to enforce the law if you came here. So if you come here, why would anybody think that we enforce a law on anybody that would come here after a Senate Gang of Eight bill might potentially become law?

And, to add insult to injury, they sent an invitation out to the people that have been sent back to their home country. It is what I call the ''well, we really didn't mean it'' clause. And that means that anybody that has been deported in the past is sent an invitation saying reapply; we really didn't mean it. That is how bad this is.

And this gaping hole that we have in our border in the McAllen sector of the Texas border, where we now have 57,000 unaccompanied children who have come into the United States—many of them hustled across 2,500 miles or more from El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala through Mexico, and there is a significant number yet from Mexico coming into the United States—these unaccompanied minors are hauled up here by coyotes who may live in those communities and recruit these kids.

All of this is going on. And we have a President who says: I need $3.7 billion to expand the bureaucracy to maybe buy a hotel to put them in and move them across the country and infuse them into our communities.

People that are unlawfully present in the United States simply say: I am an unaccompanied minor, and I have been promised that if I can get into America, I get to stay in America. 57,000 of them, Mr. Speaker. And what percentage of the unaccompanied minors have been sent back to their home country? 0.1 percent. One-tenth of 1 percent.

They sent JOE BIDEN down to Guatemala. He landed in Panama and then went to Guatemala. He said that he went down there to send a message which is that we are going to send your kids back. Don't send them here. Well, if there is no record of that, then they know it is not happening.

So think of the difference. If we would take a military airplane and put a couple hundred unaccompanied Guatemalan minors on it, for example, send that plane down the runway and up into the air, if the President picked up the phone and called the President of Guatemala and said: Be on the tarmac in 2 hours; you are going to have 200 of your kids that are going to arrive there, and you should greet them—that is what a leader does, sends them back. If you do that and do that and do that, eventually they will stop coming because they will know they are actually coming back, and they will know that their money is wasted. It is not happening.

But this President is not going to secure this border, Mr. Speaker. He has demonstrated that. We have got 2½ more years of this President. And whatever we do in this Congress, we can't make him secure the border. We can't make him do it. The Congress doesn't have the authority to do that. There are only two constitutional provisions that can force the President to do anything, and we have tried them both within the last 15 years or so, and neither one of them have proven to be effective.

Public opinion might push back hard enough. Well, they kind of are. But we cannot allow our border—especially right now, the Texas border—to be under invasion in the fashion that it is by the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors who are, by the way, only 20 percent of the illegals coming in in that sector. And they are maybe stopping, at best, 25 percent of those that are trying to come across. So we have got a number that is up there over 1 million people that are attempting to cross into the United States, and 57,000 of those that we pick up on that are unaccompanied minor kids.

The President will not secure the border. We should come to that conclusion. We have got 2½ years of open borders. Or we find a way to secure it, maybe even against the will of the President of the United States, because I don't know if he has got the will to block it if we do this.

But who has the authority? I look around the whole country, and the people who have the authority to do so are the Governors of the border States.

I have a resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to introduce into the RECORD that says so. It calls upon the border Governors to call out their National Guard to secure the border, and it says that this House of Representatives will support the funding to do so. I call for that, Mr. Speaker. I urge us to pick this up and sign it. I am going to introduce it tomorrow. I would like to take it up real soon and send that resolution to the world, and I would appreciate your indulgence in doing so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

H. RES. _____

Whereas, the crisis on the Southwest border is of such significance that it demands national attention and urgent action.

Whereas, the President, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Administration have enacted unconstitutional policies, such as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program and the Morton Memos, that have contributed significantly to a massive increase in illegal immigration.

Whereas, the President has not secured the border.

Whereas, the President has failed to fulfill his Constitutional obligation to protect each state against invasion according to Article IV, Section 4.

Whereas, states have specific authorities under Article I, Section 10 when ''actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.''

Whereas, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection between October 1, 2013 and June 15, 2014, 52,193 unaccompanied children have been apprehended on the Southwest border.

Whereas, according to a June 3, 2014 Homeland Security Intelligence report, only 0.1% of illegal alien, unaccompanied minor children from non-contiguous countries were removed in FY 2013.

Whereas, the Secretary of Homeland Security expects 90,000 unaccompanied alien children to be interdicted by the U.S. government while crossing the border in Fiscal Year 2014.

Whereas, according to the Department of Homeland Security, only twenty percent of those interdicted are and will be children.

Whereas, border security officials estimate the interdiction ratio is twenty-five percent of those attempting to cross the border.

Whereas, according to border security official's testimony before Congress, the likely number of illegal crossing attempts is four times the number of those interdicted.

Whereas, our Southern border is not secure, and this fact represents an immediate danger to every citizen of the United States of America.

Whereas, the Governor of a state is the commander in chief of the National Guard of that state.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes, supports and defends the Constitutional authority of any Governor to deploy his or her state's National Guard division to secure the border;

(2) commits to appropriating the necessary monies to effectively support any such deployment of National Guard troops; and

(3) calls upon the Governors of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to deploy the National Guard forces under their command to immediately gain effective control of our southern border, to turn back anyone without legal immigration status, and to ensure for the people of their states and the United States a safe and free future.

AMERICA, THE ATTRACTIVE NUISANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my dear friend from Iowa (Mr. KING).

I know we have a good friend here on the other side of the aisle who was recently quoted as saying something along the lines that Mr. KING and I have never met an immigrant that we didn't think was a criminal, something of that sort, and I like the gentleman from Illinois, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ. I think he is a good guy. I think he has a big heart. But the truth is escaping him on such grandiose claims. He doesn't know my heart. I know he is a good guy. He has a big heart. But he doesn't understand the role of government.

When I looked at one of the most beautiful little girls I had ever seen. It was a Saturday night in the wee hours. She had been drug clear across Mexico. She was asked about home. Well, were you anxious to leave home? She starts crying. She didn't want to leave home, she said. She misses her family. But some adult decided that because the administration's policies are luring people here with the promise that they will most likely be able to stay, then people are coming and the children are not afraid of violence in their home country. Some adults may be. But they are adults making decisions to subject a beautiful child like that and so many of the others that our border patrolmen are processing, our border patrolmen and -women are processing out there, especially in the McAllen sector, which is a rough area.

It was interesting seeing my first tarantula in the wild. I have seen plenty of rattlesnakes before in that area of Texas, but I haven't seen any in the last month that I have been down there. I know they are there. The border patrolmen tell me they are there. But I had never seen a tarantula in the wild like that. It was interesting.

But parents are choosing to send their children, bring their children, in some cases put their children in the hands of drug cartel human traffickers hoping that the tremendous money they pay will get them to the United States rather than make them sex slaves. Some make it, some don't. Some die on the way. Some are raped. Some are abused. And it is all because there is what, under the civil law, might be called an attractive nuisance.

We learned in law school that if you have a swimming pool and you have no fence and a child comes over and drowns in your pool because you didn't have a fence, then you would be liable for civil damages for having an attractive nuisance that lured a child to his or her death. Well, this administration has created an attractive nuisance under civil law.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know the United States is not a nuisance. It has been a force for good because it has applied the laws of the Judeo-Christian heritage. That is why George Washington, in the resignation he sent to the 13 Governors, as the first and only general commander to have led the military in revolution, won the revolution, and then resigned and went home, asking nothing further.

But at the end of his resignation that he sent out to the Governors, he had a prayer for the Nation, praying that he hoped we would never forget those who have served in the field. And I am grateful that both sides of the aisle repeatedly are grateful to our military for their service.

I have, in past years, heard someone say, you know, no liberal ever spit at anybody in uniform. Well, they just don't know; because I served 4 years in the Army after Vietnam, and it was not a good time to be in the Army as far as accolades for your service. I have been spit at.

And when I went through basic at Fort Riley, Kansas, there was a standing order from our commander going through training that we were not to ever wear our uniform off post because—though Kansas is one of the greatest States there is, with wonderful people—there were people who didn't like the military. And if they found you as one or two together, then you would likely get beat up.

□ 1800

They had had instances, and we were ordered—that is what we were told—we were ordered not to ever wear uniforms off post or in basic. Every now and then, even at Fort Benning, Georgia, there would be indications, orders, don't be wearing your uniform off post this weekend. So it was not a good time. And I thank God that people have realized the importance and value of our United States military men and women who take an oath and are willing to lay down their lives for their friends and for their fellow Americans.

But government has a different position from individuals. And that is why some Christians get confused and say, well, I am a Christian. I am supposed to turn the other cheek. I am supposed to love my fellow man. I am supposed to reach out and help sojourners. All of that is true. The beatitudes that Jesus gave are the kinds of things we need to be doing for anyone who is a Christian, and I would humbly submit for anybody who is an atheist, Buddhist. Buddhists practice many of the beatitudes and are very noble in doing so. But for a government, it is different.

The government's role, even when it is composed of Christians, is to make sure that the law is enforced fairly and impartially. Romans talks about the government being an agent for good, for encouraging good, but if you do evil, be afraid because the government is not given the sword in vain. If you do evil, the government is not supposed to turn the other cheek. It is supposed to apply the law fairly across the board.

So when an adult child of one of the wealthier families in all of east Texas who was before my court—and my predecessor had repeatedly given her probation—I couldn't give her probation because I knew I would not do that to anyone else in her situation. So I sent her to prison because I had to be fair and impartial despite knowing the parents, the family, and knowing that that family brought most of my contributors, the biggest contributors I

had, into my courtroom the day of sentencing.

Well, it would be nice to do special favors for friends, and I realized that day there may be nobody in this courtroom that ever supports me for office again, and if that is the way it is, so be it. But I had faith in my friends that they would understand. Some didn't, most did. But it is the job of the government to apply the law fairly across the board, whether it is a very wealthy person, as the girl I sentenced, or whether it is someone of no means whatsoever, the law is supposed to be applied impartially.

In that case, it was some years later, I heard that she had served her time and been released and that she got involved in her father's business, but he had passed away while she was in prison. I knew her parents hated my guts and would probably never speak to me again, but I had heard she got off drugs, cleaned up her act, got involved in the family business after she got out, and was doing well.

When I was walking the neighborhood, I walked by the parents' house. And I thought, well, they may still hate me, but I want to let them know how proud I am of their daughter that has gotten out of prison, has gotten drugs under control and was clean and sober. I knocked on the door. It took a while for her mom to come to the door. Eventually she did. I didn't realize her sight had gotten so bad. She asked who it was. I said, it is LOUIE GOHMERT, and she immediately opened the door and said, please, please come in and sit down.

We sat down there in the foyer of their beautiful home. She said, I feel a bit guilty. And I said, I don't know why you would feel guilty. She said, because I owed you an apology and a thank you. And I said, you don't owe me anything. I just stopped by to tell—I was hoping your daughter would be here to let her know how proud I am that she was able to overcome her addiction. I know it is a daily fight, but that she is doing so well. I just wanted to encourage. I was hoping you didn't still hate me like I knew you once did. And she said, no, my husband and I were visiting our daughter. In one of our trips to see her in prison, we realized you gave us our daughter back. You saved her life.

I didn't do anything special. I just stood up to those who wanted me to act partially and give special favor to very wealthy friends. I couldn't do that as a judge because I had the role of government. I had to treat people impartially and fairly across the board, and that is what I did.

Someone once raised the issue that perhaps judges—and I know they had gotten it at a seminar—raised the issue that maybe your judge—since judges, even though they don't select the grand jurors, they select the grand jury foreman, the one that leads the grand jury—raised the issue, especially in death penalty cases, that judges have been unfair racially and that there would be racial disparity in their appointments.

So I got a subpoena to appear to talk about my appointments. But then the criminal defense lawyer got my grand jury records and found that there was a great racial disparity in my appointments of grand jury foremen, men and women both, that I had appointed, and the great racial disparity was that I had appointed significantly more African Americans to be grand jury foremen, men and women, given the racial components of our district. And so I was notified I was no longer needed and was not wanted to testify.

Well, I didn't pick grand jury foremen because of their skin color. I could have cared less. I looked at all of those people, the 12 that were on the grand jury each time—and I knew so many of them—and I picked people I knew were upright, good, and smart leaders. And each time I selected grand jury foremen, I would ultimately have people come to me that were on the grand jury individually and say, you really made a good choice of your grand jury foreman.

Well, it was because I did so fairly and impartially without any regard for their status in the community. They were good people, they were leaders, and I knew they would do a good job leading the grand jury without regard to their race, creed, color, national origin, or gender. It didn't matter. It was who would be the best. That is what government is supposed to be about.

Mr. Speaker, it breaks down a government's effectiveness when the leaders of a government use partiality to make decisions. It may have been humorous, but, as it is often said, humor usually has a little element of truth, but I sarcastically and cynically sent out a tweet yesterday that since basically we knew the President—according to the United States CIS, they said that the President had given amnesty to 553,000 or so people who were here illegally, and that there had recently been another surge, we were told by sources like The New York Times, of another 300,000, and then we hear yesterday that 38 people were being deported. And so my cynical tweet was, in essence, that the Obama administration had dramatically lowered the chances of anyone coming in illegally being able to stay from 100 percent to 99.9955 percent, and that should scare people.

Dana Loesch responded that the administration must have found 38 Republicans, which is rather funny and amusing. But the little element of truth is that this administration has been partial, and they have been unfair.

This administration, through its Internal Revenue Service, has gone after conservatives and Republicans even to the point of demanding to know the contents of their prayers and demanding to know information they had no business knowing. Actually, they were violating the law and committing crimes by turning over information to other entities. That was a violation of the law, and they did so knowingly. Crimes have been committed, and it is important we have a special prosecutor because this Attorney General has made clear his Justice Department is about ''just us.'' It is more a Department of Injustice.

So it is time to make a change.

Through all of this, the story yesterday from The Hill, by Alexander Bolton:

> Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Democrat from Nevada, on Tuesday asserted the southern border is secure despite the massive surge of illegal minors from Central America that has overwhelmed federal agencies. ''The border is secure,'' he told reporters after the Senate Democrats' weekly policy lunch. Senator Martin Heinrich, Democrat from New Mexico, talked to the caucus today. He is a border State Senator. He said he can say without any equivocation the border is secure.

Well, it is not. And anybody who will be fair and impartial and with the least semblance of objectivity who has eyes to see and ears to hear will go to the border, as I have a number of times now, and find the border is not secure. That is how you have 550,000 people that this President gives amnesty to.

Then this article from NetRight Daily by Robert Romano:

> Last September, the National Council of La Raza issued comments in favor of a Department of Housing and Urban Development regulation. Under the regulation, in October the Obama administration will be empowered to condition eligibility for community development block grants on redrawing zoning maps to create evenly distributed neighborhoods based on racial composition and income.

Mr. Speaker, this article is exactly what I am talking about. The Bible warns against, and wise people throughout time have warned against, if you want to have peace in a nation, you must have a leader or a government that is fair and impartial across the board, that you do not look at people's race, you don't look at their income, you do as I had to do to that very rich lady when I sent her to prison. Why? She was white, and she was rich. But I knew anybody else in her circumstance I would have sent to prison, so I sent her. That is why perhaps she was able to turn her life around.

□ 1815

One of the saddest things I ever heard during a sentencing was during her sentencing. They put on quite a dog and pony show, some impressive evidence about the family and the upbringing and she never really had discipline growing up, never had to make up her bed, study for school, and all kinds of things.

At the end of the hearing her lawyer basically said: Is there anything left you want to tell the judge?

She looked up at me with tears in her eyes because she knew what I was going to do because I was going to do what I would do to anybody in her situation with the priors she had, the

chances she had already had, she looked up at me with tears in her eyes and said: I just wish someone had told me no before today and meant it.

It was tragic. Nobody had told her no before today. She was raised so wealthy. She said I was the first one who ever told her no because I was being fair and impartial and treating her like any other defendant.

Well, this government, this administration, wants to look and be unfair and partial and make decisions based on the color of people's skin, rather than on the content of the character, and in fact, this administration is taking us away from the dream of Martin Luther King, Jr.

He is the one who said those fantastic words. He had a dream, and part of the dream was that people would be judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

We have made so much progress in America, and the President that went abroad and criticized America for being divisive, he has divided this country more than any President in my lifetime—along gender lines, along racial lines—by playing partial politics.

It looks, from this article, as if it is going to happen again:

In 2012, HUD dispersed about $3.8 billion of these grants to almost 1,200 municipalities.

According to La Raza's comment in favor of the regulation, Hispanic families often do not know their housing rights and have cited fear of deportation as reason for not reporting rights violations.

This is telling. By La Raza's own analysis, then, HUD implementation of the racial rezoning rule will benefit those who have cited fear of deportation—that is, low-skilled, low-income illegal immigrants, either those who are outright illegal the moment they set foot in the United States or who have simply overstayed their visas. After all, who else would fear deportation?

Therefore, one of the sure effects of HUD's regime will be to flood unwilling communities with a significant percentage of illegal immigrants.

While the current relocation of thousands, including children, from detention centers on the U.S.-Mexico border has garnered national headlines and the ire of elected Republicans, including Senator Mark Kirk, Republican of Illinois, and Governor Dave Heineman, Republican of Nebraska, the HUD regulation has largely flown under the radar.

But it is every bit as important. It is not enough to arbitrarily implement amnesty, whether through refusal to enforce existing law or congressional action. The Federal Government wants to draw the maps of where the new residents will live, forcing local communities to make room whether they like it or not.

It is no secret that Republicans, with their low tax message, tend to do better among the middle and upper middle classes, while Democrats with their social welfare regime tend to do better among the poor. The political effect of the HUD rule will invariably be to gerrymander Republican districts at the local level.

Take a Republican State like Texas as a prime example of how this might work. Houston, currently controlled by Democrats, has accepted $38.5 million of these community development block grants. Harris County has accepted another $10.3 million. Dallas, another Democratic stronghold, has accepted $16.6 million, and Dallas County took $2.1 million. Austin, too controlled by Democrats, took $7.5 million of the grants.

Republicans at the State level cannot block these grants going to these municipalities, and now, thanks to the HUD rule, by virtue of accepting these grants, bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., will get to redraw zoning maps along racial and income boundaries to include more affordable ''units and combat discrimination.''

It has all the hallmarks of a master plan. Too conspiratorial? It does not take a cynic to see who the winners and losers will be in implement the racial housing quotas.

In the case of La Raza and illegal immigration amnesty proponents, the likely beneficiaries of the HUD rezoning rule will be Democrat parties across the country. Both U.S. and immigrant-born Hispanics favor Democrats by nearly 2 to 1, according to Gallup.

What emerges is a plan to resettle as many as 20 million illegal immigrants in specific communities as a pretext to tilt the political scales on the national and local political scenes to favor Democrats.

Fortunately, the House of Representatives has already acted, passing an amendment to the Transportation and HUD Appropriations bill by Representative Paul Gosar, Republican of Arizona, in a close 219 to 207 vote to defund implementation of the regulation.

Anyway, I keep coming back to true peace in a country can come from a government that treats everyone impartially, and the great genius of America has been free enterprise, the ability of somebody like DARRELL ISSA that is a captain in the United States Army, who comes up with a brilliant idea of a door lock that would go up and down automatically, which idea was apparently stolen, as I recall, and then he figures, well, I can spend 20 years in litigation or so, or if I can come up with something smart then—I can come up with something else smart, and he comes up with the idea of the automatic car alarm, and my friend DARRELL has done quite well with that.

This is America. It is the genius of American free enterprise. Let people profit when they have good ideas, when they work hard and do well. America is a stronger place to be.

But the results of failing to enforce the law fairly and impartially as it is written, also brought about this headline today from Breitbart, ''Released Alien from Border Crisis Arrested for Alleged Murder, Kidnapping in Texas.''

An illegal immigrant who was released by U.S. authorities with a notice to appear has been arrested for the alleged murder of a woman and kidnapping of children on U.S. soil. The alleged crimes occurred after the man was released.

It goes on in the article and talks about the AP actually reported this, but they neglected to say the man was an illegal alien. It is time for the AP, for the media, for this administration, to start following and enforcing the law, and this country will be a better place in which to live.

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

VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor now because of a serious concern, a deadly concern even, that the people of my district, the First Congressional District of Illinois, the citizens of the great city of Chicago, and indeed those from around our country, that they are experiencing and that they are witnessing, and that is the preponderance of violence, killings, young people killing each other, and innocent bystanders shot down on the streets of my city.

They leave victims of gun violence perpetrated by young men, older citizens, retirees, victims of gun violence in my city.

One will get the notion that the name attributed to my city is apropos, that it is a worthy name, Chiraq, a nickname that has been associated with my city.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to say that this great city that I love, these people—worthy people of the First Congressional District, these hardworking Americans who have contributed greatly to the greatness of this Nation, they don't live in a place called Chiraq. Chiraq is not apropos.

We wholeheartedly and determinedly resist and repudiate any references to our city with the inappropriate—grossly inappropriate name of Chiraq. We don't embrace Chiraq and none of its implications.

Yes, there is a focus on the violence that occurs in our city, but, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this functionality in Chicago and in other places across the country is a direct result of decades-long failed governmental policies, failed public policies, policies that have emanated out of this very institution, this Federal Government, policies that have emanated out of State capitals all across this Nation and city halls, village halls, all across this Nation, decades-long.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about just the vestiges of slavery and that dark period of American history. We are not just speaking about segregation and all of the abuses and all of the trauma that segregation has caused upon African Americans.

□ 1830

We are not just talking about Jim Crow laws that were a result of public policies. Mr. Speaker, we are not just talking about all of the policies that emanated out of this institution, the housing policies in my very city that until the seventies denied African Americans in my city to actually acquire a mortgage which was and still is the foundation of a middle class lifestyle, a foundation for the American Dream. Without the ability to get a mortgage, to own a home, the American Dream becomes an American nightmare.

That is what we have experienced over these last decades—structural inequities, structural discrimination. Mr. Speaker, I am here to say this evening that there are three d's that define the structural inequities, structural problems in my city and other cities across this Nation.

At the foundation of the violence that we are witnessing today—and I would just plead with anyone in this Chamber, anyone who is viewing this today in any capacity, on any platform throughout the Nation, please do not mistake anything that I say or feel as being an attempt to coddle criminals, to somehow give a sense of relief to those who are killing innocent people in our communities. They are just as wrong as they could ever be, and I am not in any way trying to give them cover.

But if we want to get some real answers, then we are going to have to ask some real questions. Know ye the truth, the Bible says, and it shall set you free.

The truth of the matter is that this violence can be summed up for the most part in terms of its causes by these three d's.

Discrimination. Years and years, decades and decades of discrimination. Discrimination that has denied hardworking Americans access to the best that this Nation can provide. Discrimination not of the southern type, more subtle, more insidious, even in some ways more deadly than anything that the Ku Klux Klan could ever devise. This subtle institutional discrimination that has been a part of the culture in my city for too long and that takes on different characteristics is able to mask itself. Even with the good intentions of some of our friends, some people who will recall at the assault, that they might have mistakenly involved themselves at some point in time in being a part of the problem rather than a part of the solution.

Discrimination is alive and well in my city, even today. The hopelessness that young people find themselves facing and embracing here in the year 2014 in this Nation, the hopelessness just completely engulfs their very existence. Every waking hour, they are confronted every day of the week, every week of the month, every month of the year. Year by year by year by year they are faced with total despair and utter hopelessness that erupts and stands tall in this institutional framework that is built upon discrimination. Discrimination rises up and causes all types of dysfunction in those who are discriminated against. Discrimination, the first d.

Discrimination leads very quickly to disinvestment, the second d. You can discriminate against a community, against a people, and thereby you can disinvest in those communities—on the south side and the west side and the north side of the city, particularly on the south and the west side. My friend Congressman DAVIS is here and he can speak very, very appropriately and eloquently to the discrimination of people on the west side of the city.

But the disinvestment, the stark disinvestment can't be denied. These patterns of disinvestment in our schools, in our business districts, in our housing, in our recreational opportunities, in our parks, on our streets, this rampant disinvestment decades long has led to a sense of frustrated rage. When there is no way out for families, for neighbors, for neighborhoods, for communities, then psychologists will tell you that violence is a byproduct of that failure to believe and to hope and to be assured that you have a future, that you have a stake. Life loses its meaning when there is no significant and righteous investment in the future of any of our citizens, particularly those who are young and those who have easy access to guns.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the National Rifle Association on this one matter: guns don't kill people; people kill people. But I disagree with them, and I want to take it a little further, because that is only one side of the coin. We are not just talking about people. We are talking about a hopeless people. People without hope for the future. Anybody, regardless of race, creed, color, sex, or nationality, anybody when you are caught, caged into a corner with no hope of getting out, you are going to turn violent. That is a part of the human makeup. Your violence is going to be directed to somebody. So the NRA, if it is going to be truthful, then it just cannot deal with any kind of people. It has got to deal more pointedly at people who have no hope.

This disinvestment has led to staggering intergenerational unemployment. The bottom didn't fall out of the economy on the west side and the south side of the city of Chicago in '07, '08, and '09. The bottom fell out 25 years ago, 50 years ago, and it never has been repaired. There is no safety net in my city. It is like a bottomless pit. Generations yet to be born are still facing those desperate conditions, still will face that despair, still will face this gross disinvestment.

Why aren't there jobs in my city for my community, for my district, no light manufacturing?

□ 1845

Why is it that in my city we have to fight the labor unions in order to get employment or labor jobs? Why don't we have summer jobs for young people?

Government policies have created this nightmare, and this nightmare that we find ourselves in keeps getting darker and darker and darker and darker and deadlier and deadlier and deadlier.

Discrimination, disinvestment.

When the mayor of my city stands proudly and takes credit for closing 54 public schools—mostly on the south and west side of the city of Chicago—that is nothing but a continuation of the decades-long disinvestment in good quality schools.

If you look back at the history of my city, some of my most ferocious battles with the powers that be centered around the inequities in the public school system. Dropouts are produced at an alarming rate in my city because of the disinvestment in public education.

Discrimination is the first d, and disinvestment is the second d.

And then, Mr. Speaker, in recent times, we have seen rampant, gross depopulation of my city. Poor people have been almost run out of my city. Public housing is a failed public policy in my city.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what happened.

Yes, there were mammoth public housing developments in my city. Some we pejoratively called ''projects.'' Yes, there were a lot of social ills associated with public housing or projects, and some of those public housing buildings needed to be restructured, demolished, or redesigned. But unlike New York City, which took its public housing developments and invested money in those developments, my city didn't.

What you had, Mr. Speaker, are former residents of public housing pushed into struggling lower, middle class communities; and that is when the disruption of those heretofore struggling middle class communities could not sustain themselves against this avalanche of former public housing residents into those areas, and those communities started experiencing extreme dysfunctionality.

There is one beat in my city, beat 624. This is the most violent beat in the city of Chicago. In recent years, two police officers were killed in that beat. Day-to-day violence occurs in that beat. Six weeks ago, a brilliant special education teacher who worked part-time as a real estate agent stopped by temporarily to drop some forms off in her office on West 79th Street and lost her life. She was shot in the head by a stray bullet fired in beat 624.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. Beat 624 is in the heart of a community known as Chatham. When I was a young man growing up, Chatham was the model of middle class lifestyle for the African American community. It was exalted in many ways. Everybody thought that living in Chatham was the place to be. When you lived in Chatham, you lived in nice homes with manicured lawns, clean streets, garages, homes, good schools, a good business district, safe communities, and stable communities.

This was the Chatham of my youth. But that Chatham is a long-ago memory now because of the disinvestment and because of the failed public housing policies that emanated out of this Federal Government.

Discrimination, disinvestment, and lastly, depopulation.

I grew up in an area called Cabrini-Green. It no longer exists.

Gentrification has conquered the community of Cabrini-Green, and it is well on its way to conquering other communities.

The public dollars over these last 20 or 30 years—maybe even longer than that—have been away from the communities and toward The Loop and the businesses around The Loop.

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

VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to yield to Mr. RUSH.

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank my friend, Congressman DAVIS.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that in the central business district of Chicago, or The Loop as it is known far and wide, there is a close-in circle around The Loop. They have created three communities. One is called the Near North Side, where public dollars and enormous investments have occurred. This is the area that used to house Cabrini-Green, the Near North Side.

In recent times, we have had gentrification occur in the Near West Side. When I was a young man growing up in Chicago, there was never such a community, never such a time, never such an identity called the Near West Side.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is now something called the Near South Side.

All of these are gems of gentrification. But if you go further west, further south, you see a stark difference in Englewood and Garfield Park. You see a stark difference in capital investments in these communities, where hopelessness and despair dominate the lives and the thoughts and the culture.

That is where the violence emanates from. Unless we deal with these issues, we will never, ever be able to deal with the violence and the increasing murders that are everyday news in the city that I love, the city of Chicago.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank you, Mr. RUSH, for calling this Special Order this evening to put a different kind of light on the whole question and the whole issue of violence in Chicago, which is really the center point of America.

Those of us who live in Chicago say that: So goes Chicago, so goes America.

When I came to Chicago, it was known as the jobs capital of America. Everyplace that you looked, there were help wanted signs. You could find a job. As a matter of fact, the word was that if you couldn't find a job in Chicago, there were basically no jobs for you.

And so I agree with you, Representative RUSH, that the absence of hope is a part of the formula for violence. And if you never ask the right questions, of course, you never get the right answers.

□ 1900

There are those who talk about law enforcement, more police officers. I have even heard people talk about bringing in the National Guard and bringing in paramilitary outfits. Those are not really the solutions. The solutions are to provide people with hope because, if they have hope, then they don't find or feel the necessity for certain kinds of action.

There used to be so many businesses in the district that I represent. Over the last 50 or more years, we have lost more than 100,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs. When Representative RUSH talks about disinvestment, when business and industry decided to leave—Sears, Roebuck; Hotpoint, Motorola, General Electric—what is now Navistar—International Harvester, Allied Radio, Spiegel, Montgomery Ward—all of those entities were in the neighborhood where I lived and worked. I could just walk down the streets and see them. Western Electric was not far from where I lived. You could see hundreds of people going to and from work every morning when you woke up. Of course, things split off, and all of that changed.

Chicago used to just beckon people and jobs to come to Chicago. As a matter of fact, blues singers would have songs of going to Chicago. ''Sorry, but I can't take you.'' They were like the pied piper—people were coming. Then, as so many people came and as communities and neighborhoods began to change and as some people began to leave and others would come, there were levels of deterioration. I remember the riots that occurred after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. Many of those areas that suffered the aftermath of the riots have never been rebuilt. They are the same today as they were in the 1960s when the riots occurred. Nobody has been willing to invest in the redevelopment of those communities. Not only did housing deteriorate, but the social service structure that existed also left.

When BOBBY talked about disinvestment, there was every kind that one could imagine. In some of those communities, it is hard to find a Boy Scout troop. It is difficult to find the resources for a Girl Scout program or for activities that individuals can be engaged in after school. Yes, there is a level of violence, but there is an even deeper level of hopelessness. Without hope, it is like people being pressed up against the wall—pressed up against nowhere—trying to figure out how they get out.

I can tell you that, wherever darkness exists, there is light that comes, so I think that there are, indeed, solutions. What are the solutions? Job creation. Job creation. Job creation.

If we look at history, when times were difficult during the 1930s, there was the utilization of the Federal Government as a resource to create work opportunities, with the understanding that, if people are working, they are reinvesting because they are paying taxes, they are spending money, they are exchanging services and goods with each other. That also gives a boost to the economy. I never take the position that wherever we are that that is where we have to be.

Gun control legislation. Let me tell you that the people shooting don't necessarily make the guns. People who are shooting don't necessarily sell the guns. The people who are shooting actually acquire the guns from someplace and somebody else. If we could take away some of the opportunities for the guns to exist—I remember a song I used to listen to about a place called Black Mountain, and part of the lyrics said: ''I am going to Black Mountain with my razor and my gun. I am going to find that man of mine, shoot him if he stands still and cut him if he runs.'' If you have got to run after somebody, that is a little more difficult than being able to have an Uzi with which you drive by and mow him down. I don't know when we are going to get really serious in this country about diminishing the number of guns that people have access to.

I was disappointed when the Supreme Court said that people could actually carry weapons. That is one thing in some communities, in some places, but I can tell you that is another thing in other communities and other places. I would hate to go into a situation where I felt that everybody there who wanted to was carrying a weapon because he had the right to carry a concealed weapon.

I used to be on the Chicago City Council, and many of the people there were former police officers. Plus, you could carry a gun anyway because you were considered law enforcement. Sometimes, when you would go to lunch, you would see a number of people who might take their jackets off, and you would see a number of guns and weapons. You almost might be too afraid to eat. It would kind of take away lunch because all of these weapons were around.

I would urge our country to be willing to make the kind of investments that you must make. They are not spending. There is a difference between spending and investing. If you just spend, you don't necessarily get a return, but when you invest wisely, you expect a return. We need to invest in education. We need to invest in more social development activity, and we need to reinvest in urban communities like those on the southwest side and near-north sides and suburban areas of Chicago.

Congressman RUSH, I thank you again and commend you for calling for this Special Order, but I have got a feeling that, where there is life, there is hope, and I have a feeling that we will arrest the violence problem, not

only in Chicago, but in other places throughout America. I am pleased to join with you this evening and share a few moments in talking about the issue.

Mr. RUSH. Thank you so much, Congressman DAVIS.

I know that you have a response to what I am going to say because I am sure you share the same feeling.

I talked about discrimination earlier, and there is one aspect of discrimination that is probably of little notice. You have these youngsters in your community and in my community—in your district and in my district—and they are shepherded, to a great extent, to these prisons across the State. Most of these prisons are located in small towns, and these prisons are the economic engines for these small towns.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. They are part of the economy.

Mr. RUSH. So young people inside the city of Chicago, in your district and in my district, are actually the raw material of a lifestyle—a middle class lifestyle—for these small towns that surround these prisons because they are in the prisons, and their families and parents are working for the prisons. Their college educations are paid for by their salaries from the prisons, as are their homes, their mortgages. So they are creating an economic boon for these small towns, but we are suffering all of the issues.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. There is no doubt about it. I took 31 children to see their fathers in prison on the Saturday before Father's Day, and I can tell you that it was one of the most emotional gatherings that I have ever participated in.

We have got to put a stop to it, and we have got to start counting individuals not in the places they are imprisoned but in the communities that they come from so that the resources go back to those communities and not to the places where they are imprisoned.

Again, I thank you for shedding light this evening and for my being able to join you. We will just have to keep working on the issue, and I think we will get to the bottom of it.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of giving me the opportunity to acquire time that had not been acquired before, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of the Stay family in Houston, Texas.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 697. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6439. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6440. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Howard B. Brombreg, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6441. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral William H. McRaven, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6442. A letter from the Secretary, Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of mobilizations of select Reserve units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6443. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2013 Inventory of Contracts for Services for the Military Departments, Defense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6444. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Acting, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Benona, Township et al.); [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8339] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6445. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility Massachusetts: Acton, Town of Middlesex County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8335] received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6446. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Transnet SOC Limited (Transnet) of Johannesburg, South Africa; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6447. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Capital Planning and Stress Testing (RIN: 3133-AE27) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6448. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Limitations on Guaranteed Benefits; Shutdown and Similar Benefits (RIN: 1212-AB18) received July 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6449. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled, ''High-Performance Green Building Initiative Activities''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6450. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6451. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2013 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6452. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6453. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6454. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for the Northern Mexican Gartersnake and Narrow-headed Gartersnake [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0071] (RIN: 1018-AY23) received June, 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6455. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2014 Summer Flounder Specifications; 2015 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Specifications [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD094) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6456. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2013 Wiretap Report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6457. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of 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-AD52) received May 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6458. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1021] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6459. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1031; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-155-AD; Amendment 39-

17854; AD 2014-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6460. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (Bell) Helicopter [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0697; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-009-AD; Amendment 39-17862; AD 2014-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6461. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Redmond, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0171; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-6] received July 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6462. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bois Blanc Island, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0986; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-25] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6463. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Crandon, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0022; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-31] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6464. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Newnan, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0097; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-4] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6465. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Conway, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0178; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWS-23] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6466. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mineral Point, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0914; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-29] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6467. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30959; Amdt. No. 3591] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6468. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30962; Amdt. No. 3594] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6469. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30960; Amdt. No. 3596] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6470. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30961; Amdt. No. 3593] received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6471. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters (Type certificate currently held by Agusta Westland S.p.A) (Agusta) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0336; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-063-AD; Amendment 39-17857; AD 2014-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6472. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Longevity Annuity Contracts [TD 9673] (RIN: 1545-BK23) received July 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6473. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled, ''Response to Findings and Recommendations of the Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technical Advisory Committee (HTAC) during Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

6474. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

6475. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4871. A bill to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. CARNEY (for himself and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 5119. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to modernize C-130 aircraft using alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program kits and to ensure that such aircraft meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 5120. A bill to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5121. A bill to prohibit the indefinite detention of United States citizens and lawful resident aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to clarify the eligibility requirements with respect to railroad Hours of Service employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5123. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to implement country-of-origin disclosure requirements with respect to motor vehicle fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 5124. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5125. A bill to promote unlicensed spectrum use in the 5 GHz band, to maximize the use of the band for shared purposes in order to bolster innovation and economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 5126. A bill to reduce by one-half of one percent the discretionary budget authority of any Federal agency for a fiscal year if the financial statement of the agency for the previous fiscal year does not receive a qualified or unqualified audit opinion by an external independent auditor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. TAKANO:

H.R. 5127. A bill to allow funds under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be used to provide training to school personnel regarding how to recognize child sexual abuse; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 5128. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for

the Human Rights of LGBT Peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H. Res. 671. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. Res. 672. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12) to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

263. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 62 urging the Congress to enact the bills currently introduced to address sexual harassment and assault in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

264. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 382 urging the Congress to approve the President's budget proposal to provide $35 million to help communities process evidence from untested sexual assault kits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

265. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 declaring if a state opts out of a federal program, the state should not have to contribute state dollars to the federal program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. CARNEY:

H.R. 5119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 5120.

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; Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the forgoing powers.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12;

''The Congress shall have the power to ... raise and support armies...

Congress has the power to set the rules for the actions of US military forces, including their ability to detain individuals.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13;

''To provide and maintain a navy''

Congress has the power to set the rules for the actions of US military forces, including their ability to detain individuals.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18;

''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

Congress has the power to make laws to carry out the powers in Clause 12 and Clause 13 of Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 5122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5123.

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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5124.

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. LATTA:

H.R. 5125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power... ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 5126.

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. TAKANO:

H.R. 5127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 5128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 279: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 543: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 594: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 676: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 713: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 792: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 958: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 962: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1015: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1024: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1070: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1201: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1278: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1318: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1339: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1563: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1695: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1696: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1761: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1771: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1795: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1827: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1893: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2028: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VELA, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2144: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2398: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2453: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2457: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2529: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2536: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 2607: Mr. HOLT and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2646: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2656: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2673: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2780: Mr. JOLLY and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2847: Mr. POLIS and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2901: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2902: Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2909: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3136: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3367: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3654: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3833: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 3857: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 3867: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3992: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CHU, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4143: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R 4156: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4325: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4399: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4411: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 4421: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4449: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4450: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4511: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 4567: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4574: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4577: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4578: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 4589: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 4594: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 4613: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 4614: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4623: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4630: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4651: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 4682: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. REED, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 4698: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4706: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4709: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4716: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4782: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4851: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4854: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 4878: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4885: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 4906: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 4930: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4936: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4960: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4966: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4970: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4971: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 4993: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4999: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 5000: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5014: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 5051: Mr. KIND and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 5052: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 5069: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 5077: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 5078: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 5081: Mr. HONDA and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5084: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 5089: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 5095: Ms. HAHN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. ENYART.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 411: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 440: Mr. HOYER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 456: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 508: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 596: Mr. KLINE, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 601: Mr. MCALLISTER and Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 623: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 640: Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 650: Mrs. LUMMIS.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2014 No. 111

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we worship You, for Your loving-kindness, truth, and faithfulness sustain us. Though You are high, You respect the lowly. So today infuse our Senators with the spirit of lowliness and humility. Give them the wisdom to know that You give grace to the humble but oppose the proud. May their humility bring them that reverential awe that leads to honor and life. Lord, help them to remember that America's greatness comes not from the swagger of might but from the lowliness of that righteousness which exalts any nation. Guide our lawmakers with Your wisdom and uphold them with Your might.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2609 AND H.R. 5021

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2609) to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings regarding these bills at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Ronnie L. White to be a United States district judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. The debate will be until 10:15 a.m. Senators GRASSLEY, CORNYN, and SHAHEEN will control 10 minutes each of that time and Senator MCCASKILL will control any remaining time.

We have moved the time up, and I appreciate very much the cooperation of the Republicans because this is so one of our Senators can attend the funeral of one of his best friends. But we are not going to extend the time past 10:15 a.m. In light of that I am not going to give any statement today. If cloture is invoked, we will have a 12:20 p.m. vote.

Upon disposition of the White nomination, the Senate will resume legislative session and proceed to the motion to proceed to S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act. The time until 2:10 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with each side controlling 5 minutes of the final 10 minutes. At 2:10 p.m. the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2578.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between 3:30 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. be under Republican control and the time between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. be controlled by the majority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be an all-Senators briefing at 5:30 p.m. this afternoon, and it is all related to the emergency supplemental request to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

address the child and adult migration from Central America to the Southwest border.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

PROTECTING EVERYONE'S RIGHTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Members of Congress do not always see eye-to-eye on everything. It is fairly obvious. There are often strong and principled disagreements about taxes, the size and scope of government, ObamaCare, foreign policy—you name it. But let's be clear: When it comes to decisions about contraception, both parties believe a woman should be able to make her own decisions.

Now, some on the other side would like to pretend otherwise. They think they can score political points and create divisions where there are not any by distorting the facts. And that is why their increasingly outlandish claims—claims one nonpartisan fact-checker described as ''simply wrong''—just keep getting debunked. Even worse, our friends on the other side are now on record as saying we should protect the freedoms of some while stripping away the freedoms of others.

Republicans continue to insist that we can and should be in the business of protecting everyone's rights. We think that, instead of restricting Americans' religious freedoms, Congress should instead work to preserve a woman's ability to make contraception decisions for herself. And the legislation Senator AYOTTE, FISCHER, and I filed yesterday would do just that.

The Preserving Religious Freedom and a Woman's Access to Contraception Act would clarify that an employer cannot block an employee from legal access to her FDA-approved contraceptives. It is a commonsense proposal. It reaffirms that we can both preserve America's long tradition of tolerance and respect for people of faith while at the same time preserving a woman's ability to make her own decisions about contraception.

Our bill would also ask the FDA to study whether contraceptives could be made available to adults safely without a prescription. And it would allow women to set aside more money in their flexible spending accounts so they can cover out-of-pocket medical expenses, many of which are skyrocketing under ObamaCare.

So if Democrats are serious about doing right by women—if they are not just interested in stoking divisions in an election year—then they should get on board with our legislation. That is a start. And then they can work with us to undo the damage their policies—like ObamaCare—have already caused to millions—millions—of middle-class women.

Research shows that American women make about 80 percent of the health care decisions for their families. Yet, thanks to ObamaCare, millions of women lost the health insurance plans they had and they liked—causing enormous disruptions in their lives and in the lives of their families.

When women first spoke out about the betrayal they felt when they lost their plans, Washington Democrats said their plans were ''junk'' or worse, that they were lying, because Democratic politicians thought they knew better than all of these people we were hearing from. It was insulting to many, including one constituent who wrote to me from Woodford County. She described herself as a ''lifelong self-employed professional'' who ''shopped hard'' for a policy that she liked and wanted to keep. Here is what she said after Washington Democratic policies overruled her own personal choice of a plan:

> The President has referred to my type of policy as ''substandard.'' In fact, it is a good product for people in my situation. It appears that the President does not understand personal finance, and does not trust Americans to choose products that are good for them. He also does not appreciate people like me who are willing to accept personal responsibility for a large part of my own routine medical expenses.

She is not the only one who feels this way, and she is not the only one who has been hurt by ObamaCare.

As a result of ObamaCare, too many women now have fewer choices of doctors and hospitals.

As a result of ObamaCare, millions of Americans—nearly two-thirds of them women—are now at risk of having their hours and their wages reduced.

As a result of ObamaCare, married women can face penalty taxes just for working.

As a result of ObamaCare and other changes by the Obama administration, a woman on Medicare Advantage could see her average benefits reduced by more than $1,500 a year.

And thanks to ObamaCare, millions of women have had their flexible spending accounts limited and can no longer use tax-preferred medical savings to purchase all the medications they use—a wrongheaded policy that the bill we introduced yesterday seeks to address.

But that is just a start. Washington Democrats need to work with us to pass real health reform—actual, patient-centered reform that will not hurt women the way ObamaCare does. Because we have seen the letters from our constituents—letters such as the one I received from a woman in Mount Sterling who says ObamaCare did more than just cause her premiums to nearly double—it might make her medications unaffordable as well: ''I am on three medications, [and] two years ago the copay was $60 for each one,'' she said. ''Now, my medications are costing me a little over $700 a month.''

That is not fair. It is not right. And this is just the kind of challenge both parties should be working together to address.

So let's do away with the false choices. Let's focus on actually helping women instead. Let's work together to boost jobs, wages, and opportunity at a time when women are experiencing so much hardship as a result of this administration's policies.

Republicans have been asking Washington Democrats to do all of this for years now. It is about time they started showing they really care.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RONNIE L. WHITE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10:15 a.m. will be controlled as follows: 10 minutes for the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY; 10 minutes for the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN; 10 minutes for the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN; and any remaining time under the control of the Senator from Missouri, Mrs. MCCASKILL.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Senate will vote today to try to end the unjustified filibuster against Judge Ronnie White, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. Many Senators will remember Judge White from 15 years ago, when the Senate denied his confirmation by a partyline vote after an ugly campaign by Republican Senators to caricature him as a jurist who was soft on crime. Today, the Senate has an opportunity to reject that unjust characterization and confirm a well-qualified and principled man who has demonstrated his ability to be a fair judge and who is faithful to the law.

Throughout his exceptional career, Judge White has been a trail blazer in the legal community. In 1995, he became the first African American to serve on the Missouri Supreme Court and later became the first African American to serve as its Chief Justice. He previously served for 2 years as a judge on the Missouri Court of Appeals. Outside of his distinguished judicial service, Judge White has broad experience in the law, working in private practice as a partner in Missouri-based law firms both before and after his time on the bench, serving as City Counselor and Public Defender for St.

Louis, MO and serving as a State representative in the Missouri General Assembly. He has been honored for his achievements and commitment to public service by organizations such as the Federal Defense Bar of the Eastern District of Missouri and the St. Louis branch of the NAACP.

I supported Judge White when he was first nominated to the U.S. District Court and I support him now. In 1999, by the time the Senate voted on his nomination, Judge White had upheld the implementation of the death penalty 41 times as a state Supreme Court justice. Yet, then-Senator Ashcroft of Missouri claimed Judge White was ''soft on crime'' and was ''the most anti-death penalty judge on the Missouri Supreme Court.'' These claims should have been easily dismissed years ago, and should be easily dismissed today.

Judge White's nomination is supported by law enforcement, legal professionals, and the civil rights community. The elected President of the Missouri Fraternal Order of Police, Kevin Ahlbrand, wrote on behalf of his organization's 5,400 members: ''As front line law enforcement officers, we recognize the important need to have jurists such as Ronnie White, who have shown themselves to be tough on crime, yet fair and impartial. . . . We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.'' I ask consent that this letter, and others, be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Unfortunately, rather than admit that they made a mistake in voting against Judge White's nomination before, some Senators are now saying they may oppose his nomination because in 2003 he joined the Missouri Supreme Court's majority opinion in Simmons v. Roper holding that the Eight Amendment prohibits the execution of individuals who commit a capital crime when they are under 18 years of age. In 2005, in Roper v. Simmons, the U.S. Supreme Court agreed. The criticism, I gather, is that Judge White's decision to join the majority opinion was contrary to then-existing U.S. Supreme Court precedent. While I have heard some Members of the Senate criticize a nominee for having asserted a position that is ultimately rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court, this may be the first time I have heard a nominee criticized for actually getting it right.

At his confirmation hearing earlier this year, Senator MCCASKILL introduced Judge White as someone who ''continues to be a shining star to thousands of Missourians because of his career, which has really been emblematic of hard work, courage, dedication and service to public before self. . . . I can think of no one in the State of Missouri who is more deserving of this appointment to the Federal bench than my friend, Ronnie White.'' I thank Senator MCCASKILL for her leadership in recommending that President Obama nominate Judge White for this position.

Today Senators have an opportunity to right a wrong. This chance is long overdue. I am confident Judge White will serve on the Federal bench with distinction, and with fidelity to our Constitution. I thank the Majority Leader for bringing this nomination up for a vote, and I urge my fellow Senators to vote to defeat this filibuster and to confirm this well qualified nominee without further delay.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
MISSOURI STATE LODGE,
Jefferson City, MO, May 13, 2014.

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY, As the elected representative of over 5,400 law enforcement officers across the State of Missouri, I am urging your committee to vote out the nomination of Ronnie White for the open judicial seat in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

We would then be hopeful that the Senate confirms his nomination.

We do not take such stances lightly. As front line law enforcement officers, we recognize the important need to have jurists such as Ronnie White, who have shown themselves to be tough on crime, yet fair and impartial.

As a former justice on the Missouri Court of Appeals and as the Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court, Ronnie White has proven that he has the experience and requisite attributes to be a quality addition to the U.S. District Court.

We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.

Sincerely,

KEVIN AHLBRAND,
President, Missouri Fraternal Order of Police.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, we write to express our strong support for the nomination of Ronnie L. White to be a U.S. District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. As one of Missouri's leading legal minds, Mr. White has devoted his life to serving the citizens of Missouri. Throughout his career, he has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to enforcing the rule of law with objectivity, thoughtfulness and impartiality, and he would be an outstanding addition to the federal bench. We urge you to vote yes on cloture and yes on his nomination.

Mr. White is eminently qualified, as evidenced by the ''Unanimously Qualified'' rating he received from the American Bar Association and by his long career in service to the public. After graduating from the University of Missouri-Kansas City Law School in 1983, Mr. White worked as a public defender in St. Louis and served three terms in the Missouri House of Representatives. In 1993, he was appointed as City Counselor for the City of St. Louis; the following year, Governor Mel Carnahan appointed him as a judge for the Eastern District of the Missouri Court of Appeals. In 1995, Mr. White became the first African American to sit on the Supreme Court of Missouri, and he served as chief justice from July 2003 to June 2005. He retired from the bench in 2007.

As a judge, Mr. White served with distinction on the Missouri Court of Appeals and the state Supreme Court, gaining a reputation as a fair, intelligent jurist who commanded the respect of his fellow judges. When President Clinton nominated him in 1997 to a seat on the U.S. District Court for Missouri, Mr. White received support from his colleagues on the Supreme Court and many in law enforcement. However, his nomination was defeated in October 1999 in a disappointing party-line vote engineered by then-Senator John Ashcroft.

Mr. Ashcroft led a vigorous smear campaign against Mr. White based on spurious claims about his record as a judge on death penalty cases. For instance, the senator claimed that White voted against the death penalty more than any other judge on the Missouri Supreme Court. But the facts proved otherwise. Of Mr. Ashcroft's seven appointees to the court, four voted to reverse death penalty decisions more often than Mr. White. In fact, Mr. White upheld the majority of death penalty convictions that came before him as a judge, and in the rare case in which he did vote to reverse, the majority were unanimous decisions.

Further, Mr. Ashcroft used false data and misleading interpretations to solicit opposition from law enforcement and to bolster his assertion that Mr. White was ''soft on crime.'' Even so, two major law enforcement groups—the Missouri State Fraternal Order of Police and the Missouri Police Chiefs Association—endorsed White wholeheartedly and refuted the ''soft on crime'' allegation. Carl Wolf, then president of the Missouri Police Chiefs Association, revealed that Mr. Ashcroft had actively solicited opposition from law enforcement groups and that any such opposition was not spontaneous. It is worth pointing out that Mr. White's current nomination has again garnered the endorsement of the Missouri State Fraternal Order of Police.

In the aftermath of the 1999 vote against Mr. White's confirmation, many saw the vilification of him as unfair and the charges against him unfounded. In ''The Smearing of a Moderate Judge,'' Stuart Taylor of The Legal Times wrote: ''In short, the record shows that Judge White takes seriously his duty both to enforce the death penalty and to ensure that defendants get fair trials. It suggests neither that he's 'pro-criminal' nor that he's a liberal activist. What it does suggest is courage. And while White may be more sensitive to civil liberties than his Ashcroft-appointed colleagues are, his opinions also exude a spirit of moderation, care, and candor.'' Ultimately, many in the media viewed the fight as one of political expediency rather than of judging a candidate on the merits. As the Washington Post wrote, ''This vote was politics of the rawest sort. It was the politics of an upcoming Missouri Senate race, in which Sen. Ashcroft apparently intends to use the death penalty as a campaign issue.''

It is apparent that the opposition to Mr. White's previous nomination was baseless and that he fell victim to political posturing. The Leadership Conference believes Mr. White's record makes him an exceptionally qualified nominee with the ability to make objective decisions on the multifaceted and prominent cases that will surely come before the court. His impeccable credentials and the support he has garnered from people across the political spectrum make him an excellent choice for a federal judgeship on the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of Missouri. This malicious and unwarranted attack on a unanimously qualified nominee must not happen again.

For these reasons, we urge you to vote in favor of cloture and in favor of his nomination. Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to

contact Nancy Zirkin, Executive Vice President, at *Zirkin@civilrights.org* or Sakira Cook, Counsel, at *cook@civilrights.org*.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
President and CEO,
NANCY ZIRKIN,
Executive Vice President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am here today to express my concerns with the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Hobby Lobby case and the steps we are taking—hopefully, this week—to protect a woman's right to make her own health care decisions. I want to thank Senators MURRAY and UDALL for their leadership on this issue and for introducing the Not My Boss's Business Act.

I appreciate hearing from the Republican leader about their interest in supporting women's access to contraceptive care, and I hope that is something we can all agree on. But the issue here is not just access to that care, it is the cost of that care. When you charge women more for contraceptive coverage, then you are denying them access to that care.

The legislation that has been introduced by Senators MURRAY and UDALL, and of which I am a cosponsor, will prevent employers from being involved in an employee's health care decisions and it will reverse the Supreme Court's decision.

Throughout my career in office, I have fought to ensure that women have access to important contraceptive services and that women are able to make their own decisions about their health care with their doctors and with their families.

In 1999, when I was Governor of New Hampshire, I signed into law a bipartisan bill that required insurance companies to cover prescription contraceptives—the issue we are debating right now. I signed that law with strong bipartisan support because both Republicans and Democrats knew it was the right thing to do. In fact, that legislation passed in the New Hampshire House with 121 Democratic votes and 120 Republican votes and 2 Independents.

That law, passed in 1999, has now provided thousands of New Hampshire women with the ability to access the medications they and their doctors decide are right for them because they have that insurance coverage to pay for those medications. The Affordable Care Act also established that women would have access to prescription contraceptive services with no copays, just as New Hampshire did in 1999.

Do you know what is interesting? We are having this debate about religious objections. Back in 1999 the legislature appointed a committee to look at whether there were any religious concerns about what we had done. They came back and reported that this was not an issue.

A recent analysis by the Department of Health and Human Services reports that because of the Affordable Care Act, more than 30 million women are now eligible to receive preventive health services, including contraception, with no copays. In fact, since 2013 women have saved nearly $500 million in out-of-pocket costs because of the ACA's requirement to cover contraceptive care.

The Supreme Court's decision has a real financial bearing on women and their families throughout the country because this ruling will have a profound impact on the health and economic security of women throughout this Nation. As noted by Justice Ginsburg in her dissent in the Hobby Lobby case, when high cost is a factor, women are more likely to decide not to pursue certain forms of health care treatments that involve contraceptive care.

There are many reasons why a doctor may decide to prescribe contraceptives for a woman's health care needs. Contraceptives can be used to treat a broad range of medical issues—hair loss, endometriosis, acne, irregular menstrual cycles. Contraceptives have also been shown to reduce the risk of certain cancers. But just a few weeks ago the Supreme Court jeopardized that access to affordable preventive health care for too many women. As a result of the Hobby Lobby case, some employers now have the ability to claim religious objections as a justification for not providing contraceptive health care with no copay.

I understand the host of issues employers face on a daily basis. I appreciate the complexity they face when they decide to offer health insurance coverage to their employees. For example, take Jane Valliere, who owns Hermanos Mexican restaurant in Concord, NH. I recently had the opportunity to sit down with Jane and to discuss the Hobby Lobby case. Jane made it clear that while she has many choices and decisions to make on a daily basis to keep her business running, she never expected to be put in a position where she could be responsible for making a health care decision for her employees at the restaurant.

Like Jane, I do not think it makes sense for employers to make those personal, private health care decisions for their employees. Critical health decisions are simply not an employer's business. Where a woman works should not determine whether she gets insurance coverage that has been guaranteed to her under Federal law.

While we do not yet know the full extent of the impact from this ruling, we do know the Supreme Court's decision turns back progress women across the country have fought for years to achieve.

We must ensure that women have access to the health care services and medications they need. That means making them affordable, that they are able to make their own decisions about their care with their doctors and their families.

Thankfully, we have an opportunity this week to correct the Supreme Court's shortsighted decision. This week the Senate can stand for women and pass the Not My Boss's Business Act. A woman's health care decision should be made with her doctor, with her family, with her faith, not by her employer and with her employer's faith. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, later we will be voting on a judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. I come to the Senate floor today to explain why, regrettably, I am unable to support the nominee.

As my colleagues know, Justice Ronnie White was originally nominated by President Clinton during the 105th Congress. This body voted on and rejected his nomination in 1999. After careful consideration of his record, I voted against Justice White's nomination at that time. Since 1999, Justice White completed a term as chief justice of the Missouri Supreme Court and has returned to private practice. So today I would like to revisit a few aspects of Justice White's legal and judicial career that first led me to vote against his nomination. I will also discuss developments since 1999. Unfortunately, his record since that time has only reinforced my concerns.

First, I begin with some troubling aspects of Justice White's record during his days on the Missouri Supreme Court in the 1990s. I only need to point to a few cases to illustrate my concerns.

In the 1998 Johnson case, Justice White was the sole dissenter on the State's high court. It was a capital appeal case involving a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. The case was heartbreaking. The defendant shot four people to death—three Missouri sheriffs and one of the sheriffs' wives. The facts were stark and very clear-cut. This was not a close case.

The defendant was convicted based upon the overwhelming evidence of his guilt. Justice White conceded there was more than sufficient evidence to sustain the conviction on appeal, but he went out of his way to create a standard that was not based on Missouri law when he evaluated the conduct of the defense attorney. Unsurprisingly, not a single member of the State court agreed with Justice White's dissenting opinion. That is because it was obvious there was no reasonable probability that anything the defense attorney did would have

changed the outcome of the trial. That is the applicable legal standard. It is straightforward—very straightforward. In that case, every member of the State supreme court applied it correctly, except Justice White.

Unfortunately, Justice White's dissent in that case was not an isolated example. On a number of other occasions throughout his judicial career, Justice White misapplied standards of review or considered issues that were not germane to the law when he was deciding cases. Justice White has even admitted as much. Discussing his judicial philosophy, he said in 2005 that he thinks it is appropriate for judges to let their opinions be ''shaped by their own life experiences.'' I think the personal characteristics of any judge—what this nominee calls his ''own life experiences''—should play absolutely no role whatsoever in the process of judicial decisionmaking. I know my colleagues on our Judiciary Committee share that view as well.

Let me get back to the nominee's judicial track record. Justice White was the sole dissenter in another case that the Missouri Supreme Court decided in 1997. That case raised the question of whether the defendant was entitled to an additional evidentiary hearing. In his dissent, joined by none of his colleagues, Justice White again ignored a straightforward standard of review and wrote that the defendant should have the hearing because Justice White thought it would cause ''little harm.'' Here again we see Justice White's personal preferences creeping into what should be objective, law-based decisionmaking—something pretty elementary to being a judge at any level, Federal or State, in our system of jurisprudence.

Those are just two examples of what led me, after consideration of the nominee's record as a whole, to vote against his nomination in 1999.

Unfortunately, my concerns about Justice White's first nomination have only been reaffirmed by his subsequent record. For instance, I am troubled by Justice White's concurrence in the Eighth Amendment case of Roper v. Simmons. That case was first heard by the Missouri Supreme Court, was appealed to the Supreme Court, and was eventually affirmed. But the affirmance is not what my colleagues should focus on. What should concern my colleagues is the opinion that Justice White concurred in, which ignored binding Supreme Court precedent. That precedent was the Stanford v. Kentucky case. I will explain.

In 2003, when Justice White's court decided Roper, binding Supreme Court precedent at that time permitted applying the death penalty to individuals if they committed their crimes when they were under 18. Nonetheless, Justice White concurred in the State court opinion that simply ignored that precedent. Justice White concurred even though the Supreme Court had reaffirmed the Stanford principle twice in 2002, the year before Justice White's state court decision.

Moreover, in 2003 the Supreme Court rejected an appeal raising legal arguments that were identical to the ones Justice White endorsed. That is the very same year Justice White's court ruled in Roper and ignored Stanford outright.

My colleagues on our Judiciary Committee often ask nominees about their commitment to Supreme Court precedent and their faithfulness to the doctrine of stare decisis. Nominees who appear before us routinely repeat the mantra that they will unfailingly apply precedent and nothing else—in other words, leave out personal views. Justice White did as much at his hearing as well. But—and this is what I find so troubling—when I asked him about the Stanford case, he admitted that Stanford was, in fact, binding on his state court at the time he concurred in Roper. What he did not explain—what he could not explain—was why he ignored that binding precedent as a State supreme court justice. He could not explain why he thought it was appropriate for him to concur in a State court opinion that, in effect, overruled U.S. Supreme Court precedent.

I do not doubt that Justice White has always done what he thought was right and that he ruled the way he thought best to achieve justice for the litigants before him. But in my view that is not an appropriate role for a Federal district judge. Judicial decisionmaking requires a disinterested and objective approach that never takes into account the judge's life experiences or policy preferences. From the careful look I have taken at Justice White's 13-year track record as a judge, I have too many questions about his ability to keep his personal considerations separate from his judicial opinions.

Finally, it is worth noting that there continues to be opposition to this nominee from law enforcement.

Specifically, both the National Sheriffs' Association and the Missouri Sheriffs' Association oppose this nominee.

I always try to give judicial nominees the benefit of doubt when I have questions about their records, but in this nominee's case, I simply can't ignore so many indications that the nominee isn't the right person to occupy a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench.

I sincerely hope I am wrong about Justice White, and I reluctantly vote no on the nominee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Missouri Sheriffs' Association Training Academy and National Sheriffs' Association.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missouri Sheriffs' Association and Training Academy, May 10, 2014]

MISSOURI SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION OPPOSES CONFIRMATION OF RONNIE L. WHITE TO THE FEDERAL BENCH

On behalf of the 115 Sheriffs in the State of Missouri, the Missouri Sheriffs' Association vehemently opposes the confirmation of Ronnie L. White to the federal bench.

Victims of crime, families of victims and law enforcement deserve a better federal judge than Ronnie L. White. As we explained to Senators Blunt and McCaskill last year, Ronnie L. White proved himself an activist judge who sought protection for criminals from punishment given to them by a jury even in cases where criminals performed unforgiveable acts of violence against our fellow citizens and law enforcement.

Ronnie L. White's actions and beliefs doomed his confirmation in 1999. In 1999, fifty four Senators knew Ronnie L. White was not the right person for the job based on the merits of his decisions on the bench. Nothing has changed since 1999 warranting Ronnie L. White's confirmation this year.

Senators who want to protect our citizenry from activist judges like Ronnie L. White should vote against confirmation just as was done in 1999.

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, April 2, 2014.

Hon. CLAIRE MCCASKILL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROY BLUNT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCASKILL AND SENATOR BLUNT: I write on behalf of the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA) and the more than 3,000 elected Sheriffs nationwide to express our support for the efforts of the Missouri Sheriffs' Association to prevent the nomination of Ronnie L. White to a federal judgeship in St. Louis. The Missouri Sheriffs' Association was outspoken in its opposition to Judge White's previous nomination by President Bill Clinton and continues to be outspoken against any further consideration to the federal courts. I respectfully request that, as you examine candidates for the federal judgeship in St. Louis, you carefully consider the concerns presented by the Missouri Sheriffs' Association regarding any judicial nomination of Ronnie L. White.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL LEIDHOLT,
Sheriff NSA President.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the past several weeks, I have spoken about the ongoing crisis on our southern border—the President has acknowledged as a humanitarian crisis—with tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors making a perilous journey from Central America and ending on our doorstep, most often in my State, the State of Texas.

In this year, the numbers are skyrocketing again. Starting in 2011 we saw the numbers, roughly, about 6,000 unaccompanied minors. They doubled from 2011 to 2012, they doubled again from 2012 to 2013, and they look as though they are going to double again from 2013 to 2014. We can only wonder at what might happen thereafter unless we come up with a solution to the problem.

A majority of these children, as I indicated, come from Central America—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. Under current law when these children are detained by the Border Patrol, they are processed by the Border Patrol and

then given a notice to appear at a future court hearing and turned over to the Department of Health and Human Services for safekeeping.

Health and Human Services tries to identify a guardian to pick up the child and, not surprisingly, most of them are never heard from again. Certainly they don't show up for this court hearing in response to the notice to appear. Thus, the transnational criminal organizations, the cartels—the people who make money from transporting these children and other migrants across Mexico and the United States—have discovered an effective business model. In other words, they are able to deliver these children to their families—at least the ones who survive—from Central America through Mexico and into Texas.

The majority of them will make it, because they will be placed with a family member or some other relative, and never appear at the court hearing for which they have been notified to appear.

For children detained from bordering nations such as Mexico or Canada, the process is different than it is from noncontiguous countries such as Central America. Border Patrol, under the current law, can determine whether the children are eligible to stay in the United States or give these children the choice to be safely transferred to officials from their home countries.

Our country simply does not have the current capacity to deal with 50,000, much less 90,000 or 100,000, unaccompanied minors appearing on our Nation's doorstep.

As a result, these children are being kept at Border Patrol facilities, such as I witnessed in McAllen, TX, that have capacity for a few hundred people, but they are currently holding well over double, many times triple and beyond, their current capacity.

I and other Members of Congress, unlike the President, have seen these facilities firsthand and talked to some of the children. The conditions they are kept in are unacceptable by any standard: babies in diapers sleeping on cement floors and dozens of children crammed into one cell with a single toilet.

In addition to these overcrowded detention facilities, there is an overburdened judicial system. Minors in custody of the Department of Health and Human Services are released to family members or guardians or sponsors in the United States, but they are given a notice to appear before an immigration judge if they wish to make a claim for relief under our immigration laws.

Those who show up will not see a judge, on average, for more than 1 year—leaving, as I said, plenty of incentive to simply disappear and never return for a court date. As the law is currently written, in 2008, there are few other options available.

For that reason I have, along with my friend and colleague from Texas, HENRY CUELLAR from the House of Representatives, introduced a clear, commonsense change to the 2008 law to address the immediate crisis.

This is, I hasten to add, not a complete fix to our broken immigration system, but it does target this particular crisis and offers a commonsense solution.

We call this the Helping Unaccompanied Minors and Alleviating National Emergency Act, or the HUMANE Act. It would amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. That law had good intentions, because it was focused on the victims of human trafficking, and we preserve those protections for the victims of human trafficking, but it needs to be improved so that thousands of children who now make this perilous journey in the hands of these criminal organizations up these smuggling corridors from Central America to the United States—we must make sure they are deterred from making this life-threatening journey.

Our changes to the law maintain all of the safeguards built into the 2008 law, and so there should be no objection on that basis. But what we would go further to do is the HUMANE Act would treat all unaccompanied minors the same and ensure an orderly legal process.

A majority of these children would be reunited with their parents in their home countries. Those who choose to appear in front of an immigration judge will have every opportunity to do so on an expedited basis. In those cases where they qualify for removal under our current laws, they would be placed in safekeeping with federally screened sponsors while additional hearings are scheduled.

This expedited process would alleviate overburdened Border Patrol and HHS facilities, as well as the local officials who have been disproportionately affected—although I would add that I read newspaper stories about officials in places such as Massachusetts, Arizona, California, and others expressing concern about these large numbers of unaccompanied children who are being warehoused in their States.

Most importantly, this legislation would send a message to people in Central America that the dangerous journey to the United States in the hands of ruthless smugglers and cartel operatives is simply not worth it.

Central American families would hear loudly and clearly that not only will the journey place their children at risk of sexual assault and even death, they will by and large not be permitted to stay in the United States once they arrive under current law.

Some will. If you are a victim of human trafficking, you may be eligible for a T-visa. If you have a colorable claim to asylum, you can make that claim to an immigration judge under our legislation. But if you don't have a claim to relief under our current immigration laws, you will be returned safely to your home country.

Tackling this crisis is a significant challenge that requires Presidential leadership. But, in the meantime, these children are sleeping in overcrowded cells, Texas communities are reeling from the impact, and we need action. With this legislation we try to target a commonsense solution that will take immediate steps to help stem the tide of the growing crisis.

I hope my colleagues will join us in cosponsoring this legislation. It sounds as if the House of Representatives is probably going to be moving next week. I know there is a lot of controversy anytime we talk about circumstances such as this. Some people think it should be tougher, others think it is too tough to enforce current law. But the fact is, the drug cartels, the transnational criminal organizations, have created a business model based on a loophole they found in the 2008 law.

Our bipartisan, bicameral legislation seeks to fix that and to give these children the benefit of the law if they qualify under the law as currently written. But to continue to leave the law as it exists now with this loophole in it, and continue to see it exploited by the Zetas and other cartels that traffic in human beings, is simply an invitation to continue to see these numbers double year after year and our capacity to deal with these children on a humane basis further diminished.

We need to have immigration laws that protect these children and all of us, and it does not mean that anybody and everybody under every circumstance can qualify to come to the United States and stay. That is simply an invitation to chaos.

We can treat these children humanely, we can give them the benefit that the law allows as written, but if they don't qualify, we need to return them home.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, it is not often the Senate has a chance to go back and fix a grievous error that occurred in our history, and that error occurred in 1999 when a good and qualified man was defeated in the Senate for a position on the eastern district court of the Federal bench in Missouri.

At that time there was an attack on Ronnie White for being soft on crime. The record, as it stands today, flies in the face of that assertion.

At the time of his defeat, he had voted to uphold the death penalty almost 70 percent of the time. In fact, in his career on the Missouri Supreme Court, being the first African American appointed to the Supreme Court, he voted with the majority on death penalty cases 90 percent of the time.

This is a mainstream jurist. This is not someone who is outside of the mainstream. That is why the Fraternal Order of Police has endorsed his nomination. That is why he is considered in the State of Missouri as an iconic leader in the legal community. He went back to Missouri, was the chief justice in the Supreme Court after he was defeated on the floor of the Senate, retired from the Supreme Court, and has gone on to be an established and respected lawyer in the St. Louis community—frankly, part of many big cases, especially the appellate work, because he served on both the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court.

I think Ronnie White handled what happened to him with as much character as could possibly be required of any individual. I look forward to finally righting the wrong and allowing Ronnie White his well-deserved place on the Federal bench.

I ask all my colleagues to support the confirmation of Ronnie White.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Claire McCaskill, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Christopher Murphy, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murphy
Begich	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Mikulski	Rockefeller	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yes are 54, the nays are 43. The motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, the time until 12:20 p.m. will be divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak on an issue of vital importance to all who value true liberty in the United States.

Last month the Supreme Court issued its decision in the Hobby Lobby case. In 2010, in the Citizens United case, the Court said corporations have a First Amendment right to participate in elections. In the Hobby Lobby ruling, the Court took it a step further and said that since a corporation can be a person, it can also have religious views and because a corporation is a person, it can impose its religious beliefs on an employee and deny a woman insurance that protects her health by providing contraception. So the folly of the Supreme Court has come full circle, where an actual person will be denied their rights because the views of a corporation have been given priority under the U.S. Constitution as interpreted by this Supreme Court.

Instead of ''we the people,'' it is now ''I the CEO of a corporation'' who has the right to exercise their constitutional privileges as interpreted by this Supreme Court that truncates the right of individual women in America to exercise theirs.

The Supreme Court majorities have continued to extend our basic constitutional rights—the inalienable rights held by individuals—to corporations. Corporations are not people.

Supporters of the Hobby Lobby ruling have accused Democrats of hyperbole. They say we are making the Hobby Lobby case seem more dire than it truly is. The corporate personhood supporters say the ruling doesn't mean women can't use the contraception of their choice, just that the insurance provided by their employer doesn't have to cover it or they say the ruling doesn't mean a boss is imposing his or her religious views on their employees. That is just wrong. It says that the boss doesn't have to subsidize health care that violates the boss's religious views.

What happens when the religious views of a CEO are imposed on the real life of a working woman?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. MARKEY. In real life working women earn their insurance coverage. It is part of their pay, and they depend on insurance to pay for their health care—including contraception—for themselves and their families. If that employer's choice of insurance doesn't pay for a particular type of contraception, a woman will be forced to give up her right to use it.

If one form of contraception is—just as Ginsburg explained in her dissent—$1,000, and insurance won't cover even a penny, a working woman is going to be forced to make medical decisions based on the religion her employer practices, not on what she and her doctor determine is best for her from a medical perspective. The religion of the employer trumps the recommendation of a physician to a woman, and this is just a step that changes the whole relationship between an individual and their country.

If a corporation's insurance doesn't cover any contraception because all contraceptives violate the employer's religious beliefs, then their employee's religious views are especially burdened, and she will have to pay for contraception out of her own pocket. Keep in mind that the average woman makes 77 cents on the dollar to a man, but if you are an African-American woman, then it is 66 cents on the dollar, and Latina women earn 59 cents on the dollar compared to what a white man makes in the United States of America.

In the Hobby Lobby case, the Supreme Court transformed religion from a personal choice into a corporate decision, and the corporate world—in real life—can impose its religious views on its employees. That is why I am an original cosponsor of S. 2578, the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act, or as supporters call it the Not My Boss's Business Act.

Let's be clear. Corporations are not people, period. For-profit corporations do not have religious views. For-profit corporations should not be able to deny their employees critical health care or force American taxpayers to pay for it

because of the owner's personal religious views.

The Not My Boss's Business Act will fix the Hobby Lobby decision by making it illegal for corporations to deny their employees health care benefits—including contraception—that are required to be covered by Federal law. It will protect employees from having their health care restricted by bosses who want to impose their religious belief on others.

I urge my colleagues to vote to restore true liberty by voting to pass S. 2578. I thank all of my colleagues.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, last month, as my friend from Massachusetts just mentioned, the Supreme Court ruled that the Obama administration's Health and Human Services mandate infringes on the First Amendment guarantee of religious freedom. This is a guarantee that Americans have enjoyed for the entire history of our country. It is the first freedom in the First Amendment to the Constitution. The first sentence has the words ''freedom of religion.''

In the very recent past, the Congress of the United States voted for a bill that protected freedom of religion unless there was some extraordinary reason not to have freedom of religion in our country. It is important to try to maintain some sense of good humor and be willing to work with people on other issues. As it is, people come to the floor and just say the same things over and over that are not true.

Everybody is entitled to their own opinion on religious freedom. Everybody is entitled to their own opinion on the President's health care bill. Everybody is not entitled to their own facts. If we were dealing with the facts as they truly exist right now, this would be a much different debate.

In fact, just a couple of days ago the Washington Post Fact Checker said that what the Senate Democrats are saying in their rhetoric is just wrong. He said: They are simply wrong. He said the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives. The court ruling does not prevent women from seeking birth control. The court ruling does not take away a person's religious freedom. In fact, all the court ruling does is say that although many people are exempted from this law, we are going to find a way to have people's religious rights upheld.

In America you should not be forced to choose between giving up your business for your faith or giving up your faith for your business. Under the Constitution and under the political heritage of this country and the foundation this country was built on, the government has no right to ask people to make that choice. There are plenty of protections in the Religious Restoration Freedom Act that passed just a few years ago that don't allow this to be taken to some unacceptable extreme.

Religious freedom has historically been a bipartisan issue. In fact, the law the Court based their decision on was introduced in the House by then-Congressman CHUCK SCHUMER—now Senator SCHUMER who sits right over there—and the late Senator Ted Kennedy. They were the people who proposed this legislation. President Clinton signed the bill into law. The Vice President of the United States, JOE BIDEN, voted for the bill. The minority leader of the House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, was a cosponsor of the bill, and this was just considered something that was easily done.

It was unanimously passed in the House. It got three no votes—the vote was 97 to 3 in the Senate. This was in 1993, not 1893. This was a dozen years ago when the understanding was clear that there was a principle in our country that if you are going to violate that principle, you better have taken every step possible not to violate the principle of religious freedom. People on the other side would say it was only a handful of years ago when the bill passed and they didn't know that was what it meant.

Of course they knew that was what it meant. One of the reasons they know that is what it meant is because they knew at the time that this principle was a principle the government would adhere to.

In fact, the specific language in the Respect for Rights of Conscience Act that I introduced in the 112th Congress plus the specific language that Senator Kennedy put in the Health Insurance Consumer's Bill of Rights Act in 1997 exempted the protected religious faith. It says that based on the religious or moral convictions of the issuer, the issuer didn't have to do things they thought were wrong.

In the 103rd Congress Senator Moynihan introduced the Clinton health care package—sometimes called Hillary care—which said that nothing in this title should be construed to prevent any employer from contributing to the purchase of a standard benefits package which excludes coverage for abortion or other services if the employer objects to such services on the basis of a religious belief or moral conviction. It can't get much clearer than that.

According to Senator SCHUMER—when the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was introduced it said the government shall not substantially burden a person's exercise of religion even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability unless it demonstrates such a burden is, one, in the furtherance of a compelling governmental interest or, two, is the least restrictive means of furthering that governmental interest.

This is not a law—the Affordable Care Act—that people are not exempted from. In fact, every woman and man in America who works for an employer that has fewer than 50 people employed is exempted from this act. There are entire religious faith groups exempted from this act if they don't believe in government health care. There are waivers the President has issued over and over that exempt people from this act—many of whom were employees of fast-food restaurants and other places that had minimal packages. The President said we are going to exempt them for a while.

People who work for employers with under 50 employees are exempted forever until the law changes. There are millions more people who work for employers with under 50 employees than work for employers that will have a sincere faith-based interest in not doing the wrong thing.

The majority of people who worship in this country in a given week go to worship in a church where they say this practice is wrong. It doesn't mean it is illegal. It doesn't mean anybody who hears them or appreciates them can't do whatever they want to do. But it does mean you can easily go to church and be told this is the wrong thing to be a part of.

The companies involved in the court case have a great tradition of following their faith. When you get a full-time job at Hobby Lobby, your starting wage is $14 an hour—almost twice the minimum wage. You have to work a couple of hours to have the extra $10 a month that some of these particular medicines, procedures, and birth control pills would cost. They are closed on Sunday. They close earlier at night than their competitors so people who work there can have a family life. In fact, the government conceded these were companies that were clear in their belief.

Now, if you have millions of people who are not covered by the law, why can't you find a way to exempt people from providing a small portion of health coverage that they feel is the wrong thing to do? What did the government say? The government said: Well, you have a way out; you don't have to provide insurance at all. So if you are an employer of faith and you want to do everything you can to provide the best benefit—probably in excess of the government-required benefits in almost all areas you want to provide—your choice is to not provide insurance at all.

In fact, the suggestion was made that they would save money by not providing insurance at all because it would cost $2,000 per employee not to provide insurance at all. That was the penalty in the law, and the government suggested that was probably a lot less than these companies were paying for insurance.

They said: Why not just pay the penalty? You don't have to violate your faith. You can just violate your belief to take special responsibility for your employees. You can pay the $2,000 penalty and save money.

While I'm on the $2,000 penalty, I will say that one of the egregious overreaches of what the government was trying to do here is to say if you don't provide insurance at all, your penalty is $2,000. If you don't provide the exact insurance the government says you have to provide—whether it is based on your faith or otherwise—your penalty is $36,500 per employee.

You can provide better insurance in every other area than what the government says, you can provide insurance in areas that the government didn't even require you to provide insurance, you can do anything you want to do beyond what the government says to do, but if you don't do everything the government says, you have to pay $36,500 per employee per year. And that was in the regulation.

That is the law that Members of the House and Senate voted for. I was not one of them. I was against this law. But the law said you have to pay $2,000 if you don't do anything at all. But the Obama administration said you have to pay $36,500 if you didn't do exactly what they said you have to do. It is the wrong application of religious freedom. The idea that people could not have access to any FDA-approved product is just wrong. Somehow if your employer can keep you from having access to anything you want to have access to that has been approved by the FDA is wrong as the millions of women and men who work for companies who aren't covered under the law prove every day. They prove it every day. If we listen to our friends on the other side, one would think we would be driven backward—we are talking about on behalf of religious freedom, being driven back into the dark ages of December 2013—when everybody who could buy a product in December of 2013 can buy that same FDA-approved product today.

This is about religious freedom. It is not about money. In fact, this bill proposed in the last Congress—I had a provision in that bill that a few Democrats voted for—more Democrats voted for the bill than Republicans voted against it. There was bipartisan support for the bill. I offered an amendment that said if the Department of Health and Human Services wants to, they can promulgate a rule that requires an employer to add a benefit of equal value for any benefit the government requires that they don't want to offer. That is an easy way to say there is no economic motive at all. Maybe the government doesn't require mental health coverage, and if an employer can offer that mental health coverage of equal value to a benefit the employer's faith prohibits being a part of—the bill that most Democrats in the Senate voted against had that provision in there.

This is not about our pocketbooks. This is not about what something costs. This is about whether the government has done everything possible to accommodate people's deeply held religious beliefs. The first freedom in the first sentence in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution mattered when it was put in there, it mattered when 16 or so of the current Members of the Senate voted for the Religious Freedom Act, it mattered when Ted Kennedy and Senator Moynihan put this exact same ability in the health care laws they proposed less than 20 years ago, and it matters today.

I hope we move on to solving problems based on the real facts rather than continuing to talk about facts as my friends would like them to be rather than facts as they really are.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the Protect Women's Health Care from Corporate Interference Act.

I thank my colleague Senator MURRAY from Washington and my colleague Senator UDALL from Colorado for introducing this bill and Senator MURRAY for her long championed efforts on women's health. I am very proud to support this bill.

I guess I would say to my colleague, who I know feels passionately about these issues, that the issue is really how important prescription benefits are to women's health and particularly how important contraception is to women and the fact that it is not an add-on to our health care but, rather, an essential part of our health care. So I hope it doesn't really take us getting a majority of women on the Supreme Court to convince people how central this issue is to the health care of women and why we don't want to deal with a boss who decides to say: I don't want to cover that in employee benefit packages.

I hope I and my colleagues will get a chance to vote on this legislation because I think the Supreme Court's ruling in this case 2 weeks ago really set us on a slippery slope. In a 5-to-4 decision they held that corporations can deny contraceptive coverage for women who are their employees if the owner—if the owner—professes a religious objection.

I know my colleagues think, why don't we just make this product more available so that women can pay an out-of-pocket amount for it?

It is an essential part of women's health and should be part of an employee's package and should not have to be a component she has to add on later.

This precedent by the Court is a troubling precedent. The decision threatens access to critical preventive health services for women, and it opens the door for employers to deny other health care services just because of the owner's religious beliefs.

Many of my colleagues have come to the floor and articulated how this is not about the religious exemption part of the Affordable Care Act that can be sought by churches and religious organizations; this is about employers who are corporations. So those exemptions for people who do have religious beliefs and don't want to offer these health care services are still preserved. But what is not preserved is a woman's ability to say to her employer: Why are you discriminating against me and my health care insurance that you are going to provide when you are not providing the full range of benefits for women?

So, as I said, it really is a slippery slope, and the question is, How many other things are going to be thrown into this same area?

I am getting a lot of letters. I have heard from several people from the Northwest. In fact, this one individual wrote to me saying, ''I am terrified that affordable access''—affordable access, not an add-on. Just because I am a woman and I work for an employer, now I have an add-on because you are discriminating against what my health care services are. She said, ''I am terrified that affordable access to my medically indicated preferred method of birth control may be in jeopardy due to the recent Supreme Court decision.''

So, yes, we are hearing from a lot of people that the decision imperils the ability of women to access evidence-based, clinically effective contraceptive methods in their health care plans. These are health care plans they pay for through their hard-earned wages as part of their benefit package when they sign on to work for a company.

We know this is a vital component of health care, and it helps women with everything from family planning to reducing risks of ovarian cancer and other medical conditions. So we want to make sure these recommendations, such as the recommendations of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, which says to include reproductive health care methods as preventive services—we want those services to be offered. As a result of those recommendations, about 675,000 women in Washington State now have robust access to a set of 20 FDA-approved contraceptive methods as part of a preventive services package. These services are covered free of coinsurance, free of copays, and free of deductibles.

Now we are basically saying that because a person is a woman and even though this is an essential part of health care, all of a sudden, because of the Supreme Court decision, a woman might work for an employer who is going to ask her to pay for that instead out of her own pocket.

I think this decision threatens real progress for our health care delivery system. We know this well because in Washington State employers denying women basic health coverage is not a new issue. In fact, women in my State have been fighting for decades.

In 1999 Jennifer Erickson was supervising as a pharmacist at Bartell Drugs in Bellevue, WA. Upon starting her job, she learned that her company didn't

cover one prescription that she needed—birth control pills—so she appealed to the company asking them to cover that benefit. She was denied. She went on to file a class action lawsuit on behalf of the company's nonunionized employees. In a landmark ruling, the Federal district court—Judge Robert Lasnik—held that Ms. Erickson had the legal right to access birth control under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. What is more, the decision was based on a Supreme Court precedent.

Unlike the district court, though, the Supreme Court has gotten this wrong, and the ruling is a dangerous precedent to allow employers to deny other health care benefits just because the owner wants to proclaim that his religious beliefs don't want him to offer those coverages.

As Justice Ginsburg said, would the exemption the Court holds that has been used on contraceptives based on religious grounds—would there be other examples, such as blood transfusions because they are a Jehovah's Witness or antidepressants because they are a Scientologist or medications derived from pigs, including anesthesia and other things, because certain other ethnic groups—Muslims, Jews, or Hindus—said they didn't want to provide those services?

Does it set us up for a lot of medical necessities not being covered by corporations simply because the CEO or many owners of that company decide it is in their religious beliefs not to offer those important services?

It is very important that we vote to make sure we speak on behalf of these women who are writing to us now, that we give them the kind of coverage for health care they deserve and that ensures every employer who sponsors a health care plan has these same benefits included in the package.

The good news is that 60 percent of working women in Washington State get their coverage through their employers. But we need to make sure the employers—just because the CEO all of a sudden has now become the judge of whether they want to cover important health care services, we have to make sure we pass this legislation to protect those employees.

I hope my colleagues will support this legislation.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor. I ask that the time during the quorum call be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to set the record straight. Since the Supreme Court ruled on the Hobby Lobby case, a flood of misinformation has spread, distorting the true meaning of the Court's decision. We have seen a misrepresentation of the case, I think to divide the American people, and I find these scare tactics very disappointing.

It is time to move away from the overheated rhetoric and it is time for us to discuss the facts. The Washington Post Fact Checker has systematically rebutted a series of misleading claims from my friends on the other side of the aisle. The Fact Checker concluded that, ''Simply put, the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives, does not allow bosses to prevent women from seeking birth control and does not take away a person's religious freedom.''

In other words, under this ruling, no boss has the right to tell an employee that they cannot use birth control. Nothing in the decision, nothing takes away women's access to birth control. All women continue to hold the constitutional right that was first articulated in Griswold v. Connecticut to use contraceptives. The Court's Hobby Lobby opinion reaffirms Griswold and unequivocally states, ''under our cases, women (and men) have a constitutional right to obtain contraceptives.'' Discrimination based on gender continues to be illegal. Employers may not punish, retaliate, or discriminate against women who choose to use contraception.

Moreover, current privacy laws prevent employers from even asking if an employee uses birth control.

The Court went on to state that its decision ''provides no such shield'' against discrimination in hiring. An employer cannot prohibit a woman from purchasing any form of contraception. Moreover, women can continue to have broad access to safe, affordable birth control.

Even before the Affordable Care Act was passed, 28 States already had laws or regulations on the books to provide for contraceptive coverage. Over 85 percent of large businesses provide contraceptive coverage for their employees. For women without such coverage, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services administers five separate programs to ensure affordable access to contraception, including Medicaid.

The bottom line: All women continue to have the ability to purchase or use a wide variety of contraceptives. It is both possible to stand tall for the principle of religious freedom and also to support safe access to birth control. The two are not mutually exclusive. The issue in Hobby Lobby is not whether women can purchase birth control, it is who pays for what. Those of us who believe that life begins at conception have moral objections to devices or procedures that destroy fertilized embryos.

The Green family, the owners of Hobby Lobby, have similar objections. They do not want to use their money to violate their religious beliefs. I think most Americans would believe that is reasonable. In fact, the Greens offered health coverage that pays for 16 out of 20 forms of contraception, including birth control pills.

The Court narrowly ruled that the Green family's decision was protected by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, a bill led by Democrats and passed with overwhelming support by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The bill requires the government to show a high level of proof before it can interfere with the free exercise of religion. The Court ruled that in this case the government failed to meet that burden. Accordingly, it could not abridge the Green family's legitimate religious views.

While not all Americans share these particular views, I do believe all Americans understand the importance of preserving religious liberty. Indeed, our Nation was largely founded by men and women seeking that religious freedom. The Court's decision was a narrow one, applying only to closely held, mostly family-owned companies. Some have suggested the ruling could open the door to objections over blood transfusions or vaccines. We heard similar fears when the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was passed over 20 years ago. None of those fears have been realized.

Finally, I would like to state my strong support for the legislation I introduced with Senator KELLY AYOTTE and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL that reaffirms the dual principles of religious freedom and safe access to contraception for all women.

Rather than seeking to divide Americans, our legislation brings people together around ideas that we all can support. I would especially like to commend Senator AYOTTE for her strong leadership on this issue. I have enjoyed working with her to push back against those misleading claims about the Hobby Lobby ruling and ensuring that women across America know the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the assault on women's health that has come from a majority of our Supreme Court in recent weeks. It is unfortunate and frankly shocking that in the year 2014 we are still debating the issue of access to birth control. But here we are. Millions of Americans are looking to the Senate today and counting on us to stand for women's rights. They are counting on us to put health care back between a woman and her doctor. They are counting on us to stand for millions of Americans' access to affordable, preventive health care of every kind. They are counting on us to say that birth control is not your boss's business.

In short, they are counting on us to right this huge wrong from the Supreme Court. We have that ability to

right this wrong. We have that ability here in this room. The Court, in its decision, lays out a structure in which Congress does have the power to overturn this misguided decision. The Court based its decision on an act of Congress, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Now Congress can respond. Congress can pass a new law that says: That is not what the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was meant to mean. The Court got it wrong. We are going to make it right. We should all remember that the act was set up to protect the religious choices of employees. The Supreme Court has stood that on its head.

But for us to right the wrong we have to be willing to debate. We have to be willing to go to the bill. We have to be willing to consider each other's viewpoints, listen to each other. We have to be willing to vote. But we cannot get to the bill if the majority is thwarted by a minority which uses its filibuster power in a way never envisioned in the past, never utilized until recent history, which has prevented Congress from actually debating bills.

So let's all join together and say: Wherever you stand on this issue, this issue is important enough to debate. Women's health care is important enough to debate. Access to contraceptive care is important enough to have that issue before this body. So let's all say yes to debate this bill. The bill is formally titled The Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act or, as it is commonly known, the Not My Boss's Business Act.

I hope we will all join collectively in saying this is an important issue, because it really is about women's access to fundamental health care. Whether contraceptives are used for family planning or for painful medical conditions such as endometriosis, birth control is essential health care for millions of Americans. While some are trying to say this case has nothing to do with access to birth control, that is simply not true. For most working families, affordability is access. Without insurance, birth control can cost tens of thousands of dollars over a lifetime. One-third of women in America say they have struggled with the cost of birth control at some point in their lives. For working families, getting by month to month, often paycheck to paycheck, these costs, though they might be dismissed by Washington pundits and even politicians here across the aisle, add up. They can put contraception out of reach.

A loss of insurance coverage can certainly make certain types of contraception totally unaffordable. As Justice Ginsburg noted in her dissent, the upfront cost of an IUD is equivalent to nearly a month's wages for a minimum wage worker. In the blue-collar community I live in, in working America, a month's wage is a very big deal.

Not having insurance coverage equals not having access. Although our Republican colleagues would have you believe otherwise, this dangerous precedent could apply to all sorts of basic, essential health care. What is to stop a boss from claiming a religious objection to vaccinations under the theory espoused in this decision or from access to a blood transfusion or to surgery or to HIV and AIDS, because all of those fit the same pattern in that various religions have a strong religious objection to those health care benefits.

I am not sure what is more troubling, the path charted by five Justices that allows a boss to trump essential personal, preventive health care choices or the Court's notion that it is okay to single out women's health care in this decision.

The bottom line is this: The bill before us that we would go to on the vote this afternoon, the Murray-Udall bill, is about putting women back in charge of their own health care. Women do not want politicians interfering in their health care. They certainly do not want their bosses and CEOs interfering in their health care. Bosses belong in the boardroom. They do not belong in employees' bedrooms or their exam rooms. Let's send a message to all Americans who are watching this body, this great deliberative body today, that the Senate is listening, that we hear the concerns of millions of women across this land and that we are ready to put women back in charge of their own health care and get the bosses out of the exam rooms.

I urge my colleagues to join in voting yes to open debate on this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, whenever any Americans' religious liberty is infringed, every American should be concerned. Religious liberty is a part of the American character. Before our Constitution was adopted, religious freedom was a part of the American character. It was the reason the first Europeans settled on our shores. It was a great source of the American Revolution.

My Scotch-Irish Presbyterian ancestors came here to escape religious persecution from two churches, and when they came here they objected to paying taxes to support another church.

So our very foundation as a country has in it the guarantees of religious freedom.

That is why after the States created our Constitution, the people came back and said: Wait a minute. You forgot something. You forgot the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights begins with guarantees of religious liberty. They are emblazoned on the wall at the Newseum at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th, the guarantees of liberty. They were spoken by President Roosevelt when he talked about World War II and why we were fighting that great war.

So whenever any American's religious liberty is trampled upon, every American should be concerned.

That is why I am so disappointed that Senate Democrats are proposing to carve a giant hole out of America's religious freedom.

This is very different than what has consistently been the attitude in this body. Twenty-one years ago Congress voted to pass the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, an act which reflects the American character as well as any other act that Congress has passed. It created a very high hurdle for government to burden a person's religious beliefs.

That legislation says that if the government is going to take an action that creates a burden on a person's faith, the government must prove there is a compelling national interest and that burden must be as light as possible.

That bill passed nearly unanimously. It became law nearly unanimously, with support from many in the Senate today, many on the other side of the aisle who are supporting this carve-out for religious freedom.

When he signed the bill into law, President Bill Clinton was eloquent and said:

> We all have a shared desire here to protect perhaps the most precious of all American liberties, religious freedom.

President Clinton continues:

> Usually the signing of legislation by a President is a ministerial act, often a quiet ending to a turbulent legislative process. Today this event assumes a more majestic quality because of our ability together to affirm the historic role that people of faith have played in the history of this country and the constitutional protections those who profess and express their faith have always demanded and cherished.

But here we are debating a Democratic proposal to gut the law President Clinton was describing and require Americans who own businesses to provide insurance coverage for any health care item or service that is required by Federal law or regulation, whether or not it violates the employer's sincere religious beliefs.

So what has changed?

On June 30, the Supreme Court of the United States found that the law meant what Congress and the President said it did when it was enacted.

They held that the Federal Government could not order the owners of a closely held corporation to violate the basic tenets of their faith. The company in question in this case, Hobby Lobby—and having been a law student, I know that over time this will be known in law schools across the country as the great case of Hobby Lobby because of its importance and because of its name—is owned by the Green family, who make their faith central to their business. They close their stores

on Sunday. They refuse to engage in profitable transactions that facilitate or promote alcohol use. They contribute profits to Christian missionaries and ministries.

No one doubts those are sincerely held religious beliefs. The Green family offers health insurance which covers 16 of 20 forms of contraception. It does not cover four forms of contraception that prevent implantation of the embryo but employees are free to purchase those four forms themselves.

The company in no way interferes with its employees' lives. It does not tell them what to do with their bodies. It does not tell them how to live their lives. It simply does not offer in the company's insurance plan, coverage for the four forms of contraception that violate the faith of the owners of the business.

Obamacare regulations tried to mandate 20 forms of contraception, but recognizing this violated the beliefs of those who believe in life at conception, they created a carve-out for several organizations, Catholic hospitals for example. They could have created a similar carve-out for closely held companies, but they did not.

Instead, the Green family and others were forced to defend their freedoms in court, which fortunately ruled that the family was entitled to protection from the government's mandates under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. This ought to have been a victory for everyone if it is true in our country that when any American's religious freedom is upheld, all of us benefit.

In 1993, the passage of the legislation was hailed as a momentous achievement of religious freedom. The New York Times editorialized in support of it. My friend Senator REID from Nevada—now the majority leader—said:

> I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. I congratulate the authors and the committee for creating a fine bill.

The distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER—then a Member of the House and the lead Democratic sponsor—said: ''This is a good moment for those of us who believe in the flower of religious freedom that so adorns America. . . . ''

But here we are debating a bill that would fundamentally undermine that very act spoken of so eloquently by the Democratic leaders of Congress and by the Democratic President of the United States.

What has changed? If they are successful, an American who opens a business in this country will know that he or she will forfeit their right to religious freedom. That is not consistent with the American character. That is not the American way.

Why would Democrats who felt so strongly about this in 1993 feel so differently today? Why would they be willing to do such damage to the cause of religious freedom they so ardently proclaim? Because the Democrats ''believe they have a powerful campaign weapon'' in this issue, according to a report in Politico.

The Democrats charge that under the Supreme Court decision, an employer's personal views can interfere with women's access to essential health care services.

They say that under this decision corporations can limit their employees' health care options and restrict their freedoms. That is not true. It is patently false. It is absurd. It is wrong.

In the words of the Washington Post's nonpartisan Fact Checker Glenn Kessler:

> Nothing in the ruling allows a company to stop a woman from getting or filling a prescription for contraceptives . . .

Second, the Fact Checker says:

> Democrats need to be more careful in their language about the ruling. All too often, lawmakers leap to conclusions that are not warranted by the facts at hand. Simply put, the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives, does not allow bosses to prevent women from seeking birth control and does not take away a person's religious freedom.

Today, women have the same rights they did before Obamacare—at least in terms of religious freedom. The Supreme Court decision did nothing to change or alter a woman's ability to access birth control or other contraceptive care.

Hobby Lobby's insurance today already covers 16 of 20 forms of contraception for the company's employees. A Hobby Lobby employee who wishes to use a drug or device not covered by the company's insurance is in no way prohibited from purchasing it. Nothing in the Hobby Lobby decision prevents a woman from making her own decisions about contraception. The only effect of the decision is that certain employers cannot be forced to include it in their insurance coverage against their religious objections.

The Supreme Court decision covered certain closely held, for-profit companies—meaning they are controlled by five or fewer individuals—where the owners have sincere religious beliefs. The Court's decision does not mean all Americans of faith who own businesses and ask for religious exemption from a general law will receive that exemption.

The Court's decision does not mean employers will be able to use the Religious Freedom Restoration Act as a reason to refuse to cover critical health services, such as vaccines, blood transfusions, and HIV treatment. In fact, such fears were raised by opponents of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act before it became law in 1993. The Democrats didn't believe those objections then, and they shouldn't believe them now because 21 years later these doomsday predictions have not come true. Courts are well-equipped to dispel spurious or frivolous claims.

I think the Democrats know all of this. I think they are just trying to win an election.

This Supreme Court decision was about individual freedoms that do not disappear if you decide to open a business. It was not about contraceptive rights.

What is really happening is my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to change the subject. They want to talk about health care, but they don't want to talk about Obamacare and what it is doing to the women of this country. Let me tell a story that gives an example of what it is that really concerns me.

First, what concerns me is the destruction of anyone's religious freedom.

While we are talking about women and health care, let me talk about Emilie of Lawrenceburg, TN. She is 39 years old. She came to see me. She has lupus. Under Tennessee's laws, she had an insurance policy granted by something called CoverTN. It was created by our then-Democratic Governor and Blue Cross. It gave her the policy she needed at a cost of about $50 a month. When Obamacare arrived, it canceled Emilie's policy. She went on the exchange to try to replace it, according to Washington's wisdom.

This is Emilie. This is a real woman in Tennessee who is really hurt by the Obamacare law. We should be talking about her. This is what she wrote to me:

> I cannot keep my current plan because it doesn't meet the standards of coverage. This alone is a travesty. CoverTN has been a lifeline [for me]. . . . With the discontinuation of CoverTN, I am being forced to purchase a plan through the Exchange. . . . My insurance premiums alone will increase a staggering 410 percent. My out-of-pocket expenses will increase by more than $6,000 a year—that includes subsidies. Please help me understand how this is ''affordable.''

Here is an American woman who has been hurt by ObamaCare. She lost her policy—a policy that she could afford, that fit her health care needs and her budget—but all of the wise people in Washington said: This is the policy you need. So she got the policy Obamacare says she should have, and her insurance premiums went up to approximately $400 a month, and she got an insurance policy that does not fit her budget and does not fit her health care needs. She is the one who has been hurt.

Unfortunately, Emilie is not the only one experiencing rate shock. Millions of Americans are losing their insurance plans. They are being forced to buy new plans, many of them with higher premiums, many with higher deductibles, many of them with coinsurance.

Let me talk about a Tennessee woman whose name is Carol, a single mom with a son starting at Austin Peay University in the fall. She is an office administrator in an office that used to have CoverTN insurance that cost less than $100 a month in premiums and covered all of her health care needs. Carol said:

> Now, thanks to Obamacare, I must pay over $300 per month [compared to $100 a month] in insurance premiums for a policy that has a $2,500 deductible and a $4,000 out of pocket limit.

If we want to talk about a war on women, let's talk about the war on Emilie and Carol in Tennessee and millions of other women who are hurt by ObamaCare. Carol earns too much to qualify for a subsidy, so now she puts a big chunk of her income toward her premiums—such a big chunk that now she can't afford to help pay for her son's education.

These are the kinds of stories all of us hear from people who are being harmed by Obamacare. These are the kinds of stories our friends on the other side don't want repeated, so they even go so far as to bring up carving big chunks out of America's character by trampling on religious freedom—the freedom that is talked about in the First Amendment.

We have proposals to help Americans like Carol and Americans like Emilie. We have offered them on the Senate floor repeatedly since 2010 when the ObamaCare law was passed. They would move our country in a different direction toward health care as rapidly and as responsibly as we could go—a direction toward more freedom, more choices, and lower costs for Emilie and Carol and for millions of women and millions of men and millions of younger people across this country.

Our bills would allow Americans to keep more of their insurance plans, as the President promised.

Our bills would allow people to buy insurance in another State if it fits their budget and fits their needs. Let's say Emilie, who has lupus, finds a policy regulated in Kentucky that fits her budget and fits her needs. We would allow Emilie to buy that.

We would allow small business employers to combine purchasing power with other employers and offer their employees lower cost insurance. More freedom, more choices, lower costs.

We would allow Americans to buy a major medical plan to insure themselves against a catastrophe—today, some Americans can, but under Obamacare all Americans cannot—buy a major medical plan to insure against catastrophe—that is what a lot Americans would like to do—and then open a health savings account that is expanded to pay for everyday health expenses. More freedom, more choices, lower costs.

We would like to repair the damage Obamacare has done. We would like to prevent future damage. Republicans want to move in a different direction that provides more freedom, more choices, lower costs. We trust Americans to make decisions for themselves. That is the American way. That is what we believe in. Religious freedom and health care freedom—that is the American way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Washington Post by the Fact Checker.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial today in the Wall Street Journal, an op-ed by two of my colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Nebraska, Senators AYOTTE and FISCHER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post—Fact Checker, July 14, 2014]

DEMOCRATS ON HOBBY LOBBY: ''MISSPEAKS'' ''OPINION'' AND OVERHEATED RHETORIC

(By Glenn Kessler)

''Really, we should be afraid of this court. The five guys who start determining what contraceptions are legal. Let's not even go there.''—Houe Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D–Calif.), at her weekly news conference, on July 10

In the wake of the Supreme Court's 5-to-4 ruling that, as a closely held company, Hobby Lobby was not required to pay for all of the birth-control procedures mandated by the Affordable Care Act, Democrats have rushed to condemn the court. But in some cases the rhetoric has gotten way ahead of the facts.

Here's a round-up of some of the more noteworthy claims. In some cases, lawmakers concede that they make a mistake; in others, they are argue that they are offering what amounts to opinion, even though the assertion was stated as fact.

Statements on Supreme Court cases are notoriously difficult to fact check because rulings are open to interpretation—and the full impact is often difficult to judge until lower courts begin to react to the ruling. Both Democrats and Republicans use adverse Supreme Court rulings to rally their respective bases, but lawmakers have a responsibility not to succumb to overheated and inaccurate rhetoric.

Nothing in the ruling allows a company to stop a woman from getting or filling a prescription for contraceptives, but that salient fact is often lost as lawmakers jump to conclusions that the cost will be prohibitive. That may or may not be the case depending on circumstances. Moreover, it is worth remembering that when the Affordable Care Act was passed, 28 states already had laws or regulations that promote insurance coverage for contraception. The law sought to extend that across the country—and even with this ruling, that will remain the case for the vast majority of workers.

''Really, we should be afraid of this court. The five guys who start determining what contraceptions are legal. Let's not even go there.''—Pelosi

This is a very odd statement from the House Democratic leader, given that the majority opinion flatly states that ''under our cases, women (and men) have a constitutional right to obtain contraceptives,'' citing the 1965 ruling in Griswold v. Connecticut, which under the right to privacy nullified a law prohibiting the use of contraceptives.

Drew Hammill, Pelosi's spokesman, acknowledged that she ''misspoke.'' ''Obviously the impact of the court's decision is not to make these four contraceptive methods illegal—i.e. no longer allowed to be sold'', he said. ''But the overriding point here is that the decision does in fact limit access, which is the key point Pelosi made.''

Hammill cited Justice Ruth Ginsburg's dissent that women have a compelling interest in being able to plan their pregnancies and that they need reliable birth control.

Later, in the same news conference, Pelosi decried that ''five men could get down to specifics of whether a woman should use a diaphragm and she should pay for it herself or her boss.''

Hobby Lobby involved the owners' objection to four types of birth control but not diaphragms, but here Pelosi adhered closer to the essence of the case (and a related temporary injunction the court awarded to Wheaton College): the question of who should pay for contraceptives. (The court also vacated a decision by an appeals court that had ruled against a Michigan company that objected to providing any contraceptives under its employee health plan, so that would include diaphragms.)

Ginsburg's dissent pointed out that it costs $1,000 for the office visit and insertion procedure for intrauterine devices (IUDs)—''nearly the equivalent to a month's full-time pay for workers earning the minimum wage.''

Our colleagues at PolitiFact gave Pelosi a rating of ''false'' for her comments, and we certainly agree, though we generally do not award Pinocchios when politicians fess up to a mistake.

Still, we note that despite her office's admission of a mistake, the transcript of the news conference had not yet been corrected three days later. ''It will be,'' Hammill said. ''We're migrating to a new site in the next two weeks, so everything is a little slow.''

''The one thing we are going to do during this work period, sooner rather than later, is to ensure that women's lives are not determined by virtue of five white men. This Hobby Lobby decision is outrageous, and we are going to do something about it.''—Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D–Nev.), remarks to reporters, on July 8

The Hobby Lobby decision was written by Justice Samuel Alito, joined by Chief Justice John Roberts and Justices Antonin Scalia, Anthony Kennedy and Clarence Thomas. That's certainly five men, but Thomas is African American.

''That was a mistake, and he knew it right away,'' spokesman Adam Jentleson said. He noted that on other occasions Reid has simply said ''five men.'' (The four dissenters included three women.)

''This is deeply troubling because you have organized religions that oppose health care, period. So if you have an employer who is a member of an organized religion and they decide, you know, I wouldn't provide health care to my own family because I object religiously, I'm not going to allow any kind of health-care treatment.''—Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz (Fla.), Democratic National Committee chair, appearing on MSNBC, June 30

While there are some religions that object to certain medical procedures, Wasserman Schultz goes to quite an extreme to suggest that employers could block an employee from seeking any kind of health-care treatment. (Again, the issue was who would pay for contraceptives, not whether someone was barred from getting contraceptives.)

''The Chair was referring to the Justice's ruling which puts employers' religious beliefs ahead of the medical needs of employees,'' spokesman Michael Czin said. ''We fundamentally disagree with the logic behind that ruling.''

''[In Griswold v. Connecticut,] the Supreme Court said that the right of privacy of individuals and families trumped any state right to ban contraceptives. It was a breakthrough. They found privacy, at least the inference of privacy, in the Constitution. I

asked that question repeatedly of Justice Roberts and Justice Alito to make sure that they would honor that same tradition of privacy. The Hobby Lobby decision violates that fundamental premise. [While both justices were careful in their answers before confirmation,] they both said they stood by the Griswold decision.''—Sen. Dick Durbin (D–Ill.), quoted in ABC's ''The Note,'' July 10

Durbin serves on the Judiciary Committee and is the second-ranking Democrat on the Senate. Here, he appears to come close to saying what Pelosi asserted—that the ruling signaled a possible ban on contraceptives. He specifically mentions the Griswold decision, which as we noted was cited by Alito in the majority opinion as settled law.

But a Durbin spokeswoman said he was not trying to say the court was on a path to overturn Griswold. ''He was saying Hobby Lobby was out of line with the general 'tradition of privacy' that permitted women to make their own choices about birth control,'' she said, asking not to be identified. ''He was critiquing this ruling and its impact on women's access to contraceptive coverage, not making a prediction about future cases.''

''The U.S. Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decision opened the door to unprecedented corporate intrusion into our private lives. Coloradans understand that women should never have to ask their bosses for a permission slip to access common forms of birth control.''—Sen. Mark Udall (D–Colo.), in a news release, July 9

Udall's remarks were contained in a news release he issued with Sen. Patty Murray (D–Wash.) about a bill that seeks to overturn the Hobby Lobby decision. There is a bit of an irony here: Udall voted for the Affordable Care Act, which built upon the employer-based health-care system in the United States and thus led to a ruling by the Supreme Court in the first place. So it's a chicken-or-egg question about how the door was opened in the first place.

Again, the issue is not whether women will have access to birth control, but whether the health plan will cover the cost. Spokesman Mike Saccone argues that this is, in effect, ''a permission slip.''

''Following the court's decision, women will need to effectively ask their employers if they will continue to cover contraception,'' Saccone said. ''They will need to determine if their boss will give permission for their insurance plans to cover birth control.''

He added: ''Without insurance coverage, IUDs (what Hobby Lobby objects to covering) cost up to $1,000, which poses a huge barrier for women, especially if she is making the minimum wage. Without her boss's permission to get coverage for that service in her health plan, it becomes much more—potentially prohibitively—expensive for that woman.''

''Before the Hobby Lobby decision, the fight against corporate influence was mainly about making sure real people and their ideas were in charge of elections. But now it is no longer just about a democracy; it is about keeping corporations out of our private lives, out of our bedrooms, and out of our religious decisions.''—Sen. Jon Tester (D–Mont.), statement in the Congressional Record, July 10

Here again, a lawmaker mixes up the question of paying for contraceptives with a broader prohibition against all contraceptives.

''If an employer doesn't cover contraceptive care, for many women access to birth control is effectively blocked because it becomes cost-prohibitive,'' argued spokesman Dan Malessa. ''If an employer refuses to cover contraceptives based on its religious views, then its religious views trump the religious views of its employees.''

''You know, what I am objecting to is that these bosses should not be able to tell their employees that they cannot use birth control. Motherhood is not a hobby. That is what I am objecting to.''—Rep. Gwen Moore (D–Wisc.), speaking on MSNBC, July 1

Moore also falls into the trap of claiming that corporate bosses can now dictate whether women can have access to birth control. No boss under this ruling has the right to tell an employee that they cannot use birth control. That's simply wrong, but Moore's spokeswoman argued this is open to interpretation.

''Congresswoman Moore was referring to the Supreme Court decision that now allows certain employers to deny contraceptive coverage to their employees through employer-sponsored health care plans. By denying this coverage to their employees, many workers may not have the financial means to access this health care necessity,'' spokeswoman Staci Moore said. ''To your point on the Hobby Lobby decision concerning only certain forms of contraceptive coverage, the congresswoman would argue that the ruling opens the door for employers to challenge other vital health-care coverage, not limited to the four contraceptives you mentioned.''

''What they've done, Chris, is taken away the religious freedom of their employees. They have to comply with the religious freedom of their employers.''—Rep. Louise Slaughter (D–N.Y.), interview on MSNBC, June 30

Is Slaughter really saying that the court has taken away an employee's religious freedom because some contraceptives may not be covered by insurance? Eric Walker, her spokesman, says this is a matter of opinion.

''By forcing an employee to live with the religious choices imposed on them by their employer, the employee's own religious freedom is infringed upon,'' Walker said. ''I think it's fair to say that 'freedom from religion' goes hand in hand with 'religious freedom.' The first amendment protects Americans from having religion thrust upon them by others—a standard the court failed to uphold, in the congresswoman's opinion.''

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

The Fact Checker generally does not award Pinocchios for ''misspeaking'' or for statements of opinion. And we obviously take no position on the Supreme Court opinion. But this collection of rhetoric suggests that Democrats need to be more careful in their language about the ruling. All too often, lawmakers leap to conclusions that are not warranted by the facts at hand. Simply put, the court ruling does not outlaw contraceptives, does not allow bosses to prevent women from seeking birth control and does not take away a person's religious freedom.

Certainly, a case can be made that perhaps this is a slippery slope (as Ginsburg argues in dissent) or that the cost of some contraceptives may be prohibitively high for some women who need them. But the rhetoric needs to be firmly rooted in these objections—and in many cases the Democratic response has been untethered from those basis facts.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Wall Street Journal, July 16, 2014]

THE HOBBY LOBBY DECISION AND ITS DISTORTIONS

NOTHING IN THE SUPREME COURT'S RECENT RULING DENIES WOMEN ACCESS TO BIRTH CONTROL.

(By Kelly Ayotte and Deb Fischer)

In the days since the Supreme Court's June 30 Burwell v. Hobby Lobby decision, we have been troubled by those who seem eager to misrepresent both the facts of the case and the impact of its ruling on women—all to divide Americans and score political points in a tough election year.

The biggest distortion: the #NotMyBossBusiness campaign on which falsely suggests that under the ruling employers can deny their employees access to birth control.

That's flat-out false. Nothing in the Hobby Lobby ruling stops a woman from getting or filling a prescription for any form of contraception. Those who distort the court's decision insist that one cannot support religious liberty and also support access to safe, affordable birth control. But these are principles that we, and millions of others, support. Americans believe strongly that we should be able to practice our religion without undue interference from the government. It's a fundamental conviction that goes to the very core of our character—and dates back to the founding of our nation. The Supreme Court's decision in the Hobby Lobby case, which protects rights of conscience, reaffirmed our centuries-old tradition of religious liberty.

Contrary to the misleading rhetoric, the Hobby Lobby ruling does not take away women's access to birth control. No employee is prohibited from purchasing any Food and Drug Administration approved drug or device, and contraception remains readily available and accessible for all women nationwide. According to a Kaiser Family Foundation poll, prior to ObamaCare over 85% of large businesses already offered contraceptive coverage to their employees. And the ObamaCare mandate under review in the case doesn't even apply to businesses with fewer than 50 employees. For lower-income women, there are five programs at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that help ensure access to contraception for women, including Medicaid.

The court's decision applies to businesses whose owners have genuine religious convictions. In the Hobby Lobby case, the company's owners—the Green family—offered health-care plans that provide coverage for 16 of the 20 FDA-approved contraceptive drugs and devices, including birth-control pills, required under the Affordable Care Act.

The Greens only had moral objections to the remaining four methods, which they consider to be abortifacients. The family felt strongly that paying for insurance that includes these methods would compromise their deeply held religious belief that life begins at conception.

In its narrow ruling, the court agreed, basing its decision on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, which was introduced in the Senate by the late Sen. Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) and in the House by then-Congressman Charles Schumer (D., N.Y.), and supported by over a dozen current Democratic senators, Vice President Joe Biden, and Secretary of State John Kerry.

Kennedy and Mr. Schumer sponsored this bipartisan law in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's 1990 decision in Employment Division v. Smith, which held that ''generally applicable laws'' that have nothing to do with religion could effectively prevent Americans from fully exercising their religious rights.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed the Democratic-controlled House by voice vote and was approved by the Democratic-controlled Senate in an overwhelming vote of 97 to 3.

When President Clinton signed the bill, he said: ''What this law basically says is that the government should be held to a very high level of proof before it interferes with someone's free exercise of religion.''

In the Hobby Lobby decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the government failed to make that case.

With misinformation now swirling, it's important to understand what the court's decision doesn't mean.

The court's majority opinion explicitly states that the ruling does not ''provide a shield for employers who might cloak illegal discrimination as a religious practice.'' Additionally, the court said that ''our decision should not be understood to hold that an insurance-coverage mandate must necessarily fall if it conflicts with an employer's religious beliefs''—meaning, you must show a legitimate religious objection.

While some Americans may disagree with the Green family's views, nearly all Americans believe that religious freedom is a fundamental right that must not be abridged. When President Clinton signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, he said: ''Our laws and institutions should not impede or hinder, but rather should protect and preserve fundamental religious liberties.''

Congressional Democrats used to share that view. What's changed? We can preserve access to contraceptives without trampling on Americans' religious freedom.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Ronnie White to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. I was proud to chair Justice White's nomination hearing before the Judiciary Committee in May.

Justice White has the experience, the integrity, and the qualifications to be an outstanding district court judge.

He came from humble beginnings. He was born in St. Louis to teenage parents and grew up poor in a segregated neighborhood. He has worked since age 11 to help make ends meet and to put himself through college at St. Louis University and law school at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

Justice White went on to accomplish great things in his legal career—most notably, becoming the first African-American Supreme Court Justice and Chief Justice in Missouri's history. It was a powerful moment when Justice White was sworn in to the Missouri Supreme Court. The ceremony took place at a courthouse where slaves were once sold on the steps.

I am pleased that the Senate is voting today on Justice White's nomination to the Federal bench.

It is not often that the Senate gets the chance to correct a historic mistake, But by confirming Ronnie White to the Federal bench, we will be able to do so.

Justice White's previous nomination to the district court was defeated on the Senate floor in 1999 on a partyline vote. At the time, the claim was made that Justice White was ''pro-criminal.'' This was a grossly inaccurate claim, both then and now.

Over his long career as an attorney and a judge, Justice White has been widely recognized as fair, unbiased, and committed to the rule of law. Just read the letter from the Missouri State Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police in support of Justice White's nomination. The Missouri FOP said:

As front line law enforcement officers, we recognize the important need to have jurists such as Ronnie White, who have shown themselves to be tough on crime, yet fair and impartial. As a former justice on the Missouri Court of Appeals and as the Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court, Ronnie White has proven that he has the experience and requisite attributes to be a quality addition to the U.S. District Court. We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.

This is a compelling endorsement from the Missouri FOP.

In 2001 I had the opportunity to ask Justice White in a hearing before the Judiciary Committee about the allegation that he was somehow hostile to law enforcement. Here was his response. He said:

That is not true that I was opposed to law enforcement. Senator Durbin, I have a brother-in-law who is a police officer in St. Louis. I have a cousin who is a police officer in St. Louis. I have served on boards and commissions with police officers in the St. Louis community, and I also, when I was city counselor for the city of St. Louis, was the lawyer for the St. Louis City Police Department and we defended police officers. As a judge, all I have tried to do is to apply the law as best I could and the way I saw it.

Overall, Justice White's track record shows that his judicial decisions were well within the legal mainstream and were supported by precedent and legal authority. His decisions showed respect for the rule of law, even in hard cases that involved difficult or emotional facts.

The bottom line is that Justice White is a man with integrity, a wealth of judicial experience, and a real respect for the law. He is going to be an outstanding Federal judge.

I urge my colleagues to support this nomination and to put this good man on the Federal bench.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Ronnie White to serve as a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

In the Senate, as in life, there rarely is a chance for a do-over—to get something right that went wrong a long time ago.

For me, Ronnie White's nomination is a chance to do that. This year should have been his fifteenth as a district court judge—he would be close to senior status today had his nomination by President Clinton been confirmed in 1999.

I was very pleased this year to see him appear once again before the Judiciary Committee, and I believe he will distinguish himself as a Federal district judge.

Let me simply quote from a letter from the Missouri State Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police, which wrote a letter on May 13, 2014 in support of Judge White's nomination:

As a former justice on the Missouri Court of Appeals and as the Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court, Ronnie White has proven that he has the experience and requisite attributes to be a quality addition to the U.S. District Court. We can think of no finer or more worthy nominee.

Ronnie White's confirmation is long past due, and I really am pleased it is likely to come to pass. I just wanted to say that, and to urge my colleagues to support him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the confirmation of the nomination of Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Cardin	Mikulski	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2578.

Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time? Does any Senator yield time?

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the most extraordinary feature of the bill before us today is the incongruity between the bill's title and its content. The title, the ''Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act,'' is clear and straightforward. It suggests the bill is aimed at the important and worthy goal of protecting women's health. But the text of the bill plainly demonstrates that the bill's true objective is to circumscribe Americans' religious freedoms—the religious liberties of individual Americans—within the narrow confines of the Democratic Party's partisan agenda and the whims of politicians and bureaucrats.

While maintaining the appearance of preserving all of the current legal protections of religious freedom in America today, this proposal quietly adds to them a subtle yet deeply problematic and inappropriate qualification. The Federal Government will not prohibit the free exercise of religion until the Federal Government decides that it wants to do so. Under this bill, your religious liberties stop at the doorstep of the Democratic National Committee.

So I rise today in opposition to this bill because it doesn't do anything to protect women's health and it does much to undermine the bulwarks of religious liberty enshrined in our Constitution that have made America the most religiously diverse and tolerant Nation in human history.

Although this proposal is only the latest maneuver attempted by my Democratic colleagues to assert their power and restrict religious freedom in America, it also represents the culmination, at least for now, of their opposition to the Supreme Court's recent ruling in Burwell v. Hobby Lobby.

On June 30 of this year, the Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Government may not force closely held businesses to violate their sincerely held religious beliefs in order to comply with the contraceptive mandate issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. This decision has received a great deal of attention, but it has received this attention for all the wrong reasons.

Contrary to what many critics have suggested, the Hobby Lobby decision did not promulgate national health care policy nor did it render any opinion on the virtues of contraception and religious faith. No, the issue in Hobby Lobby involved not a dispute of competing rights but a straightforward application of plainly written law.

As the Constitution states in Article III, Section 2, the role of the Supreme Court is to adjudicate legal disputes by hearing ''cases and controversies'' that arise when two laws or two parties come into conflict.

In Hobby Lobby, the two laws in dispute were the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of Congress and signed into law by President Clinton in 1993, and a Federal mandate issued by the Department of Health and Human Services, acting under the powers delegated to it by the Affordable Care Act.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA as it is sometimes called, reaffirmed Americans' commitment to the fundamental religious liberty already protected by our Constitution.

With RFRA, a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, in cooperation with Republican minorities in both Houses, declared that when the Federal Government seeks to infringe on Americans' religious liberty, it must clear two thresholds. First, it must show that the law in question serves a compelling State interest. Secondly, if it does, the law must do so by the least restrictive means possible.

Given that the government openly acknowledged that there was a significant number of far less intrusive means to ensure affordable access to the drugs at issue, the Supreme Court rightly ruled that the contraception mandate violated RFRA.

However unwarranted, the overheated response to the Hobby Lobby decision among some ideological extremists on the left has led some of my colleagues to introduce a bill that would not simply overturn that modest and narrow decision but fundamentally rewrite America's social contract as it pertains to matters of personal conscience.

Whereas, the Court's ruling was limited to ''closely held'' for-profit companies such as Hobby Lobby, this bill would empower the Federal Government to coerce employers of all faiths and of no faith into violating their deepest personal convictions. It would deny any employer—devout or secular, individual or corporate, for-profit or nonprofit—conscience protection under RFRA against all present and future government mandates.

Perhaps most troubling is the warped theory of rights underlying the text of this bill. This theory holds that the American people possess constitutional and legal rights only when acting alone but not when acting in a group. These rights, along with any duties one may hold as a person of faith, must be forfeited whenever acting in association with others, on penalty of fines to be paid to the Federal Government.

This view of religious liberty might be summarized as an amendment to Matthew, chapter 18, verse 20: For where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there is the IRS in the midst of them.

This view is extreme. It is out of touch with the Constitution, with commonsense, and with America's heroic history of religious tolerance.

From our earliest days as a country, one of the sources of our strength as a people and one of the reasons for our success as a nation has been our robust understanding of religious liberty. The breadth and depth of that conception has allowed and encouraged people of all faiths and all traditions to live here in friendship and in cooperation with one another.

As two members of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom put it:

> . . . respect for the flourishing of people requires respect for their freedom—as individuals and together with others in community—to address the deepest questions of human existence and meaning. This allows them to lead lives of authenticity and integrity by fulfilling what they conscientiously believe to be their religious and moral duties. . . . It also includes the right to witness to one's beliefs in public as well as private, and to act—while respecting the equal right of others to do the same—on one's religiously inspired convictions in carrying out the duties of citizenship.

Expanding as wide as possible the space in which all people can witness their faith alongside one another has for two centuries elevated, enriched, and united American society. This robust conception of religious liberty was so essential to American unity that not only did the Founding generation reinforce its protection in a Bill of Rights—which many Framers actually thought was redundant—but it was the first freedom articulated in the First Amendment.

They understood, as most Americans still do, that the proper role of government is not to define people's happiness but to protect all individuals' equal rights, to pursue happiness according to their own hopes and values and conscience.

Yet for all its legal and constitutional protections, America's exceptional tradition of religious toleration rests ultimately on the uniquely American principle of equal dignity and respect for all women and all men, not simply as ''fellow passengers en route to the grave'' but as fellow pilgrims in search of their own promised land.

The authors of this bill know all of this. They know the American people reject their intolerance of diversity and indifference to the First Amendment. We know their bill cannot become law. Indeed, we know this for a fact because if the regulations they support were actually written in the law, ObamaCare itself would never have passed. It was slipped in after the fact by bureaucrats who are not subject to public accountability and never stand for election.

This legislation is more than an insult to the people it would target; it is

an embarrassment to the party leadership that has embraced it.

I still hold fast to that principle and to the freedom it preserves and thus strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. 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. MURPHY. Mr. President, we are entering into a new era in which five men in the Supreme Court are going to get to make the decisions about what kind of health care you get as a matter of right, living under the protection of the laws of the United States, and what kind of health care you get as an employee, at the whim of the decisions made by your boss.

These are the kinds of decisions that your boss should be making: decisions about the direction of your company, decisions about the level of your salary, about new products that your business is going to offer.

This should not be your boss's decision. It should not be up to your boss as to whether you as a female employee get access to prescription contraceptives. But that is the world we live in today after the Supreme Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, has given the power to particular employers to deny women access to prescription birth control.

Prescription birth control, contraception, is used by 99 percent of women in this country at one point over their life. A big portion of those prescriptions are actually for purposes related to complicated medical treatments such as cancer therapy. No matter how the Supreme Court tries to explain this, there is no way to effectively differentiate what the Supreme Court has done on birth control with a whole other range of potential discrimination.

As Justice Ginsburg said in her dissent, this exemption the Supreme Court has given for employers' religious beliefs would extend logically with religiously grounded objections to blood transfusions held by Jehovah's Witnesses; to religious objections to antidepressants held by Scientologists; medications derived from pigs, including anesthesia, intravenous fluids, and pills coated with gelatin held by certain religions; and even vaccinations, a belief held by Christian Scientists, amongst others.

The idea that the Supreme Court is now going to get into the business of micromanaging which particular religious beliefs they are going to protect and which ones they are not going to protect is unacceptable to the majority of people I represent, so that is why I am here today to support the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act. Pretty simple. All we are saying here is that employers should not be allowed to refuse health coverage that is guaranteed to their employees and their dependents under Federal law.

When we decide to pass a law with the majority of the House and the Senate agreeing to it, signed by the President, those protections should be available to all employees. It is not easy to pass a law and get it signed by the President. The Senate has already set up a lot of pretty significant barriers to the passage of any law, never mind a law that guarantees a certain level of health care coverage.

Until the Hobby Lobby decision, the Supreme Court has stayed out of that decision, said that if the Congress decides a minimum level of coverage should be available to employees, then employers should not be able to get in the way. That precedent is now blown up. There is no going back, as Justice Ginsburg has said. I hope we pass it this week.

The reality is it is more important now than ever to protect this coverage, because as a result of the Affordable Care Act, there are millions more women, millions more families all across the country who have access to prescription contraception. Twenty-four million more prescriptions for oral contraceptives were filled without a copay in 2013 than in 2012. That is by virtue of the protections in the Affordable Care Act.

On this particular type of prescription alone, the Affordable Care Act has saved $483 million in out-of-pocket costs for oral contraceptives. That saved a lot of families money, but that has also given access to this important medication for millions of women.

It is just another example, just another piece of evidence amidst a mounting pile, that tells us the Affordable Care Act is working today. I want to spend a few additional minutes going over the latest litany of good news when it comes to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Republicans have kind of gone quiet, silent even, in many parts of the Nation, when it comes to their critique of the Affordable Care Act. That is in large part because on both sides of the aisle, there is a quiet acceptance that the Affordable Care Act is working. It has vanished from most campaigns as a political issue this summer and this fall because it is increasingly impossible, aside from anecdotal evidence, to make the case on an empirical data-driven basis that the Affordable Care Act is not working.

Senator REID did a little bit of this earlier this week, but I want to share again some of the new numbers we have. Here is maybe the most stunning number: The uninsured rate in the United States fell 2.2 percentage points in the second quarter of 2014. We now have the lowest quarterly rate of uninsured in this country since Gallup began tracking this percentage in 2008. There are approximately 20 to 25 percent less people and families in this country without insurance than 6 months ago. That is absolutely stunning, that in 6 months of implementation of this act, we have taken one-quarter off the rolls of the uninsured in this country. Even the biggest optimists about how the implementation of the Affordable Care Act was going to go could not have guessed we were going to take that big a chunk out of the rolls of the uninsured.

But here is more evidence that this is working. Fifty-seven percent of the individuals who purchased coverage through the exchanges were uninsured when they were enrolled. So a lot of Republicans said: Well, you know, the big numbers you are seeing, 8 million people insured through the private health care exchanges, that may be people shifting from one kind of insurance to another.

Well, a Kaiser study says that, in fact, 6 out of 10 of the people who got insurance in the exchanges, through Medicaid, through staying on their parents' insurance, had no insurance beforehand. Frankly, to my mind, it does not necessarily matter, because to the extent they went on these plans coming off of another plan, it was for a reason: They were saving money, by and large. That is a good thing in and of itself.

But you have 4 out of 10 people going onto the new plans to save them money, 6 out of 10 people coming onto the new plans because they had no insurance at all. They are getting care as well. A new Commonwealth Fund survey says that 60 percent of the adults with this new coverage through the marketplace or Medicaid reported that they had visited a hospital or a doctor or filled a prescription. Sixty-two percent of those people said they could not have had access or afforded this care previously.

That was the theory. All of these people who were waiting to get so sick that they had to go to the emergency room, costing us all sorts of money in the long run, now can get preventive care. Of the 60 percent of the people who went out and saw a doctor because of the new coverage they had by virtue of the Affordable Care Act, 60 percent of them said they would have never gotten that care had they not had that coverage. That is millions of people, millions of people all across the country who are going to have an injury or an illness, who were going to sit at home and live with it until it got so bad they had to show up at the emergency room—they are now getting care.

What about the premiums? People said: Well, you know, these presume are going to be unaffordable and people are going to start paying them and then stop paying them. HHS did a survey of the premiums and found, on average, that the monthly premium people are paying is $82 per month, after a tax credit is factored in.

Listen, $82 a month is not pocket change. There are a lot of families out there who have trouble coming up with $82 a month. But for somebody like Susie Clayton, a breast cancer survivor from North Canaan, CT, that is a big deal. She is paying right about that number, $90 per month. But prior to the Affordable Care Act, because she had a preexisting condition, Susie Clayton was spending $1,600 per month. There are hundreds of thousands of Susie Claytons out there. Premiums are pretty affordable.

The critics said: All right, we will concede that more people are getting covered. We will concede they are using the care. We will concede premiums are affordable, in part because you are spending all of this money on premium assistance. But you are going to just start spiraling health care costs. Well, that did not come true either. With April's updated CBO projections, spending on major Federal health care programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and the ACA subsidies—has now been revised downward by $900 billion. That is a half a percent of GDP since the 2011 projections. So in 3 years, CBO has pushed down its projections of 10-year spending by $900 billion.

Here is an even more stunning way to think about this. If you look at what CBO said we were going to spend on a per-Medicare recipient basis in 2010 versus what they now say we are going to spend on that recipient today over the next 10 years, that per-Medicare recipient spending level has been decreased by $1,000. We are spending $1,000 less per Medicare recipient.

That does not have anything to do with the private exchanges. That has to do with all of the other provisions in the bill that start to shift health care spending away from a system that rewards volume: How much medicine you practice to a system that rewards outcomes: How good is the medicine you are practicing. Are you keeping your patients healthy?

The reality is that spending is remarkably low, historically low on health care. Listen, admittedly, some of that is because of an economy that has been slow to recover over the course of the last 6 years. But a lot of that is because of the Affordable Care Act, so much so that I saw an article in the Wall Street Journal the other day that said the President was to blame for the slow economy because he had been so successful in pushing down the rate of health care spending that now it was an economic catastrophe that we were spending so much less than we had initially projected on health care. There is no way for the President to win. If health care expenses spiral and premiums spiral, it is his fault. But if he does something to control health care premiums and health care costs, than it is a drag on the economy.

In the long run, the truth is if we get health care spending down, really just a transfer payment within our economy, then we have room to spend more money on much more necessary investments, in our infrastructure, in our scientific edge over other countries.

I am here today to support the underlying bill, because I think it is the right thing to do for women in this country, but also because it is part of a growing success story of the Affordable Care Act: $500 million saved on prescription contraception alone. But add that to all of the other evidence, and we are living in a world in which it is increasingly hard to argue that the Affordable Care Act is not working: millions more people covered, huge chunks out of the uninsured rolls being eliminated, costs for overall health care expenses decreasing. I will not even get into it this afternoon, but quality is improving as well. That is people having hospital-acquired infections, having to be readmitted to the hospital.

The stories just keep on coming in. I certainly understand that on an anecdotal basis you can find people who have had negative experiences with the health care system under the Affordable Care Act. I could find millions of other people before the Affordable Care Act was passed as well. But there are many more people like Sean and Emilie Hannon, who are two freelancers from Weston, CT, who were looking for coverage previous to the Affordable Care Act being passed. The best they could do was $1,500 per month from Golden Rule. When they heard about the Affordable Care Act, they called the Connecticut exchange and they found a plan through ConnectiCare that was going to cost them $309 a month. This is a fairly young couple, a savings of nearly 80 percent compared to what they used to pay. That is a story that can be replicated millions of times all across this country.

We would be wise this week to restore this protection to women across this country so they have access to affordable prescription birth control. That is just one part of a growing, overwhelming array of both success stories and positive data about the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, proving that the ACA works.

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. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to respond to some of the comments by the Senator from Connecticut and specifically with regard to the health care law. I come with an interest because I did part of my medical training in that State, still have many friends who practice medicine in Connecticut, and feel from the comments I hear from them that they see a very different side of the picture than what we hear from the Senator from Connecticut.

For some time now Republicans have been talking about the terrible side effects of the President's health care law. The Senator from Connecticut made some references to a family who certainly may have been helped by the health care law, but there are clearly people in that State who are being harmed by the health care law.

In the past I have spoken on this floor about a story in the Washington Post about how the health care law is hurting families all across Connecticut. The article said that two insurance carriers in the Senator's home State of Connecticut have proposed increasing their health insurance premiums by an average of about 12 percent. I didn't hear the Senator from Connecticut make reference to that today. So some people will have smaller increases than the average, but many people in Connecticut are going to pay much more. That is an expensive side effect families are going to have to deal with because of the President's health care law for which the Democrats in the Senate have voted.

There was another article a week or so ago in The Hill newspaper with the headline ''Personal data on ObamaCare enrollees may be compromised.'' It says:

> Connecticut's health insurance exchange acknowledged Friday that the personal information of some enrollees may have been compromised.

Someone found a backpack on a street in Hartford, CT, containing personal information of about 400 people, and it looks as if some of the information is connected to the exchange.

It is interesting. There was a story in the Danbury, CT, newspaper. The headline is ''Affordable Care Act could cost schools big bucks.'' So it is not just health care; the Affordable Care Act itself could cost the schools big bucks. I haven't heard the Senator from Connecticut make reference to that. This could cost school districts hundreds of thousands of dollars they didn't expect to pay.

The Senator from New York is here, and I don't know if the Senator has time locked in. If not, I wanted to speak for a few more moments because this continues to be a major impact.

The law includes a special tax on what are called the Cadillac plans. These are generous health insurance plans that some people—such as union workers, police, and school employees—get in some places.

Another big thing is the way the law defines full-time workers, and this is a problem we are seeing in a lot of places. Employees are considered full time under the health care law if they work 30 hours a week. So schools—schools that are being impacted—are having to provide insurance for those people or cut back their hours.

It is hurting a lot of folks in the Senator's home State and specifically in the school districts in Connecticut.

What they are finding is that they are having to pay more money to buy insurance for the people whom they can't cut back. So the school superintendent in Danbury, CT, wrote to the congressional delegation from Connecticut asking for help. According to a newspaper story from Danbury, he wrote:

> Unless there is some reasonable modification to the ACA [the President's health care law] there will be a tremendous drain on our limited resources.

So when I see the Senator from Connecticut with a sign that says the health care law works, I would say: Not for many people, and it is harming people, including students in our schools. The law is a drain on resources of schools, towns, and counties across the country—a very costly side effect of the health care law at the local level.

I hear the same from my constituents in Wyoming who are seeing similar decisions having to be made, tough choices. I know the Senator from Connecticut is hearing it from his constituents, such as the superintendent of schools in Danbury.

Middle-class families are getting smaller paychecks because of the law. School districts are getting stretched thin by the health care law. Families are having to pay higher premiums because of the health care law, and on top of that they are being exposed to potential fraud and identity theft in the exchanges created by the health care law, as evidenced by a backpack found on a street in Hartford, CT, containing names, Social Security numbers, home addresses, and birth dates of people who signed up for the exchange.

Republicans are going to keep talking about these devastating, dangerous side effects of the Democrats' health care law. We are going to keep pushing for real health care reform that gives people the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act of 2014, introduced by my friends and colleagues Senator MURRAY and Senator UDALL. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

We are at a critical moment when it comes to women's health care rights. We just witnessed a Supreme Court decision that curtailed important access to health care for employees across the country. The Hobby Lobby case has now opened the door for the vast majority of companies and bosses to start denying their employees contraceptive coverage if the owners have a religious objection. We must slam the door shut. To do that this body must set the record straight about the law the Supreme Court used to make their decision, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

As one of the original authors of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, I was the lead sponsor in the House of Representatives. Senator Kennedy was the lead sponsor in the Senate.

I can say with absolute certainty that the law has been unwisely stretched by the Supreme Court to extend religious protections to corporations Congress never intended to be covered under the bill. I am compelled to do so because several of my colleagues on the other side have come to the floor to defend the Hobby Lobby decision using my words. These were arguments I made in 1993 when we first passed the RFRA and we were dealing with the protection of individual—underlining individual—liberties. The quotation they used dealt broadly with the importance of religious freedom of expression in our country. I said the RFRA would help restore the American tradition of allowing maximum religious freedom. That is as true today as it was then. I believe as strongly in RFRA as it was written then as I do now, but it was misinterpreted and wrongly expanded by the Supreme Court.

When my colleagues used this quotation as a point of argument, they completely missed the point of the debate. The debate is not about the conflict between freedom of religious expression and government-mandated health coverage. That is a false choice. The debate is really whether the Supreme Court appropriately interpreted the RFRA in applying it to profit-making corporations.

As the author of the bill, I can say again with absolute certainty that the Supreme Court got the Hobby Lobby case dead wrong.

When we wrote RFRA back in 1993, we did so to protect that which individuals with strong religious beliefs had always enjoyed—the presumption that they should be able to exercise their religious beliefs without interference from the government. But the Court took that protection and misapplied it to for-profit companies that exist for the purpose of benefiting from the open market.

The Hobby Lobby decision marks a sharp departure both from the intent of RFRA and from prior judicial interpretations of RFRA. The Supreme Court got it wrong. That is why this bill, authored by my colleagues from Washington and Colorado, is of paramount importance—to clarify the law and to restore protections for employees that were stripped away by this wrong-headed Supreme Court decision.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to assert that this is just another assault by Democrats on free exercise of religion or peddle other falsehoods. So I would like to clearly explain what this bill will and won't do.

This bill will ensure that companies cannot deny their workers any health benefits, including birth control, as required to be covered by Federal law.

This bill will make it clear that bosses cannot discriminate against their female workers, ensuring equal treatment under the law for tens of thousands of workers whose coverage hangs in the balance.

This bill is not only about birth control. The Hobby Lobby decision has implications for other health services, and now this bill will ensure that all covered employees have access to all necessary health care—not only contraceptives but also blood transfusions, antidepressants, and vaccines.

The bill does not require churches or nonprofit organizations to provide contraceptive coverage even when they object on religious grounds. The Affordable Care Act exemption process for nonprofit organizations with a religious mission is unchanged by this bill.

This bill will not allow new laws that can target specific religious groups.

The bill only applies to health care.

Most importantly, this bill does not restrict the Constitution's First Amendment right to free exercise of religion. The bill only clarifies the relative weight the Court should give when two Federal statutes—such as the Affordable Care Act and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act—come into conflict.

As I continue to say, RFRA was intended to give individuals who profess strong religious beliefs what they had always enjoyed—the strong presumption that they should be able to exercise their religious beliefs without government interference. RFRA was not intended to extend the same protection to for-profit corporations the very purpose of which is to profit from the open market.

The Supreme Court's cavalier decision to grant religious rights to closely held corporations could curtail the health care freedom of women at as many as 90 percent of American businesses. By putting health care decisions in the hands of a woman's boss instead of a woman and her doctor, the decision creates a slippery slope that could affect tens of millions of Americans—our daughters, our wives—in the future.

We need this bill to clarify the law and firmly protect a woman's right to access essential health care.

I thank my colleagues Senator UDALL and Senator MURRAY for offering this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this effort to protect women's health care and religious freedom.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about one of the saddest developments in the Senate—namely, the all-out assault on the First Amendment being led by Senate Democrats.

It is important to clarify what the issue before this body is not about. The issue before this body is not about access to contraceptives, despite a whole lot of politicking by Senate Democrats who suggest to the contrary.

In this body the number of people who would do anything to restrict access to contraceptives to anybody is

zero. Let me repeat that. There is no one in this body, there is no one I am aware of across the country who is advocating restricting anyone's access to contraceptives.

My wife and I are blessed with two little girls. I am very glad we don't have 17.

Nobody, nobody, nobody is talking about restricting access to contraceptives.

What are we talking about? What we are talking about is the Federal Government using brute force to force people to pay for the abortion-inducing drugs of others against their religious faith. That is extraordinary. It is remarkable and it is dismaying.

I am sorry to show what the current First Amendment looks like in the wake of the Democrats' assault on the First Amendment.

In the Senate Judiciary Committee we have been debating on amendments some 47 Democrats have supported that would repeal the free speech protections of the First Amendment. Sadly, every Senate Democrat in the Judiciary Committee supported it.

Today, this body is considering another provision that would effectively cross out the free exercise rights.

Where have we entered when the Bill of Rights has become a partisan matter? What kind of world is it? It used to be the case that we would find bipartisan agreement that the First Amendment is part of our civil compact—that we will stand together with one voice in support of the free speech rights of individual citizens, in support of the religious liberty rights of individual citizens.

The proposal we are going to vote on in just a few minutes would go directly after the religious liberty rights of Americans.

Let me talk a little bit about one group of people who will be affected by this bill if this bill were to pass. Let me talk about the Little Sisters of the Poor, a group of Catholic nuns.

The Little Sisters of the Poor are an international congregation of Roman Catholic women founded in 1839 by St. Jeanne Jugan. Their mission is to:

> . . . offer the neediest elderly of every race and religion a home where they will be welcomed as Christ, cared for as family and accompanied with dignity until God calls them to himself.

The bill that is being voted on on this floor would shut these nuns down. The bill that is being voted on on this floor, if it were adopted, would fine the Little Sisters of the Poor millions of dollars, unless these Catholic nuns are willing to pay for abortion-producing drugs for others.

When did the Democratic Party declare war on the Catholic Church? And let me note, this is not hypothetical. I am not suggesting in theory this might be applied to the Little Sisters of the Poor. Right now—today—the Obama administration is litigating against the Little Sisters of the Poor, trying to force them to pay for abortion-producing drugs and threatening to shut the Little Sisters of the Poor down.

How far have we come from the basic bipartisan agreement in favor of religious liberty? Faith fines should have no place in American society.

The Little Sisters of Denver, which provides approximately 67 full-time jobs, has said it will incur penalties of roughly $6,700 per day—nearly $2.5 million per year—if it chooses to stay true to its religious beliefs; that is, $2.5 million a year in faith fines—fines to Catholic nuns who are devoting their time to caring and providing health care for the elderly. That is more than one-third of their $6 million budget each year.

What has become of the Democratic Party? When did they become so extreme that they would actually propose fining nuns millions of dollars if they are unwilling to pay for the abortion-producing drugs of others? That is not a mainstream position. That is a radical, extreme position.

I would encourage every one of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to ask themselves: How are they going to answer their constituents when they say: Senator, why did you vote in favor of a law that would fine Catholic nuns millions of dollars if they refuse to pay for the abortion-producing drugs of others?

Let me make a basic suggestion. If you are litigating against nuns, you have probably done something wrong. And the Obama administration is doing so right now.

Mr. President, drop your faith fines.

Mr. Majority Leader, drop your faith fines.

To all of my Democratic colleagues, drop your faith fines. Get back to the shared values that stitch all of us together as Americans.

I call upon my Democratic colleagues to stop playing election-year politics. I recognize scaring women by suggesting someone is coming at their birth control may be good politics. It is false. Even the Washington Post has said it is false and a lie.

But election-year politics should not trump religious liberty. Senate Democrats should not wage war on the Catholic Church.

It is not just the nuns who are dismayed. The Catholic bishops have said the proposed bill ''does not befit a nation committed to religious liberty'' and would allow the government to ''override religious freedom rights of Americans regarding health coverage.''

So it is not just the nuns. It is to the Catholic bishops that the Democratic party has said: Your free exercise of religious rights has no place in a Democratic Senate.

The Catholic bishops went on to say:

> If, in the future, the executive branch chose to add the abortion pill RU486, or even elective surgical abortion, including late-term abortion, to the list of ''preventative services,'' those who object to providing or purchasing such coverage would appear to have no recourse.

Think about that for a second. The Catholic bishops just said the bill this body is getting ready to vote on, if passed, would enable the Federal Government to try to force Catholic nuns to pay for and carry out partial-birth abortion. That is staggering.

If we want to talk about mainstream positions, there are mainstream positions, there are far-left positions, and then there is extreme radical fringe, which is the Federal Government forcing Catholic nuns to pay for partial-birth abortions. And that is where virtually every Senate Democrat is today.

Under the legislation before this body, the Catholic University Ave Maria would be forced to make the same choice: Authorize abortion-inducing drugs right now or pay millions of dollars in fines to the U.S. Government.

As Ave Maria President Jim Towey has said:

> Ave Maria University pays 95 percent of the cost of the health plan we offer our employees. Under the federal mandate Ave Maria University would be paying for these drugs if we complied with the law. So we will not.

Every Senate Democrat who votes yes in a few minutes will be voting to fine Ave Maria Catholic University millions of dollars simply for standing true to their faith. That is a vote that should embarrass any Member of this body.

Mr. Towey went on to say:

> We are prepared to discontinue our health plan and pay the $2,000 per employee, per year fine rather than comply with an unjust, immoral mandate in violation of our rights of conscience.

Belmont Abbey College is another proud religious school—founded by Benedictine monks—that the Democrats have put in the same predicament. The Democrats' legislation would force Belmont Abbey College to pay $20,000 a day in faith fines. Faith fines have no place in our democracy.

Let me ask again: Why are Democrats so hostile to the Catholic Church? Why are Democrats trying to use the Federal Government to fine Catholic institutions for holding true to their religious beliefs? It all comes down to a hard-line, extreme, out-of-touch position on abortion.

Just yesterday we had a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee about legislation so broad that it would set aside State laws providing parental notification for abortion, prohibiting late-term abortions, mandating taxpayer-funded abortions. These are extreme radical views held by a tiny percentage of the American people but yet held by a large percentage of Democratic activists.

This position would also rip apart the bipartisan legislation that President Clinton signed into law in 1993. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed the Senate 97 to 3. When President Clinton signed that Act, he said:

> What [RFRA] basically says is that the Government should be held to a very high level of proof before it interferes with someone's free exercise of religion. This judgment is shared by the people of the United States

as well as by the Congress. We believe strongly that we can never, we can never be too vigilant in this work.

We should listen to the words of Bill Clinton in 1993, and the Senate should back away from this assault on religious liberty.

I will finally note two simple things.

In 1997, when the Senate considered another assault on the free speech protections of the First Amendment, then-Senator Ted Kennedy, liberal lion of the Senate, stood and said:

> We haven't changed the Bill of Rights in over 200 years and now is no time to start.

Senator Ted Kennedy was right in 1997.

Likewise, President John F. Kennedy, in a historic speech to the Nation, said:

> I would not look with favor upon a president working to subvert the First Amendment's guarantees of religious liberty.

Where are the Kennedys today? Does any Democrat have the courage to stand and speak for the First Amendment today? Does any Democrat have the courage to stand and speak for the constitutional rights of practicing Catholics? Does any Democrat have the courage to stand and speak for the Little Sisters of the Poor? Does any Democrat have the courage to listen to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and speak for religious liberty?

It saddens me that there are not 100 Senators here unified, regardless of our faith, standing together, protecting the religious liberty rights of everyone.

Faith fines have no business in our democracy. I urge every Member of this body to vote no on this assault on basic religious liberty of every American.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I have come to the floor every day this week to talk about my commonsense bill to keep corporate interference out of women's private health decisions.

On Monday when I was on the floor, I shared the concerns of a Denver-based OB/GYN who said that in light of the Supreme Court's split decision in the Hobby Lobby case, physicians might now have to consider an employer's religious beliefs when making a medical recommendation to ensure their patients are covered for very basic contraceptive treatments.

Yesterday I spoke about a Colorado mother whose college-aged daughter depended on contraception—prescribed by her doctor—to help her manage a debilitating health condition that often kept her from attending class. She told me that without that contraceptive coverage through her family's health plan, her daughter would not have had the coverage for a medically necessary treatment.

Women are sharing these stories with me every day. And Coloradans agree—they should not have to ask for a permission slip to be covered by the method of contraception that is best for them.

Women should be in charge of their health care, not their boss, and certainly not a corporation.

This week my colleague from Washington State and I called on our colleagues to join us in supporting our bill—the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act—or the ''Not My Boss's Business Act.'' Our bill is straightforward. It is common sense. It ensures that no boss can come between a woman and her access to affordable health care.

I thank my colleagues who have come to the Senate floor this week to highlight the importance of passing this bill. In just a few moments, we will be casting our votes as to whether we should bring this bill to the floor. So I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can at least agree this is a debate worth having. It is a discussion I know women and men in every State are encouraging their representatives to have.

After bringing this legislation to the floor for a proper debate, if my colleagues then believe that this simple bill to keep a boss's religious beliefs from impacting access to essential health care for millions of American women is misguided, then they can vote against it.

Bosses have no business interfering in women's private health decisions. Women have asked us to act. Let's act.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last month five conservative justices on the Supreme Court decided that a corporation's rights can trump a female employee's right to make her own health care decisions. This is just the latest of several rulings from a thin majority of justices that diminish the rights of hardworking Americans and have a direct effect on their economic security. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act, which the Senate is considering today. It is needed to overturn the Court's most recent expansion of corporate rights.

For far too long, women were priced out of health care simply because of their gender. The very fact of being a woman, in effect, was brandished against women as a pre-existing condition. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, much of the discrimination women faced in the health insurance market was eliminated. It is unthinkable that as recently as last year, a woman's health care premiums could cost 45 to 140 percent more than a man's. No wonder over half of women identified cost as a barrier to health coverage and why so many women went without insurance. Women could be denied coverage for something as simple as having had a C-section, or for being a victim of domestic violence. It is a travesty that in a country as great as ours this inequity survived as long as it did.

Unfortunately, in the Hobby Lobby decision, which this legislation would address, the Supreme Court set back these advances in equality in health coverage by sanctioning the very discrimination in health care access and services that the Affordable Care Act remedied. By ruling that the owners of corporations may impose their religious beliefs on their employees, women are no longer guaranteed the right to make their own health care decisions. Additionally, this ruling could have far reaching consequences beyond access to contraception. Unless Congress acts, we could see employers restricting the right to other health care services, including vaccines or blood transfusions.

This ruling comes on the heels of another decision that also threatens women's access to health care. In McCullen v. Coakley, the Court ruled that a 35-foot buffer zone protecting women from harassment when entering women's health clinics was not justified and was therefore unconstitutional. This was yet another decision where the Roberts Court allowed other's rights—whether an employer or a stranger on the street who holds a different view point—to trump that of a woman seeking health care.

In addition to the Supreme Court narrowing the rights of American women, we have seen many legislative efforts across the country to cut away at the progress we have made in women's health over the last few years. We have seen Federal bills and amendments introduced that would take decisions out of the hands of patients and doctors, and place them with businesses and insurance companies. States have followed suit by passing laws limiting women's access to health care services. I believe our focus should be on improving access to quality and affordable health care for all Americans, not arbitrarily restricting the important treatments needed by millions of women.

The Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act would restore Congress' intent by preventing any company from denying their workers specific health coverage, including birth control, as required to be covered by Federal law. Without this legislation, for-profit corporations that otherwise offer preventative health benefits can choose to deny their employers contraception coverage based on their bosses' religious beliefs. The bill before the Senate would once again prohibit bosses from discriminating against their employees based on their gender and would ensure that women's health care decisions are put back in the hands of those women and their doctors, where they belong.

At the core of the Affordable Care Act is the principle that all Americans, regardless of health history or gender, have the right to access health care services and make their own decisions about their health care. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee—and as a husband, a father, a grandfather, and as a Vermonter—this is a principle I take seriously. I will continue to fight

against efforts to roll back protections for women, minorities, or any group that has faced discrimination.

I hope that instead of focusing on ways to limit health care options for women, we can join together to promote the interests of women across America by supporting this bill. Nothing less than the economic security of our families is at stake.

PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH FROM CORPORATE INTERFERENCE ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to allow us to begin debate on the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act of 2014, of which I am a cosponsor.

One of this Nation's founding principles is respect for religious faith. Most all of us agree that one American should not be able to impose his or her religious convictions upon another. Yet the outcome of the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Hobby Lobby case is that thousands of Americans may lose the ability to make the most personal choices about what health care meets their religious or ethical standards and hand those decisions over to an employer.

The Court's reasoning in the Hobby Lobby decision was deeply flawed. As I and several colleagues argued in a brief to the Court, applying the Religious Freedom Restoration Act as the Court did seriously misconstrues the language of the statute and ignores the intent of Congress in passing it. Giving for-profit corporations the power to impose the religious beliefs of managers or owners upon employees is what violates basic religious freedom.

It is a central feature of our health care system that millions of Americans receive health insurance through employer-sponsored plans and those employers are most often, as was the case with Hobby Lobby, corporations. Business owners choose to incorporate because forming a corporation means access to limited liability and other government-conferred privileges.

But corporations don't have faiths. People do. That includes the women who have now lost their ability to make the most important and personal decisions about their health care.

If we are to say we truly value the freedom to practice any religion or no religion, as we see fit, surely that includes the freedom for American women to make choices about their own health care without the imposition of their employer's religious convictions. The Supreme Court's decision has elevated the religious faith of a business's owners above the values of that business's employees. That is not what the law envisions, and it is not what Americans believe.

I strongly support this legislation to repair the damage the Supreme Court has done. We should proceed to this bill, debate it, vote on it, and hopefully pass it. America's women and their families deserve nothing less.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Protect Women From Corporate Interference Act, and I praise Senator MURRAY and Senator UDALL (of Colorado) for their work on this bill.

Let me first discuss the Supreme Court's 5–4 decision in Hobby Lobby v. Burwell—a decision that in my view is deeply disappointing. In the Hobby Lobby case, the Supreme Court found that large, closely-held, for-profit corporations have religious-freedom rights under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). Major corporations can now assert a religious objection to generally applicable federal law.

It is possible such corporations will not get most exemptions they seek. This will be examined on a case-by-case basis. But the point is the Court has opened the door to granting these sorts of exemptions to large, for-profit corporations.

This is a far-reaching result that Congress never intended when it enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

As 18 other senators and I made clear to the Court in an amicus brief in the Hobby Lobby case, Congress's purpose in passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993 was simple. Congress wanted to strengthen individuals' free-exercise protections, after a Supreme Court decision in Employment Division v. Smith (1990) limited those rights. But Congress never intended to grant new free-exercise protections to artificial, for-profit business corporations.

The Court's decision in Hobby Lobby went far beyond what Congress intended in passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The Federal law limited by Hobby Lobby was the Affordable Care Act's requirement that preventive health services including contraceptives are covered without cost-sharing in both individual and employer-provided health plans. Preventive health services include contraception because it is basic health care for women. This is an important benefit secured by federal law for all American women, 99 percent of whom have used contraception at some point in their lives. The medical community has almost unanimously recognized contraception as basic and essential health care. As the Guttmacher Institute explained in 2011: Contraceptive use ''help[s] women avoid short intervals between births, thereby reducing the risk of poor birth outcomes.'' ''[S]hort birth intervals have been linked with numerous negative perinatal outcomes,'' including ''low birth weight, pre-term birth and small size for gestational age.'' Contraceptives can also be used to treat common medical conditions including ''menstrual-related migraines, the treatment of pelvic pain that accompanies endometriosis, and of bleeding due to uterine fibroids.''

The Institute of Medicine also recognized the importance of these benefits when it recommended that all FDA-approved contraceptives should be covered without cost-sharing, pursuant to the Women's Health Amendment to the health care law, which I strongly supported.

Yet the Court's decision in Hobby Lobby means a woman's employer can for religious reasons ignore the federal requirement to include this important health benefit in its health plan.

To me, that is wrong. A woman's employer-provided health plan should include basic preventive services required by law, without the owners of the corporation she works for imposing their own personal religious views upon her health care decisions.

I understand some have argued that this decision doesn't impact women's access to contraception because it doesn't allow a corporation to bar a woman from buying contraception. That's ridiculous. Of course health insurance coverage impacts access to care. That is the whole point of insurance. No one would argue that if an employer decided not to cover antibiotics that patients would still have the same access to needed medication on their own. When insurance coverage is limited, access is limited as well, particularly for those of lower financial means.

According to a 2009 study from the Guttmacher Institute, 23 percent of women surveyed reported having a harder time paying for birth control during the economic downturn, and this number rose to one out of three among those who were financially worse off compared to the year before. In fact, my Republican colleagues felt that prescription drug coverage was so important to ensuring patient access to medication that they led the creation of Medicare Part D, which was signed into law by President Bush. I supported that legislation and still believe that health insurance coverage is critical to ensuring patient access.

It is also important to note that contraception is not the only issue here. The Hobby Lobby decision means that other Federal health laws—including other benefits required by law, or even coverage itself—could be the subject of a religious objection by a corporate employer.

In the United States more than half of all individuals get insurance through their employer, and estimates suggest that more than half of Americans work for a closely-held corporation.

In the Affordable Care Act Congress recognized the importance of preventive care. We included coverage without a copay for effective prevention services as determined by independent medical experts. I will just name some: Blood pressure and cholesterol screening, colonoscopies, immunizations, HIV tests, mammograms and cervical cancer screening, diabetes screening, autism screening for children, hearing tests for newborns and screening for sickle-cell anemia.

The point is certain essential, preventive services for adults and children

must be part of employer-provided health care under the law. But the Hobby Lobby decision grants for-profit corporations the ability to seek a religious exemption from providing them. Those exemptions may or may not be granted, but the Supreme Court has now opened the door to those claims.

In my view this is at odds with the fundamental principle that health care decisions should be made by patients in consultation with their doctors.

This bill is simple: it would protect elements of employer-provided health care plans that are already required by law against challenge on the basis of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

It would not infringe any individual's constitutional right to the free exercise of religion, nor would it alter existing exemptions and accommodations for religious organizations and nonprofits.

I urge my colleagues to defend the critical health protections that we have created and join me in supporting this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:10 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reserve the last 3 minutes of debate for my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, in a few minutes we are going to vote to proceed to debate on the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act—or, as we call it, the Not My Boss's Business Act—straightforward, simple legislation that would ensure that no CEO or corporation can come between you and your guaranteed access to health care, period.

Women across the country are watching. Affordability of care equals access to care, and we know that millions of Americans lacked health insurance prior to the Affordable Care Act because they couldn't afford it, not because it wasn't available to them to purchase. Contraceptives should be a part of the options in women's health care because it is an essential part. We don't single out other benefits for employees. Why should we single out benefits that are so important to women in this country?

Now is the time for our colleagues to answer a few basic questions. Who should be in charge of a woman's health care decision? Should it be the woman making those decisions with her partner and her doctor and her faith or should it be her boss making those decisions for her based on his own religious beliefs? To me and to the vast majority of people across the country, the answer to that question is obvious: Women should call the shots when it comes to their health care decisions, not their boss, not the government, not anyone else, period.

But we are here today because five men on the Supreme Court disagreed. Five men on the Supreme Court rolled back the clock on women across America. We are here today because we simply cannot allow that to stand.

In the aftermath of that decision, women across America turned up here in Congress and demanded we fix it. That is why I worked with my partner, the senior Senator from Colorado, to introduce this bill, and we have 46 cosponsors in the Senate and over 120 organizations that have voiced their support now. So I sincerely hope our Republican colleagues will join us in allowing us to proceed to debate on this important bill.

I wish to remind them that women across the country are watching. In fact, we have a number of them here in the Nation's Capitol today, and I believe they will be very interested in seeing who is on their side.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor, and I ask unanimous consent to yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Mark Udall, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Carl Levin, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, Jeanne Shaheen, Michael F. Bennet, Jon Tester, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Maria Cantwell, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 459, S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Harkin	Murphy
Begich	Heinrich	Murray
Bennet	Heitkamp	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hirono	Pryor
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murkowski	

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reid
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
Cruz	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 56 and the nays are 43. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 2578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The Senator from Vermont.

IMMIGRATION CRISIS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, over the years I have frequently spoken on the Senate floor about refugees. I have asked my fellow Senators to support our humanitarian refugee efforts in farflung corners of the world. In doing so, I cite America's role as a human rights leader and our long history of providing refuge to those fleeing persecution and violence. I also remind people of a time in the past, around World War II, when this country unwisely closed its borders to people who were fleeing the Holocaust in Germany. They came here, they were turned back, sent back, many of them to certain death in the death camps. That was a sorry part of our history. Usually our history reflects what we see in the Statue of Liberty: a beckoning torch to refuge. But now the refugee crisis has come back again and to our own border.

It is a complicated problem. I hope we will stop trying to react to whatever was in the latest news cycle 12½ seconds ago so we can get to the next sound bite 12½ seconds from now and resist the urge to let politics shape our response. Critics are arguing that the increase in unaccompanied children arriving at the southwest border is driven by recent changes in our immigration policy. This is a sound bite. The facts, of course, are a lot different. They tell a different and more complicated story.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has found over 50 percent of the children ages 12 to 17 arriving from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras have been forcibly displaced and have claims to international protection because of the violence they have encountered. If changes in immigration policy were the primary factor, we would expect to see an across-the-board increase in children arriving from Mexico and Central America.

What Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras have in common is widespread corruption and weak governments that have failed to implement effective social and economic programs or to protect their most vulnerable citizens from record levels of violence. This reality, more than any change in U.S. policy, is responsible for the massive increase in unaccompanied minors arriving on our southwest border.

It is true that many of these children do not have claims to immigration relief and they are going to be returned. For them, the dangers of this trip are not worth it, and we must discourage them from making the arduous journey alone. But others are fleeing murder or being forced into gangs or girls in their early teens are being raped and impregnated. This is what they are escaping.

There is no doubt that simply maintaining the status quo is not an option. We should take up and pass the administration's emergency supplemental request without delay. But instead of supporting the supplemental, Republicans are trying to use the crisis to promote fear and their enforcement-only agenda. It has not worked in the past. It will not work now. These children coming across the border are not trying to flee from enforcement. If they see somebody in uniform, they run to them, thinking that finally they are escaping the gangs and the murderers and the rapists, and now they suddenly feel safe because they see an American in uniform. As we know from the experience of other countries facing far greater refugee crises, increased detention and other messages of deterrence do not persuade desperate people from taking dangerous journeys.

Some Members of Congress are proposing that the way to solve this problem is by amending the Trafficking Victims Protection Act to make it easier to deport these children by rushing them through a superficial hearing—and it would be superficial—without access to counsel or child welfare specialists, in a country strange to them and in a language different than theirs. That is unacceptable. We are talking about young children—6 and 7 and 8 years old—who have experienced horrific violence and now are in a country where they don't even speak the language. It is unconscionable to push them through our complicated legal system terrified and alone, without a lawyer, and with the ultimate idea that they will be summarily deported back to the very danger they fled. I will vote against anything that would allow such a travesty.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act is not a windfall for these children. It hasn't been from the time President George W. Bush signed it into law until today. It simply provides commonsense protections such as requiring the children who arrive alone to be interviewed by a child welfare specialist and have a meaningful opportunity to tell their story to a judge. That is how we identify victims of trafficking or sexual violence or persecution. If improving the efficiency of the process is the goal, the administration already has the discretion to do that. The funding for immigration judges and legal assistance in the supplemental will further help. We can address this humanitarian crisis without watering down our law. We don't have to turn our backs on our own basic values as Americans—the basic values that brought my grandparents to Italy from Vermont and my great-great grandparents from Ireland to Vermont. It is our humanitarian values. Let's not turn our backs on them.

The problem, in fact, we are facing now could be alleviated in part if the Republican-controlled House of Representatives would allow a vote on the Senate's comprehensive immigration reform bill, S. 744. We had hundreds of hours of hearings, of markups, of debate, sometimes going late into the evening, and then days of debate on the floor, and we passed it by a strong bipartisan majority. We passed this bill 1 year ago, and the Republican leadership in the House will not even allow it to come to a vote, even though it would probably pass in the same form as we did. They will not let it come to a vote because whether people vote for or against it, there are some people who will disagree with the vote, so it is easier to vote maybe. No matter what the humanitarian crisis we have, vote maybe. Don't vote yes, don't vote no; vote maybe by not voting, but then blame it on the President, blame it on everybody else.

The Senate stepped up and we passed a bill the President said he would sign. The Senate-passed bill calls for nearly 20,000 new Border Patrol agents, 3,500 additional Customs and Border Protection officers, and 700 miles of fencing. We have heard people stand and say—as though they suddenly found this out—we need tougher laws to fight back against coyotes and cartels that want an opportunity to exploit these vulnerable children. I have heard some of the same people refuse to vote on a bill and say we need this protection. Read the bill. S. 744 does that too. It has tougher provisions to fight against human smuggling and enhanced penalties in situations that result in serious bodily injury, death, bribery or corruption.

We have done it. We have done it in the Senate. Why isn't there a hue and cry? I understand it is very easy, if you are going to do a sound bite for the evening news or something, to stand up and say: Why haven't Obama and the Democrats acted? It takes a little bit more time to say: Why haven't you voted for a bill that does everything you say is needed? Why won't the Republican leadership even allow the House Members—Republicans and Democrats—to vote on a bill that does everything they say they need?

I want to thank Senators HARKIN and FEINSTEIN and DURBIN for their comments at the last week's Appropriations Committee hearing. It is clear to me that they, too, understand our Nation is at a crossroads with this crisis. The world is watching how we are going to respond. How is the greatest Nation on Earth going to respond?

I know one person who spoke out: Pope Francis. He has urged us to protect these children. Well, I think the Pope is right.

We have a choice. We can either make good on the promises we have already written into our law and Republicans and Democrats have voted for, or we can decide: Gosh, we didn't mean it. We voted for it, we gave great press conferences, but we did not mean it. Now, gee whiz, it is complicated—as though life is always easy—so let's just rewrite the law. If we do that, just send these children back. Send these children back to the murderers, the rapists, the gangs. Doesn't that turn our back on the very principles on which this Nation was founded—the principles that brought my grandparents here from Italy, my great-grandparents here from Ireland?

Where are those principles? We forgot them at the beginning of the Holocaust. We look at the people who died, the number of Jews who went to the ovens because we had forgotten our principles.

Well, President George W. Bush was right in signing the bill. The Republicans and Democrats who voted for it were right. Let's not turn our backs. If we want to do something beyond the sound bites, something realistic, pass the supplemental for the people we need to do it for and allow the House of Representatives to vote up or down on the bill that Republicans and Democrats voted for here in the Senate a whole year ago. But do not let the supplemental request be a political football. It should be passed clean, without delay. Do not try to remove all the protections for victims of human trafficking.

Pass the supplemental, and then have the courage to stand up and vote yes or no on S. 744. We did here in the Senate. Republicans and Democrats came together. A large majority of us passed it in the Senate. Why can't the House of Representatives do the same thing? I will tell you why. They are afraid whichever way they vote, it might be unpopular. Well, that is what you expect. I have cast more votes than all but a half dozen Senators in the history of this country. Can anybody go back through all those thousands upon thousands of votes and find some they could attack me on? Of course. I could give them a list myself. Can I find some that I probably on second thought wish I had cast differently? Of course I can. But I had the courage to vote yes or no. I was criticized when I became the first Vermonter—in fact, the only Vermonter—to ever vote against the war in Vietnam. The authorization was cut off by one vote. Today it would be hard to find anybody who supported that war.

My point is not whether as a Senator from Vermont I vote right or wrong or any one of us as a Senator from our State votes right or wrong—but at least vote. That is what we said we would do when we were elected: vote. So I am talking about what is wrong with immigration law when you are afraid to even vote one way or the other. But let's not turn our back on the principles this country stands for. Let's not say to 7- or 8- or 9-year-old children—trying to escape a fate that my children or my grandchildren would never face—sorry, we are too great and big and busy a country to worry about you. Go back and face your fate, whatever it might be, because we don't care. That is not the America I serve. That is not the America I love. That is not the place where the Senate should be if we are going to be the conscience of the Nation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. 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. COBURN. Madam President, I want to spend a few minutes discussing the effect and the premise of the legislation on which we just decided not to move forward.

I have spent 25 years of my life caring for women. There is not a complication of pregnancy I have not handled. I have seen every aspect of it. I have delivered babies the size of my little finger and watched them move their little arms, not yet far enough along to survive. I have cared for women in the midst of lost pregnancies and the tragedy and trauma and the heartbreak. I have cared for women who have had abortions and the complications that has completed and exacerbated in their own lives from psychological to real physical problems. I have actually performed abortions to save women's lives who had severe congenital heart defects and would have died had their pregnancy continued.

But the premise under which this bill was brought forward is an absolute false premise. You see, I come from Oklahoma. David Green and his family come from Oklahoma. They are the owners of Hobby Lobby. They are one of the finest groups of people I have ever met in my life. They are responsible corporate citizens. But everything they have done in their life is guided by their faith and their ethics. Therefore, they are not open on Sunday because they feel their employees have a right to a restful weekend. They pay a very livable wage. They have always had health insurance.

The Supreme Court decision was about religious freedom and whether I, as a private businessperson, am still entitled to that as I carry on commerce in this country.

What has been described—maybe not specifically but negatively—is that Hobby Lobby and the Green family do not appreciate women or their contributions or their rights or their freedoms. Nothing could be further from the truth. They had a very personal objection to four abortifacients—not birth control pills—four medicines, devices that actually kill a living human being. See, what we do not think about very often—and I think about all the time—is that when an egg and a sperm unite, there is created something that has never been created before: a unique human being. The genetic material will be no different at conception than it is when you are 85 years old. It is unique. It has never before been here; it will never again be here.

So based on these deeply held beliefs and ethics—and what I would say is morals—they chose to supply their entire employee network with 16 different methods of birth control. But the four that actually kill a baby that has been formed—they thought it was their religious right to be able to say they should not have to take money out of their pocket to pay for something that goes against their strongly held moral, ethical, and faith beliefs.

So we have had a reaction. It is political in nature. It does not have much to do with the facts. It has a lot to do with darkness, of saying something is so that is not true, and saying it often enough so we can tell people that here are those terrible Republicans and they want to hurt women.

I dedicated 25 years of my life to helping women in every type of tragedy, every type of disease, whether it is cancer or diabetes or hypertension or pregnancy or miscarriages or just the common cold. Before the Senate forced me to stop delivering babies, I was delivering babies that I delivered; in other words, it was the third generation. That is how crazy the Senate ethics rules are.

So the very undercurrent of what we heard could not be further from the truth. What we heard—the implications were that the Green family is somehow this negative corporate monster who wants to take women's rights away—is absolutely untrue.

The other falsehood we hear is that if you do not have health care, you do not have available birth control. We spend $400 million a year on title 19, most of which is in birth control pills that are given out to women who do not have access. It costs $7 a month to buy birth control pills, and most physicians, like myself, who had women who could not either access title 19 or who did not have $7 a month, gave the pills themselves out of their stocks, their samples.

So there is a reality other than what has been painted in the Senate, and I could not sit by and let this hang out, this terrible untruth. I do not know of a family business, I do not know of a business in America that cares more about its employees than Hobby Lobby, and it is manifested through the employee loyalty and also the success of their brand because they really have a team. And you do not have a team if you do not feel as if you are being cared for—that you are not one of the group.

There are a lot of problems in front of this country. But the one described in this last piece of legislation is not one of them. The Green family does not keep anybody from buying abortifacients if they want them. They are not all that expensive. The morning-after pill is over the counter. But to force a person of faith to pay for an action against what they believe is morally wrong. It is far away from the religious liberties our Constitution guarantees.

I know we can get hyped up on emotion, but the emotion we ought to get hyped on is preserving the rights our Founders guaranteed when they started this country. They were based on the same set of beliefs the Green family inculcates into everything they do with Hobby Lobby. It is pretty ironic to me that we have become so postmodern, so smart, so ''for'' what the government can do and mandate that we are willing to destroy the very freedoms that created this country in the first place.

This bill was a cynical attack on truth. I am glad it is not proceeding. It is time to quit wasting the Senate's time on political games and start addressing the very real problems this country has, such as the fact that Social Security disability will run out of money next month; the fact that one-third of those on disability who are not truly disabled are threatening the livelihood of those who truly are; the fact that Medicare, 17 years from now or 16 years from now, will be out of money; the fact that Social Security will be out of money in 18 years; the fact that we are having corporations leave this country in a mass flood because we

have a Tax Code that is not competitive with the rest of the world; the fact that we are wasting $250 billion a year on duplicative programs that do not accomplish the goals which the Congress set out for them. Yet we have no leadership that says we are going to address the very real problems in front of the country. It is not a great record to be proud of.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask to be recognized to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SECOND LIEUTENANT NOAH HARRIS

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I wish to share an experience I had a couple of weeks ago while riding the mountains of North Georgia to my home. I was in the pickup truck alone, driving my red Silverado from a place in the mountains. I spent a lot of time thinking—which I try to do when I get a few moments to myself—about all the difficult positions we are now in as a country. I thought about our border with Mexico and all the Central American children who are coming through, huddled on the border, and the crisis there. I thought about Syria and the tragedy of that civil war. I thought about the fact that the Israelis and Hamas are firing rockets back and forth from Gaza and into the mainland of Israel. I thought about the fact that we are now negotiating with Iran, our archenemy. I thought about the fact that Vladimir Putin decided to take advantage of the vacuum that has been created in world leadership and moved into Crimea, threatening Kiev and threatening Ukraine. I thought about all the crises we have along the way.

Then I came to Ellijay, GA, a little town known for its apples and its population of 2,000 great Georgia citizens.

I came to Poole's Bar-B-Q, which is a landmark along the highway in Ellijay, GA. I stopped, and all of a sudden all those thoughts I had of the wars going on, the conflicts going on, the strife and the trouble going on all culminated in Gilmer County, because in Gilmer County in 2005 I attended the funeral of Noah Harris. Noah Harris was killed in Iraq in 2005.

I thought about his story, and I thought about our position now, and I thought about some message I want to send to my country and to this body of the Senate.

Let me talk about Noah Harris. Noah Harris was a cheerleader at the University of Georgia. On the Saturday before 9/11 in 2001, he was in Sanford Stadium with 92,000 fans of the Georgia Bulldogs cheering on the team.

Then, like the rest of the world, he saw the terrible attack of 9/11 in 2001—in New York City, in Shanksville, PA, and in Washington, DC.

On the morning of the 12th, he got out of bed in the dormitory and he went straight to the Army ROTC building in Athens, GA, and told them he wanted to sign up for an ROTC commission because he wanted to go fight whoever it was who killed those 3,000 citizens of the world tragically in New York City.

They said: Noah, you can't get a commission in just a year. You only have a year left.

He said: I can double up and do it. I want to go for my country. I want to go for what is right. I want to go fight for America.

He became a second lieutenant in the 3rd Infantry Division, and, sure enough, 3 years after that, he was in Iraq. He became known as the Beanie Baby soldier because he had his pockets stuffed with Beanie Babies. And as he would go through Ghazaliya, where he was stationed near Baghdad, he would hand out Beanie Babies to the Iraqi children. He was like a pied piper. Unfortunately, in the 11th month of his tour, a rocket-propelled grenade his hit humvee and he and two of his buddies were killed instantly in Iraq.

I didn't know Noah Harris, but I went to the funeral that day because, as a Senator from Georgia, I wanted to pay my respects to a soldier who paid the ultimate sacrifice in the war on terror.

So as I was riding through Gilmer County a couple weeks ago, thinking about the crises we have today around the world and then thinking about Noah Harris, I thought to myself, there is a message all of us need to remember: Those soldiers should never have died in vain, and we have to make sure they did not.

In Iraq 4,486 American soldiers were killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. In Afghanistan, to date, 2,319—a total of 6,805—most of them Americans, some of them immigrants seeking their citizenship in America and fighting for America in our Armed Forces—fought for the rights and freedoms that all our Founding Fathers stood for, fought for all the reasons we serve in this body today, fought for all the reasons that America is the great and noble country it is around the world.

But right now there is an absence of leadership in the world, and because of it we are seeing one crisis come up after another. I worry that Noah Harris, who died in Iraq in 2005, might—and I underscore the word ''might''—have died in vain if we don't recognize our responsibilities and see to it that we try and prevent what has been happening lately from continuing to happen.

There is a decision point coming to the United States of America—it is coming next year. It is one I want to encourage the President to think about deeply and for all of us to think about deeply.

We have lost Iraq to ISIS. ISIS is a renegade group of terrorists who have basically taken over that country and partnered with some of the terrorists in Syria to control Iraq.

One of the reasons they did that is we left a huge vacuum in Iraq when we pulled out. We pulled every American soldier out. I know it was our goal to leave after the surge worked—and that was the right thing to do. But it wasn't the right thing to pull out every single soldier, because we abandoned all the infrastructure that we had built. We abandoned the image of American strength and power. We abandoned the ability for us to be agile in a dangerous part of the world.

In Afghanistan, we are supposed to pull our troops out at the beginning of next year. Some of them should come home but not all of them. We have invested billions of dollars in American hardware and American money to see to it we had the best support in the world for our soldiers in Afghanistan. If we abandon Bagram, if we abandon Kabul—if we abandon Afghanistan, the same thing will happen in Afghanistan as happened in Iraq. And those soldiers, the 2,319 who died in Afghanistan, will have in part died in vain because we abandoned what they built. We abandoned what they protected. We abandoned the investment they made.

We need also to remember what happened on 9/11 of 2001, when we decided to go into Iraq and then later into Afghanistan. We didn't have enough infrastructure in that part of the world to make an invasion. We had to rent the Kyrgyzstan airport near Russia to be able to fly our troops in to begin positioning outside of the Tora Bora area in Afghanistan.

We have built tremendous infrastructure, we have built tremendous bases, and we have tremendous assets for which the taxpayers of the United States have paid. We should maintain a presence there so we are agile; so our SEALs teams, if needed, can be positioned; so that the rest of the world knows that while the war may be over and America has come home, it hasn't left. It hasn't abandoned us. An American presence will remain—just as we have in Germany, just as we have in Japan, just as we have in South Korea. Our best friends today were our enemies 40, 50, and 60 years ago, because America didn't leave when the fight was over. We need to make sure that relationship happens in Afghanistan so we can begin to build our presence in that part of the world and be that somebody who prohibits and inhibits terrorism and people like ISIS from taking over countries.

Make no mistake about it. Vladimir Putin has been encouraged by an absence of leadership, and ISIS took advantage of an absence of leadership. What is going on between Hamas and Israel in the Gaza Strip is an absence of leadership, in part on our part. We can't sit around and be bystanders. We have to recommit ourselves to the effort in that part of the world because

in the end the peace and security of America from terrorism and from those who would bring us down is not our looking the other way and not living up to our responsibility to the Noah Harrises of the world who gave the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq in 2005—all because he watched what we all watched that morning of 9/11 in 2001, and said: This shall not stand. I want to volunteer to fight for my country. And he joined our Army and did so.

God bless Noah Harris. God bless his parents, Rick and Lucy. God bless the United States of America. May we remember our responsibility not to leave what we have built and remain a beacon of peace, liberty, and democracy around the world.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wanted to inform the Members about an important hearing that was held this morning in the Senate Veterans' Committee. I also wish to thank the Members of the Senate who, in the midst of a very partisan environment last month, voted with 93 votes—overwhelming support—to pass a very significant piece of legislation to help the men and women who put their lives on the line to defend our country—legislation that was written by Senator MCCAIN and myself, and I thank him very much for his help in this effort.

One of the important provisions in that legislation was an understanding that the needs of our veterans are a cost of war. They are a cost of war just as much as guns and tanks and planes and missiles are a cost of war. It seems to me to be fairly obvious that if we spend trillions of dollars fighting the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is absolutely appropriate to make sure we have money available on an emergency basis to take care of the men and women who use those guns and tanks and missiles and who put their lives on the line and, in some cases, never come home.

So the first point I wish to make is that if we send people to war, we should always understand that a cost of that war is taking care of our veterans.

I recall—and I see the chairperson of the Appropriations Committee and she will recall this as well—that when this country went to war in Iraq and after in Afghanistan—and let me be clear, I voted against the war in Iraq—but when we went to war in Iraq and in Afghanistan, the understanding was that this is emergency funding; that our troops, no matter how one voted on the war, needed the equipment to take care of themselves, to protect themselves, and to win the mission. That is exactly where we are today. We want to win this mission. The mission we are involved in now is making sure the men and women who served this country in the military get quality care in a timely manner. That is the mission we have to win now, and that, in my view, is a cost of war.

I think there is not widespread awareness of what the cost of war is, and I hope, A, we never get into more wars in the future, but that if we ever do, people understand that any budget for war must include the needs of veterans—not 2 years after the war but 70 years after the war. When some veteran is sitting in some room in an apartment without legs, without arms, without eyesight, that is a cost of war and we don't desert those people—not tomorrow, not 50 years from now, not 70 years from now. Our moral commitment is to make certain we provide for those who defend us.

I think there is not sufficient understanding about what the cost of war truly is. I wish to mention just a few facts people should understand. Over 2 million men and women served this country in Afghanistan and in Iraq. Studies are very clear that 20 to 30 percent of those men and women have come home with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury. That is between 400,000 to 500,000 men and women who are coming home with PTSD or TBI. What that translates into is men and women who are struggling every single day. It translates into outrageously high rates of suicide for younger veterans, substance abuse, inability to hold on to a job and earn a living; many of these folks have a difficult time being around people. It translates into divorce. It translates into emotional problems for kids and for other family members.

Since fiscal year 2006, the number of veterans receiving specialized mental health treatment has risen from over 927,000 to more than 1.4 million in fiscal year 2013. Today, and every day, approximately 49,000 veterans are receiving outpatient mental health appointments. Let me repeat that. Today, some 49,000 veterans in 50 States in this country are receiving mental health appointments. That is a staggering number. During the last 4 years, VA outpatient mental health visits have increased from $14 million a year to more than $18 million a year. This is just one of the problems facing the veterans community. How do we provide the psychiatrists, the social workers, the psychologists, the counselors we need? It is a huge issue because PTSD and TBI are very tough illnesses.

In addition, what we are looking at now—and every Member of the Senate is familiar with this—is outrageously high waiting periods for veterans to get into the VA. Time and time again I hear from veterans in Vermont and I hear from veterans all over the country; I hear from veterans organizations and I read independent surveys which tell me that when veterans get into the VA, the quality of the care they get is good. I just met 2 hours ago with a veterans organization—same thing: Once people get into the system, the quality of care is generally good; the problem is accessing the care. The problem is appointments.

I will not read to my colleagues all of the statistics, but trust me the waiting lines all over this country are much too high in many parts of America. There are other people who never even made it to the waiting lines. This has to do with a whole lot of issues that we have discussed.

The bottom line is we must address the waiting time issue and make sure that in the very near future, every veteran who is in need of health care gets that health care in a timely manner.

Sloan Gibson, who is the Acting Secretary of the VA——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is informed that the time is under Republican control, if the Senator would suspend.

Mr. SANDERS. Could I ask my colleague just for 3 more minutes?

Mr. RISCH. The Senator may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, Senator SANDERS is speaking. Senator RISCH, I believe, is going to speak. The time now is on unaccompanied children; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent agreement was that the Republicans control the time until 4:30.

Ms. MIKULSKI. OK.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. I ask unanimous consent that——

Ms. MIKULSKI. I haven't yielded the floor. I reserved my right to object. I am just clarifying. So Senator SANDERS wishes to speak, and as I understand it, I have time—this is not in any way to interfere with the Senator from Idaho, but at 4:30 I am supposed to have the time under the time controlled by the Democrats; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We already agreed to the unanimous consent request that the Republicans control the time until 4:30.

Ms. MIKULSKI. How much time is—all I am trying to do is know when I am going to be able to speak.

If I could turn to the Senator from Idaho, how long does he intend to speak?

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I intend to speak for about 4½ minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I withdraw my objection. I think we deserve to hear Senator SANDERS, and I will wait patiently for my turn.

Mr. RISCH. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank very much the Senator from Idaho.

Let me wrap it up by making the point that Acting Secretary Gibson made this morning which was a very simple but important one. What he said is we must address the immediate crisis of ending these outrageously long waiting periods that veterans are now experiencing in order to get into the VA. Right now—and I am proud of what he is doing—they are moving very aggressively to get veterans all over this country into private health care when necessary and any other form of health care, to make sure those waiting periods go down. I think they are doing a pretty good job. They have to continue to do that, but we should be mindful that this is going to be a very expensive process.

The other point he made, which is equally important, is that long term, if the goal is to end these unacceptable waiting periods, we have to give the VA the staffing and the space and the facilities and the infrastructure they need.

He came forward with what I recognize is a very big pricetag. His pricetag was $17.6 billion, so we can get the 10,000 more staff we need, the doctors, the psychiatrists, the primary health care physicians, the mental health counselors we need, get the space we need, because in many facilities around the country the staff can't operate because they don't have adequate space.

So what I would say to my colleagues, if we are serious about addressing this very important problem, we will go forward in two ways. No. 1, immediate crisis, let's end those waiting lists. Let's contract out when necessary to private physicians.

Long term, it is absolutely imperative that the VA have the infrastructure it needs so we don't have this crisis again 2 years from today.

The last point, I reiterate. If we send people off to war—if we make that enormously difficult, painful decision—I hope every Member in this body understands that taking care of veterans is a cost of that war and that we have a moral responsibility to do everything we can with them and for them and their families.

Before I yield the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum submitted by Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson at our committee hearing earlier today.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRMAN SANDERS

From: Sloan D. Gibson, Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Regarding: Testimony at July 16, 2014 Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs Hearing.

Per your request, attached for your information is a summary of additional resource needs through FY2017 that I outlined in my testimony today before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In developing the resource requirements, the overarching goals were to:

Support the work of the Senate-House conference committee to improve Veterans' access to medical care and services.

Ensure that VA has the resources necessary to deliver timely, high quality care and benefits to Veterans enrolled in the VA system.

Schedule all Veteran appointments within standards of acceptable care.

Enhance and reform infrastructure that enables VA medical care (i.e. facilities construction/IT improvements) to modernize VA's operations and provide access to care when and where Veterans want it.

Further, the resource requirements were shaped by principles that the Administration believes should be key to any discussion of VA resource needs. These principles include:

Leverage contract care where necessary, but focus efforts on incentivizing improvements in the VA system itself—Consider referrals to non-VA care to address burgeoning workload as a temporary stop-gap to immediately address the current problem, but concurrently look to strengthen the VA system by including incentives and resources for VA to deliver care in-house.

Require cost-effective, coordinated care—Make efficient use of taxpayer dollars by ensuring quality care is delivered in a cost-effective way. Require VA to actively coordinate a Veteran's care across all care environments.

Modernize VA infrastructure and processes—Ensure that VA facilities and IT infrastructure are modernized and equipped to meet increasing demand for services; reform VA IT delivery and procurement to make it more effective in delivering services to Veterans.

Support VA system without undercutting other national priorities—Given that VA is required to provide quality care to Veterans—and faces serious resources needs not contemplated when budget caps were negotiated—funding to support the ramp-up of VA medical care contemplated below must be provided outside of current base discretionary resources.

If you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

VA RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS FACT SHEET

Investments to Address VA Access to Care and Modernize Infrastructure and Processes

Resource	Cost ($Billions)	Summary of Use of Funds
Increasing Veterans' System-wide Access to Care.	$10.0	• Access: $8.2B for approximately 10,000 primary care and specialty care physicians, and other clinical/medical staff including physicians, nurses, social workers, mental health professionals, and others—and funds other associated expenses such as equipment, supplies, and other overhead costs • Hepatitis-C Drugs: $1.3B for critical new therapies over the next 2 years for higher than expected costs for two new Hepatitis C drug therapies that are significantly more effective and carry fewer side effects • Caregivers Program: $186M is estimated to support higher-than-expected demand for the Caregivers program (over approximately 22,000 Caregivers in total)
IT Enhancements	$1.2	• IT Infrastructure: Additional funding is needed to provide IT support in new space generated by major and minor construction and Non-Recurring Maintenance (NRM). • Project Development: Additional funding is needed for the development of OIT programs. These include Interoperable Purchased Care, Mobile App Scheduling, and additional Veterans Benefits Management System & VBA IT development. • Other IT Support: Additional funding for IT staff to support operational requirements and for hardware, bandwidth, security, etc.
Improve and Invest in VA Physical Infrastructure.	$6.0	Funding for approximately: • 700 Minor and NRM projects to include safer inpatient care to eradicate legionella and other threats • 8 major construction projects that address safety or access issues
Veterans Benefits Administration	$0.4	• Funding for approximately 1700 staff to speed appeals, non-rating benefits workload, and other benefits programs
Total	$17.6	

• These resources are needed to ensure that VA is able to deliver high quality, timely health care to Veterans enrolled in the VA.

With that, I yield the floor, and again I wish to thank my friend Senator RISCH for the courtesy of giving me some extra time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

(The remarks of Mr. RISCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 2616 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. RISCH. I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time between now and 5:30 p.m. will be controlled by the majority party.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, for the next hour a number of us from the Democratic Caucus will be talking about the Central American refugee crisis. We are lucky to be joined by Senator MIKULSKI, the chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to get us started today. So I look forward very much to hearing what she has to say and you will be hearing from me in a little bit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an urgent crisis at our border in which over 250 children a week are coming from Central America, fleeing horrific gang violence—horrific gang violence—to seek refuge and asylum in the United States of America.

This is being called a crisis at the border. Well, it is a border crisis, but the crisis actually begins in Central America, where brutal, violent gangs, based on organized crime, are either trying to recruit the boys into organized crime, drug smuggling, human trafficking, or to recruit the girls into human trafficking in other just dangerous and repugnant circumstances.

But when you go to the border the way I have, you will see that the situation is dire. It is dire because, as these children come to the border, crossing the Rio Grande—probably within really almost a 50-mile stretch of the Grande; it is not over the 1,900 miles of the Grande—they come and, actually, they do not try to sneak in, they come right up to where the border control is and they have pieces of paper with their name on it. They are then taken into custody by border control. They are placed into holding cells that are designed for adult males. They were designed to hold drug smugglers, narcotraffickers, and now they hold as many as 20 or 30 or 40 children, while under the law they are to be placed in the hands of the Health and Human Services Agency while their legal and asylum status is being verified.

Well, I am telling you, the entire infrastructure for dealing with these children—from the way the border control is trying to take care of them, the overrunning of the capacity of these holding cells, to the backlog on processing their legal and asylum determination, to really trying to place them in facilities under the care of Health and Human Services—the situation is dire.

The President of the United States has asked for emergency funding to deal with it. I hope we consider this emergency funding. The amount of money the President is seeking is $3.7 billion. This is to care for the humanitarian needs of the children, the enforcement at the border, the identifying of their legal status under a law passed under the administration of President Bush to deal with the trafficking of children, both boys and girls, and also for robust deterrence in the home countries where these children are coming from. But the deterrence comes from breaking down and prosecuting organized crime syndicates of the smugglers and the traffickers.

We are also asking for money to conduct a massive educational campaign advising Central American families against the dangers and false hopes of this journey. The journey is, indeed, dangerous. They come on foot. They come by car. They ride the tops of a train that is referred to as The Beast. There was one little girl who I spoke to with Secretary Johnson. She had stayed awake for 2 days on the rooftop of a train, terrified that she would fall off and be mutilated, just to be able to make it into the United States of America. And why did she make such a perilous, dangerous journey? It was because they were trying to recruit her into these violent and vile ways.

We need to make sure Central America, with our help, goes after the seven organized crime units that we know are sparking this, that are trying to recruit these kids; giving them false promises too, that if they come to this country, they will be able to get a free pass somehow for getting into this country. We need to be able to stop this and be able to deal with it in the most effective way.

The President's program actually does outline the money to be able to do that. When the children do come, as I said, while they are awaiting their legal status to be determined, they are placed in the hands of HHS. Now, HHS does not run group homes. HHS does not run foster care. HHS funds it, and they need to be able to turn to local communities to be able to have these children be able to stay.

I saw fantastic work being done while the children were being placed at Lackland Air Force Base and the social services were being run by—under contract of a faith-based organization—the Baptist church. I know the distinguished Presiding Officer knows a lot about human services. I myself am a social worker, and I will tell you that faith-based organization is really running a good program for these kids.

But we are running out of money. We need money for food and shelter for the children. We need money for the border agents. We need money for transportation to shelters and also transportation, when we can, returning these children home. We need money for immigration judges and legal services for the children to determine their asylum status, and, as I said, we need the muscular deterrence in the home country breaking up the organized gangs that then create the violence that then sets these children on this journey.

The best way to make sure the surge of children is stopped is not by harsher immigration laws. It is by making it hard on the drug dealers and the human traffickers, the smugglers, the coyotes. Because they are the ones who are the reason they are coming.

Looking at the data—looking at data—we see that these children are coming not only where there is high poverty, but that children are coming where there is a high level of crime, particularly homicide, murder, and other recruitment of children. These children are almost being recruited by child soldiers in their own country to engage in violent criminal activity.

So we need to be able to look at this emergency supplemental and be able to meet the human needs while the children are here, make sure we fund the judges, the immigration judges and the legal services, to determine their asylum status, and be able to take care of them.

Already, 60,000 unaccompanied children have come into our country during this last year. In the 2 weeks I toured the border, I saw young children as young as 5 with one instruction: Cross the border, turn yourself in, and try to get as safe as you can. Border agents find these children often dehydrated, malnourished, and usually a victim of some type of trauma. Also, they have heard false promises from the smugglers about what it will be when they come here.

These smugglers—as part of these dangerous gangs and cartels—see women and children as a commodity to be bought, sold, transported, as if they were cargo. Children leave these homes based on lies. They think they are coming to an area where they will never have to go home or that they will be safe. I hope we then pass this appropriations. I hope in passing the appropriations we will be able to protect the safety of the children, we determine their legal and asylum status, and we have this muscular deterrent strategy in the home country.

There are those who want to have a new immigration policy or want to repeal the George Bush law. I would caution that because, remember, our problem is not the children; our problem is what causes the children to come. We have to go after what causes the children to come; and that is the drug dealers, the smugglers, the coyotes, those who are engaging in such violent crime.

The host countries, along with Mexico, need to help deal with this, and we need to marshal our law enforcement resources to be able to help them do this. Now they say: Let's bring in the National Guard at the border. What is our National Guard going to do? When these little kids cross the Rio Grande, they are going to go right up to that soldier, put their arms around his or her leg, and say: I need to be safe. Can you help me? What is the National Guard going to do? It is not a border enforcement problem; it is a criminal gang problem in Central America.

So we need to be able to be sure we are targeting the right areas in order to solve this problem. The children are not the threats. They are coming here because they are threatened themselves. We need to meet these urgent humanitarian needs, and we need to focus on our hemisphere to break up the gangs and crime.

Later on today we are going to have a briefing for every single Senator so they can ask the questions about this situation. Who are the children? Why are they coming? What are their legal rights under the law? But how can we effectively deal with this children's march, where the children are in danger in their host country and on the long journey to this one?

We are also asking that this $3.7 billion be designated as an emergency.

There are those who will want to take from other domestic programs. I would caution that. In fact, I would object to the very idea. The President has said this is an emergency because under the Budget Control Act of 2011 it meets the criteria that it is sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and temporary, deals with the loss of life, property, or our national security interests. I think it meets that test. I do not want to take offsets from existing programs to do this. It is unexpected. It is significant. We can deal with it, but let's not do it at the expense of other programs designed to help the American family and the American middle class.

I know there are others who want to speak on this issue. I will have more to

say later, but for now let's examine the urgent supplemental and let's really solve the problem at the border and what causes it to be a problem for us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, let me start by thanking my colleague from Maryland for her leadership on the Appropriations Committee and her leadership on this difficult issue. She said something in caucus the other day that really struck me. She said: Every Senator has an opinion on this, but not every Senator has the facts. Facts matter. They make for good policy.

Last week I had the opportunity, along with Secretary Johnson, to visit a temporary facility for refugee mothers and their children that is in my home State of New Mexico. The holding area at this facility in Artesia, NM, is one of several ways that DHS is increasing its capacity to process the increasing number of families with children from Central America who are crossing our southwest border.

On Monday, 40 individuals were repatriated back to Honduras. It is reported that more mothers and their children will be sent back to their countries of origin.

While I was at this facility, I saw firsthand the remarkable interagency effort that it took to take a Federal law enforcement training center, a campus, and turn it into a safe and humane place for families to stay while their cases are being processed.

But that is not all I saw while I was there. I watched a young boy play soccer with his little brother, both of them clearly happy to be in the kind of secure environment where they could just be kids. I saw a lot of mothers. I saw mothers whose faces were worried, who reflected the clear concern about what the future would be for them and for their children. What I did not see at that facility—I did not see cartel mules. I did not see drug runners. I did not see criminals or gang members. Those were mothers and little kids. Most of those families come from one of the most violent regions in the world today.

This current crisis is of grave concern to all of us. I know I have heard from a number of my constituents who wanted to know what they can do to help. I have to give great credit to our local chamber of commerce in Artesia, NM, as they worked hard as they received hundreds of donations from compassionate New Mexicans across the State hoping to make a difference in these people's lives. They understand that this is first a humanitarian crisis. They also understand that we are a nation of laws, that our immigration system has been broken for a long time and needs to be fixed.

The Senate worked for months to address this, but the Republican-led House of Representatives refuses to even debate immigration reform, much less allow a vote on it. Instead, Republicans claim that the President's immigration policies, including deferred action for childhood arrivals—or DACA, as it is known—caused a crisis at the border. That could not be further from the truth. The increase in unaccompanied children started before President Obama created the DACA program 2 years ago. The United Nations High Commission on Refugees has documented an increased number of asylum seekers from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala since 2009—a full 5 years ago. What is more, children crossing the border would not be eligible for DACA. In fact, they would not be eligible for the Senate version of immigration reform.

These asylum seekers are not only fleeing to the United States but also to the other neighboring countries in the region. They are fleeing to Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize. In fact, those countries saw a 712-percent spike in asylum cases from El Salvador, from Honduras, and Guatemala from 2008 to 2013, further demonstrating that children are not coming to the United States to apply for DACA. They are coming because their lives are at risk back home.

In interviews with over 400 children, the United Nations High Commission on Refugees found that no less than 58 percent of them were forcibly displaced because they suffered or faced harm that indicated a potential or actual need for international protection—an increase of more than 400 percent from 2006.

Less than 1 percent of these kids spoke of immigration reform or some new program or policy as the basis for coming to the United States. In fact, out of the 404 children who were interviewed, there were only 4—4 children who expressed a reason for coming that related to some part of the U.S. immigration system.

The reality is, as we heard from Senator MIKULSKI, what is driving children to our borders is unimaginable violence, corruption, extreme poverty, and instability in their home countries.

This picture was taken in Tegucigalpa in Honduras. This is frankly an all-too-common sight in Honduras today. Not only is the poverty unimaginable, but the violence we have seen is like nothing in recent history. Honduras has now the world's highest murder rate, with over 90 murders per 100,000 persons annually. Last year approximately 1,000 young people under the age of 23 in Honduras were murdered—murdered in a nation of only 8 million, 1,000 young people.

In a report published by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, they found that 93 percent of crimes perpetrated against youth in Honduras go unpunished—completely unpunished.

The National Observatory of Violence reported that violent deaths of women increased by 246 percent between 2005 and 2012.

This is all the more unsettling to me because I know firsthand that Honduras did not always look this way. In the 1990s I traveled to Honduras with my wife Julie. We were on our honeymoon. We flew into San Pedro Sula. The only time I felt any fear was trying to drive in a city that moves a lot faster than I do when I try to drive on country roads in New Mexico. But we never had any fear for violence when we were in Honduras. We traveled around the country. We went to many places off the beaten path.

That is very different today. Today San Pedro Sula is a city synonymous with murder.

To understand just how bad it is, you can look at pictures like this one of literally body bags getting ready to go to mass graves from murders happening in these neighborhoods in San Pedro Sula. You can read a recent article in the New York Times by Frances Robles that tells the chilling story of Cristian, an 11-year-old sixth grader from Honduras who lost his father in March after he was robbed and murdered by gangs while working as a security guard protecting a pastry truck. It is kind of hard to imagine needing a security guard to protect a pastry truck. Three people he knows were murdered this year alone, and four others were gunned down on a nearby corner in the span of 2 weeks at the beginning of the year. A girl his age resisted being robbed of the sum of $5. She was clubbed over the head, dragged off by two men who cut a hole in her throat and stuffed her underwear in it and left her body in a ravine across the street from Cristian's house.

Then there is Anthony, a 13-year-old from Honduras, who disappeared from his gang-ridden neighborhood. His younger brother Kenneth hopped on his green bike to search for him, starting his hunt at a notorious gang hangout in the neighborhood. They were found within days of each other, both dead. Anthony, 13, and a friend had been shot in the head.

Kenneth, age 7, had been tortured and beaten with sticks and rocks. They were among seven children murdered in the La Pradera neighborhood of San Pedro Sula in April alone—in 1 month.

El Salvador and Guatemala are the world's fourth and fifth highest in murders. The Center for Gender and Refugee Studies found that in 2011, El Salvador had the highest rate of gender-motivated killings of women in the entire world. In Guatemala, the Department of State reports widespread human rights problems, including institutional corruption, particularly in the police, in judicial sectors, kidnapping, drug trafficking, execution, and often lethal violence against women.

We have a human crisis at our southern border that requires an immediate but compassionate response. Yet instead of supporting the supplemental which seeks to address the root causes of the crisis and protect these vulnerable children, Republicans are trying to use the crisis to promote fear and their border-enforcement-only agenda.

Recently, a Republican Governor suggested that the President send the National Guard to ''secure the border once and for all'' and that ''the border between the U.S. and Mexico is less secure today than at any time in the recent past.'' As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, facts are stubborn. This is simply not the case. In fact, the notion that lax border policies are somehow responsible for this latest crisis is not just a myth; it is a, well, full misrepresentation driven by politicians who would rather create a political issue than to solve a very real problem.

The border today is more secure than it has ever been. There are more Border Patrol agents on the ground. There are more resources. There is more technology deployed on the border than at any time in our Nation's history—at any time. In fiscal year 2012, the Federal Government spent almost $18 billion—$17.9 billion—on immigration enforcement. That is $3.5 billion more than the budgets of all the other Federal law enforcement agencies combined—$3.5 billion more than the FBI's budget, plus the DEA's budget, the ATF budget, plus the Secret Service, plus the U.S. Marshals Service. These resources have made a difference. From fiscal year 2009 to 2012, the Department of Homeland Security seized 71 percent more currency, 39 percent more narcotics, 189 percent more weapons along the southwest border as compared to the last 4 years of the Bush administration.

It is important to remember that this crisis from refugees in Central America is not about children and families sneaking across our border like criminals. As we heard from the Senator from Maryland, many of these refugees seek out the first Border Patrol agent they can find in order to turn themselves in. Many of these children have walked across the border or across the Rio Grande with identification literally safety-pinned to their shirts. But that image does not serve the political interests of those who prefer a border crisis to a refugee crisis.

Let's step back and remember that the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill more than a year ago now—a bill that included incredibly important provisions to further strengthen our border but that would also protect refugee children and crack down on the smugglers and the transnational criminal organizations that are at the root of the current crisis.

Notably, this bill was widely supported by both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate Chamber.

Public support and good economics have not been enough to convince the House leaders to hold a vote on immigration reform, but they cannot turn a blind eye to the current humanitarian crisis along our Nation's southern border.

Instead of attacking the President, Senate Republicans should work with them to address the issue, and they should demand that their colleagues in the House act to fix our broken immigration system.

Additionally, passing the $3.7 billion supplemental sends a clear signal that we are aggressively stemming the flow of children and families from Central America while continuing to treat these refugee children humanely and as required under the law. This situation is an emergency and we need emergency funding.

Our immigrant communities have helped to write the economic, social, and cultural history of America. I know this firsthand. My own father is an immigrant who came to this country as a boy from Nazi Germany in the 1930s.

As a nation we value the twin promises of both freedom and opportunity. Those ideals are important no matter where you are born.

The fact is, our immigration system is broken. Those of us who represent border communities understand the challenge we face, but there are solutions—solutions before us that are pragmatic, bipartisan, and uphold our American values.

I am familiar with the promise America represents for families. I know how hard immigrants work, how much they believe in this country, and how much they are willing to give back to this country.

A small group of faith leaders from New Mexico penned an op-ed in the Albuquerque Journal over the weekend. In sharing their thoughts on this humanitarian crisis they wrote:

> While the current situation raises the issues in powerful ways, expressing hatred toward, fear of, or anger with women and children serves nothing to resolve national debate. Rather, it engenders a destructive spirit of mistrust. Let us seek to understand the immigrant's reasons for coming and to work collaboratively for just and reasonable immigration reform.

I could not agree more with these faith leaders.

It is time to fix our broken immigration system once and for all. Our short-term solution is to approve the President's emergency supplemental request now, and as part of our long-term solution we need House Republicans to put the Senate's immigration reform bill on the floor for a vote.

Our Nation will be the better for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. I rise today to speak about the ongoing humanitarian crisis on our southern border. I thank my colleagues, Senator HEINRICH and Senator MIKULSKI, for their eloquent words in speaking to this issue.

As a woman and as an immigrant, my heart breaks for these children. My mother fled Japan, where I was born. She fled out of desperation to escape a terrible marriage. I came with her to this country as a young girl, and I remember how uncertain I was about what was in store for me.

Although we came by boat in steerage, at least we traveled safely and together. We did not face the kind of danger as did these children who are risking everything to be here. Their journeys to our border are lined with smugglers and traffickers. Children are arriving injured and malnourished. Yet they continue to come, not only to the United States but to other nearby countries, fleeing their countries out of desperation.

These children don't care about the DREAM Act or the Senate immigration reform bill. They are terrified of the violence, abuse, and death in their home countries. Young girls, who represent about 40 percent of the children who arrived this year, often face sexual assault and rape.

Let me share some recent stories from young girls who are fleeing. One girl fled an area of El Salvador controlled by gangs. Her brother was killed for refusing to join a gang that tried to forcibly recruit him. She was raped by two men and became pregnant as a result. She fled El Salvador and was attacked on her journey to the United States.

Another girl was kidnapped by a gang in Honduras that attempted to traffic her into prostitution. She escaped and reported the kidnapping to the police. The gang then abducted her again, raped her, and burned her with cigarettes. She fled to the United States and is seeking asylum.

Yet another girl fled El Salvador when she was 8 years old. Gang members had kidnapped her two older sisters. The girl's mother did not want her 8-year-old daughter to suffer the same fate, so she arranged for her daughter to be brought to the United States.

These are horrific stories. It is clear that something needs to be done.

I have worked with my colleague Senator MENENDEZ to introduce a comprehensive plan to address this issue. The plan aims to curtail trafficking and smuggling, contain the violence and discord in Central America, and ensure that these children have access to legal assistance and are in safe and humane conditions when they arrive.

This Friday I will also take some of my colleagues to McAllen and San Antonio, TX, to view facilities housing these children during the processing and removal process. We will see for ourselves the conditions that these children are in and meet with officials and leaders on the ground.

This crisis clearly demonstrates that inaction is not an option with regard to these children.

I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental funding needed for our country to meet their humanitarian needs. We have a responsibility to ensure that those in our custody are treated according to our values as a nation, and the President's request will allow our government to keep these commitments.

I would also urge my colleagues to reject the idea that the solution is to speed up the deportation of these children back to the dangerous conditions

they fled. Stripping away basic legal protections for children in these terrible situations will not solve this problem. As Senator HEINRICH so eloquently showed us, the conditions in their home countries are truly horrific.

To really address this situation, we need to do more work with our partners in the region to reduce violence and improve opportunities in their home countries. We must provide resources so that we can safely, fairly, and timely process these children, including asylum determination, as provided by law.

We should all look to our conscience in seeking a path forward. Surely we can do better than sending these children back to the horrific conditions that they are escaping. Out of sight is not out of mind. That is not what our country stands for.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the President's supplemental request, and I urge my colleagues to work together toward resolving the underlying process of this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am very honored to follow my colleague from Hawaii and her eloquent and powerful remarks, as well as the Presiding Officer from New Mexico, who knows much firsthand about this issue and has really been a leader in this body for me and others. I thank the Presiding Officer for that leadership.

My view of this issue concerning the tens of thousands of young children making the difficult and dangerous journey to the United States from lands where they face violence and oppression is shaped by my meeting with some of them in my home State of Connecticut.

I had the opportunity to do so recently on a number of occasions, and it has deeply affected my own approach because what I have seen in them really inspires me. It inspires me because I understand better the reasons they have come here. The reasons they have come relate to the violence, the threat of torture, and the oppression they see in the lands they are leaving. They are coming here, many of them, for family reunification.

What struck me in speaking with these young children is they are coming here to reunify with relatives: their moms and dads, their aunts and uncles. They have come to be with members of their family and, of course, to seek education. They desperately want to go to school, and they want the opportunity simply for the freedom they see this country as epitomizing and embodying, the beacon of opportunity that drew so many of our forebears to this country, the lamp that is lit above the harbor of New York symbolically for all Americans, and the ideals this country embodies for the world. That is the reason people come and why our relatives, our own families came—one generation ago for me and perhaps more generations ago for others here.

So what we face is, in fact, a humanitarian crisis. It is a refugee crisis of children seeking asylum, family reunification, and escape from oppression, torture, and death in intolerable conditions in their home countries.

There is gang warfare that is a result of drug trading, pushed from Colombia to Central America to service better their customers in the United States. Their markets are here. This country provides the demand that fuels the trade—not only this country, of course, but all around the world.

But these children are the innocent victims of the warfare—gang warfare, market warfare that is fueled by a drug trade they have nothing to do with inciting or spurring. They are truly innocent victims.

The values this country embodies that drew them and drew our ancestors and our forebears to come are the values we must now remain true to serving. Among them is the ideal of due process and fairness to justice.

To say simply that we will deport all of them en masse, ask no questions, and put them on a bus really is a disservice to those values and ideals that this Nation embodies for the world—a source of our power in dealing with the world. Our power is not the result only of our air superiority, our great naval fleet, our brave warriors on the ground. It is truly the ideal that our military service and our military might serves to safeguard around the world.

Speaking of security, safety, and safeguarding our Nation, our border is secure, more secure than ever before—perhaps not perfectly secure—and more has to be done for border security, which immigration reform would help to accomplish.

The President has utilized an unprecedented level of resources in terms of both boots on the ground and advanced technology. There is no evidence to indicate any breakdown in border security.

What we have on our border is not a situation involving huge numbers of immigrants slipping into this country surreptitiously; they are coming here openly, surrendering themselves to authorities or being immediately apprehended by law enforcement.

This situation is entirely consistent with a fully effective border security apparatus.

If the current situation were caused by lack of policies in the United States, we would expect to see a large number of immigrant children only in this country. After all, the United States' policies apply only to the United States' borders but, in fact, that is not what we see. There are children seeking asylum and refugee status in many other Western Hemisphere countries—including some of the poorest in the world—a documented 712 percent increase in asylum seekers from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala since 2009.

We have seen no increase in illegal immigration from Mexico, which also would be happening if it were simply lax border security. Any way you look at the situation, the facts simply do not support the theory that America's border is in crisis. It is Central America that is in crisis—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras are the sources of this humanitarian crisis.

Rolling back the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act will not solve a border problem and it will not uphold the values and ideals of this Nation. The protections of this law in fact are central to ensuring the United States of America does not send innocent children into situations where they would be harmed and killed.

So I would oppose a wholesale rollback of this law. We have to make sure that we do what is right and get this situation right, because the stakes are so very high. No one in this Chamber wants to be responsible for sending one child to their death because we failed to consider the complexity and provide the humanity this situation demands.

Not only would rolling back the Trafficking Victim Protection Reauthorization Act do harm—and we must first do no harm—but it would also hurt law enforcement. This act helps enforcement and our law enforcement authorities to gain crucial actionable intelligence about trafficking. This law reflects the fact that I learned during my law enforcement career, one of the keys to putting criminals behind bars is working closely with victims. In fact, victims are essential, their cooperation is vital to making the law enforceable and making sure it is enforced.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act encourages victims of trafficking to turn themselves in and cooperate with Border Patrol agents, and provide U.S. law enforcement with the information they need. They are not interested in arresting children. They want to arrest the traffickers, the drug lords, the top of the chain. That is so very important for our colleagues to understand.

The surge in drug trafficking and drug-related violence that has turned so many communities into war zones is driven by those gangs in Central America that are in turn driving also the flood of young children to this country. We have this crisis in common with them. It is a humanitarian crisis and a law enforcement challenge. Let us move toward immigration reform which will help to address that crisis by increasing border security, by enabling millions of people now in the shadows to have a path to earned citizenship, to make sure our values and ideals are upheld by the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

I thank all my colleagues who spoke today, and most especially thank Senator LEAHY and Senator FEINSTEIN for their decades of committed work on this issue. I look forward to working with them, the Presiding Officer, and

the majority leader, who has led this Chamber and this Nation so well on this issue.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2244

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 2014, the Senate proceed to consideration of S. 2244, as provided under the previous order; that the debate time with respect to the bill and consideration of amendments in order to the bill be modified as follows: Coburn No. 3549, 30 minutes equally divided; Vitter No. 3550, 20 minutes equally divided; Flake No. 3551, 10 minutes equally divided; and Tester No. 3552, 30 minutes equally divided; further, that any remaining time until 12 noon be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at noon the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the amendments as provided under the previous order; that upon disposition of the Tester amendment, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; further, that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote and all after the first vote be 10 minutes, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JULIE E. CARNES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed now to executive session to consider Calendar No. 849.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Martin Heinrich.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ANDRE BIROTTE, JR. TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 851.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk that I ask to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Claire McCaskill, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROBIN L. ROSENBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 852.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Claire McCaskill, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. DEGRAVELLES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. REID. I now to move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 854.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk that I ask the Chair to have reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Martin Heinrich.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSUMER CHOICE AND WIRELESS COMPETITION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed commonsense legislation to help promote consumer choice and competition in the wireless phone marketplace. This legislation was a bipartisan effort to restore consumers' rights to unlock their cell phones so they can take their phones to the wireless network of their choice. Last year, over 110,000 consumers signed a petition calling for cell phone unlocking to be permitted. Their call was heard. I am pleased that the Senate has acted to pass this commonsense, bipartisan legislation that I authored with Senator GRASSLEY to promote consumer choice.

Once every 3 years, the Library of Congress undertakes a rulemaking under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, DMCA, to establish exemptions to the DMCA's prohibition on circumventing technological measures that control access to copyrighted works. From 2006 to 2012, the Library granted an exemption for cell phone unlocking that allowed users to change wireless providers after complying with their contracts. In its 2012 rulemaking, the Library did not recognize an exemption for new cell phones purchased after January 26, 2013. This act reinstates the Librarian's prior determination, ensuring that consumers will be able to use their phones on the network of their choice after satisfying their contracts without running afoul of our copyright laws.

The act takes two further steps to benefit consumers. First, it ensures that consumers who lack the technological savvy to unlock their phones themselves can authorize others to do the unlocking for them, in order for the owner or their family member to connect to a chosen wireless network. Second, in recognition of the growing importance to consumers of other wireless devices, such as tablets, the act directs the Librarian of Congress to determine whether such devices should also be eligible for unlocking. That determination will be part of the Librarian's next triennial rulemaking under the DMCA, which is set to begin later this year.

This legislation addresses the specific question of permitting consumers to unlock their cell phones to use on their chosen network consistent with the terms of their contract. The legislation creates no new obligations for cell phone manufacturers or wireless carriers, such as how a carrier may choose to process unlocking requests or provide unlocking codes. While there are larger ongoing debates about the DMCA, as well as other aspects of phone unlocking, those issues are not addressed by the bill. The bill takes a narrow, targeted approach to protect consumer choice and promote competition in the wireless industry.

I thank the Judiciary Committee ranking member, Senator GRASSLEY, and our other bipartisan cosponsors for working with me on this bill. I also thank the Republican and Democratic leadership of the House Judiciary Committee, who are continuing to work with us on this effort. I look forward to prompt consideration of the bill by the House and to the President signing it into law.

COLOMBIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on June 15, 2014, President Juan Manuel Santos was elected to a second term as Colombia's President. This is not only a tribute to President Santos, who had staked his presidency on a courageous and risky peace initiative with the FARC who have waged a 30-year guerrilla war against the government, but also to the Colombian people.

There was every reason to believe that if President Santos' opponent, Óscar Iván Zuluaga, had won the election the peace negotiations would have been abandoned. Mr. Zuluaga had the strong backing of former President Uribe, whose aggressive leadership style and emphasis on security contributed to significant battlefield advances against the FARC, but his administration was plagued by scandal and human rights abuses. He has been a vociferous critic of President Santos and the peace negotiations. Instead, the Colombian people wisely recognized that the path to a more prosperous, secure country is through a peace process that addresses the underlying causes of the armed conflict, not an open-ended civil war fueled by cocaine that has already claimed countless innocent lives, uprooted millions of people, and impeded foreign investment.

I know from my own conversations with Members of Congress that President Santos has the support of people here of both parties. Since 2000, the Congress has supported billions of dollars in aid for social and economic development, counternarcotics, military, and humanitarian programs in Colombia. While there have been disagreements in some areas, particularly the slow pace of Colombia's justice system in holding accountable members of the security forces and paramilitaries who have been implicated in massacres of civilians and other human rights crimes, our support for Colombia has remained strong.

Colombia's greatest resource is its remarkable people. It is no wonder that Colombia, despite its many challenges, has remained a vibrant democracy while the governments of neighboring Venezuela and Ecuador have been dominated by messianic leaders who have systematically dismantled the institutions of democracy and a free press.

But another of Colombia's unique features is its biological and cultural diversity. The country is not only home to more species of flora and fauna than practically any other country in the world, it is also inhabited by a multitude of indigenous groups who speak many languages and live in various stages of isolation.

Many of us have visited Cartagena and Bogota, but I suspect few people here are aware that Colombia boasts one of the hemisphere's most extensive systems of national parks. They range from Caribbean islands and coral reefs, to glacier-covered mountain peaks, semi-arid desert, and tropical rainforest with dramatic rock outcroppings and cascading waterfalls. The variety of Colombia's species of birds alone dwarfs that of most countries.

I mention this to pay tribute to President Santos who has been a strong supporter of Colombia's national parks and indigenous reserves,

and Julia Miranda who has ably led the National Park Service with tireless energy and unwavering commitment for a decade.

I also want to commend President Santos for his decision last week to protect the Estrella Fluvial de Infrida under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. This is one of the most important reserves of fresh water in the world, covering an area larger than Florida's Everglades. It is home to 415 of Colombia's bird species and 470 fish species, so this designation will play a crucial role in protecting Colombia's biodiversity for future generations.

Coupled with last year's doubling in size of the extraordinary Chiribiquete National Park, these steps to protect Colombia's natural environment will be even more important if a peace agreement is signed that ushers in a period of greater security. While Colombia's oil and coal reserves are finite and their extraction can cause lasting social and environmental harm, Colombia's national parks offer limitless ecotourism potential that over the long term can bring far greater benefits to the country.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE CENTENNIAL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there is no shortage of questions facing Congress today, and when Members and their staffs need additional information or detailed research on these complex topics, we often turn to the dedicated analysts at the Congressional Research Service, CRS. Today marks the 100th anniversary of CRS, and in the last century it has grown to become one of the most valued resources on Capitol Hill.

Informed decisions are better decisions for the American people and for the Nation. The Congressional Research Service provides research materials, historical snapshots, and confidential memoranda that help Members of Congress and their staffs prepare for debates on vital—and sometimes historic—issues. The office also provides often insightful briefings for Members of Congress and their staffs. Publicly, the office provides summaries of proposed legislation, available through the useful Thomas.gov website. In certain instances, the CRS provides useful research tools which Members are able to make available to the public.

One such example was a report that the Congressional Research Service produced earlier this year at my request. Vermont is wrestling with how to effectively combat opiate abuse in our very rural State. Our State has taken a community-based approach to the issue, involving not only law enforcement and health providers, but also faith leaders, local officials, business owners, and nonprofit advocacy groups. In March, I was pleased to take the Senate Judiciary Committee to Vermont to hear firsthand how these approaches are having an impact in addressing addiction in the State. But equally important to Vermont is knowing how other States are dealing with heroin and opioid abuse. The Congressional Research Service prepared a useful document, ''Prevention and Treatment of Heroin and Other Opioid Abuse in the States,'' which helped illustrate how other States are dealing with addiction.

Analysts for CRS include subject matter experts in such issue areas as American law; domestic social policy; foreign affairs; defense and trade; government and finance and resources; and science and industry. I have in the past supported efforts to make many of the reports produced by the CRS available to the public. It is an effort I continue to support. I believe students, researchers, and our constituents would benefit from access to this useful information.

In the 100 years since Congress established the Legislative Reference Service, the small office has evolved into the Congressional Research Service of today, which encompasses a staff of 600 analysts, lawyers, information professionals, and management and infrastructure support staff. On the occasion of its 100th anniversary, I thank the dedicated staff of the Congressional Research Service—both past and present—for their public service and commitment to fulfilling the office's core value of providing objective and nonpartisan evaluations of policy matters to Congress.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the Congressional Research Service, CRS. The CRS is celebrating its centennial this week.

Established as the Legislative Reference Service in 1914, the CRS has been assisting Members of Congress in their legislative work by providing reference information and nonpartisan policy analysis for 100 years.

I wish to thank the diligent and professional staff of the CRS that provide an invaluable service to Congress.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, allow the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and levels for a number of deficit-neutral reserve funds. These reserve funds were incorporated into the Bipartisan Budget Act by reference to S. Con. Res. 8, the Senate-passed budget resolution for 2014. Among these sections is a reference to section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, which establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance. The authority to adjust enforceable levels in the Senate for terrorism risk insurance is contingent on that legislation not increasing the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2019 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2024.

I find that S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, as reported on June 23, 2014, fulfills the conditions of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance. Therefore, pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of H. J. Res. 59, I am adjusting the budgetary aggregates, as well as the allocation to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the revisions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

$s in millions	2015	2015–19	2015–24
Current Budgetary Aggregates:*			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	2,940,093	n/a	n/a
Outlays	3,004,206	n/a	n/a
Revenue	2,533,388	13,882,333	31,202,135
Adjustments Made Pursuant to Sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act:**			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	120	n/a	n/a
Outlays	120	n/a	n/a
Revenue	0	1,770	4,000
Revised Budgetary Aggregates:			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	2,940,213	n/a	n/a
Outlays	3,004,326	n/a	n/a
Revenue	2,533,388	13,884,103	31,206,135

n/a = Not applicable. Appropriations for fiscal years 2016–2024 will be determined by future sessions of Congress and enforced through future Congressional budget resolutions.

*The levels for ''Current Budgetary Aggregates'' include a disaster cap adjustment made on 6/16/2014 for the Committee on Appropriations.

**Adjustments made pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporate by reference section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 319 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

$s in millions	Committee on Banking. Housing, and Urban Affairs		
	Current Allocation	Adjustments*	Revised Allocation
Fiscal Year 2015:			
Budget Authority	24,537	120	24,657
Outlays	5,071	120	5,191
Fiscal Years 2015–2019:			
Budget Authority	114,495	1,690	116,185
Outlays	−4,264	1,690	−2,574
Fiscal Years 2015–2024:			
Budget Authority	206,853	3,540	210,393
Outlays	−56,229	3,540	−52,689

*Adjustments made pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporate by reference section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 319 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SECOND LIEUTENANT JERED W. EWY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of a remarkable young man, Army 2LT Jered W. Ewy. Along with one other soldier, Jered died July 29, 2011, of injuries he sustained when his unit was attacked with improvised explosive devices in the town of Janak Kheyl, Paktia Province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

After graduating from Putnam City North High School, Jered enlisted in the Army Rangers in 1998 and was one of the first on the ground in Afghanistan after the tragic events of September 11, 2001. He served three tours of duty and then joined the Oklahoma National Guard in 2003 and served as an instructor.

While serving in the National Guard, Jered attended the University of Central Oklahoma pursuing a bachelor's degree in criminal justice. ''What I wanted him to do was take the degree and get into law enforcement with the Department of Justice,'' his father, John Ewy said. ''He turned it down because he missed the camaraderie.''

While attending school he taught gymnastics in Edmond, OK. Although he was very involved in the community and truly enjoyed coaching the kids, ''Gym was just kind of a side job while he could finish up school,'' added Dena Edwards. ''I think the military was pretty much where his heart lies.''

In January 2011 he graduated from Officer Candidate School and was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 179th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma Army National Guard. He deployed to Afghanistan in June 2011.

''This loss of life has shaken every member of the Oklahoma National Guard to their core,'' said MG Myles L. Deering, Adjutant General for Oklahoma. ''We have lost two very brave men who once raised their hands and took an oath to defend our nation. They courageously gave everything they had to ensure our freedom and safety and their sacrifice will not be forgotten.''

''Jered was a man of integrity, discipline and honor who put everyone else first,'' family members wrote in his obituary. ''He cared deeply about the men he served with but his true passion in his life was his wife Megan and infant daughter Kyla.''

On August 11, 2011, the family held church services at Henderson Hills Baptist Church in Edmond, OK.

He is survived by his wife Megan of Edmond, daughter Kyla, mother Martha Nelson of Edmond, father and stepmother John and Ann Ewy of Moore, grandmother Harriet Ewy, siblings, Penny Clark and her husband Rob of Moore, Michelle Davis and her children Hayden, Colton and Cody, and Chad Nelson of Edmond, and many uncles and cousins.

Today we remember Army 2LT Jered W. Ewy, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT ANTHONY DEL MAR PETERSON

Mr. President, it is my honor to also honor the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Anthony Del Mar Peterson, of Chelsea, OK who died on August 4, 2011, serving our nation in Paktya province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Peterson was assigned to B Company, 1st Battalion, 279th Infantry, 45th Brigade Combat Team, OK Army National Guard.

Sergeant Peterson died of wounds suffered during a dismounted patrol when a group of insurgents attacked his unit with small arms fire in the Zurmat district of Paktya province, Afghanistan. Anthony had previously been deployed to Afghanistan in 2006–2007.

My heartfelt prayers go out to Dakota Justice Peterson, the young son Sergeant Peterson left behind. I remain confident he will grow to learn of his father's heroism; and pray the honor of his father may be carried with pride and cultivate in him, the character of his father.

Upon hearing of Sergeant Peterson's death, MG Myles Deering, the Adjutant General for Oklahoma stated, ''Oklahoma has lost another brave son. Sergeant Peterson was an exceptional Soldier who worked tirelessly to protect the values that we as Americans hold close to our hearts.''

Sergeant Peterson has also been described as an excellent non-commissioned officer and a committed soldier. Another friend has said that he will remember his zest for life, and his passion to lead others to Christ.

Born December 8, 1986 in Sacramento, CA, Anthony graduated from Chelsea High School in 2005 and Rogers State University in Claremore, OK in 2008. He was active in Campus Crusade for Christ, Baptist Collegiate, Rescue (Outreach Program), and Stop Child Trafficking, OATH.

He enjoyed hiking, camping, canoeing, hunting, and spending time with his family and friends. The most important things in his life were: God, family, and his country. Anthony's favorite quote was, ''Come home with your shield—or on it.''

Anthony is survived by his son, Dakota Justice Peterson of Owasso, parents, Garth and Terra Peterson of Owasso, siblings: Robert Edward Peterson, and Brittany Nicole Louise Peterson both of Owasso, grandparents: Ed and Gail Peterson of Chelsea, Paula and Richard Jones of Post Falls, ID, Les Marubashi of Chelsea, and Toni and Frank Trejo of Coquille, OR, nephew, Carter Myles Thomas of Owasso, and numerous extended family members who loved him.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Anthony's family. He lived a life of love for his son, family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

ARMY SERGEANT MYCAL L. PRINCE

Mr. President, I am also honored to remember Army SGT Mycal L. Prince. Sergeant Prince was tragically killed in action on September 15, 2011, in Saygal Valley, Laghman Province, Afghanistan when enemy forces attacked his unit with rocket-propelled grenades and small arms fire.

Mycal was born July 16, 1983, in Chickasha, OK, to Harold and Arnetta—Schoolfield—Prince. After graduating from Ninnekah High School in 2001, he completed cleet training and served as a police officer in Rush Springs for 3 years. On October 25, 2001, he married Surana Smith in Chickasha, and they later moved to Minco in May 2009 where he served as a police officer with the K–9 Unit for 2 years.

Minco Police Chief Phil Blevins said, ''He was one of the most professional and squared away young men I've ever met. He had things together in his family life, in his professional life. It's unbelievable for a man who is 28 how mature he was in all areas of his life.''

Mycal was a member of Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 179th Infantry, Oklahoma National Guard. He deployed to Afghanistan for his third tour on July 29, 2011.

''Sgt. Prince served his nation and this great state for more than a decade with honor and distinction,'' MG Myles L. Deering, Oklahoma's Adjutant General, said in a statement. ''He joined the Guard five days after his 17th birthday. I think that says a lot about the kind of man Sgt. Prince was. He deployed to help the people of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and went to Iraq in 2008. He could have gotten out of the service, but he chose to stay and serve his country.''

Mycal was preceded in death by his father, Harold Prince, one child, and his paternal and maternal grandparents. He is survived by his wife Surana of Minco, two daughters, Raelynn and Mycaela of Minco, mother, Arnetta Prince of Stonewall, sister, Leslie Dickenson and husband Wade of Stonewall, sister, Kathy Prince of Stonewall, and Cody Prince as well as many nieces, nephews, relatives, and friends.

Funeral services with full military honors were held on September 26, 2011, at Bridge Assembly of God Church in Mustang, OK. Mycal was laid to rest in Bradley Cemetery in Bradley, OK.

Today we remember Army SGT Mycal L. Prince, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

RECOGNIZING THE WAYNE FAMILY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished Wayne family legacy in Louisiana. On April 29, 2014, Guinness World Records officially recognized the Wayne family as having the most family members to graduate from Grambling State University.

Beginning in the 1940s, a total of 86 descendants of the Wayne family have attended Grambling State University. More than five generations of this Marion, LA family have studied at this storied institution and pursued lasting careers as military administrators and officers, doctors, lawyers, professors, professional athletes, and more. Through their years of service, this family has created enduring changes in a wide breadth of research and direction to impact and improve the lives of all those within their communities.

The Wayne family sets the Guinness World Record for ''Most family members to graduate from the same university'' with 40 approved relatives from the Wayne record. This outstanding accomplishment is a testament to the family's unparalleled devotion to education and to one of Louisiana's Historically Black College and Universities, Grambling State University. The continued commitment of this proud Louisiana family sets a new standard of both professional and educational aspiration and leaves a lasting legacy of achievement for generations to come.

Among this family's graduates of Grambling State University are: Alma McElroy Andrews, descendent of Matilda Wayne McElroy; Gloria Marie Brown, descendent of Ida Wayne Rivers; Claudine Williams, Dossie Roger Williams Jr., Shelia E. Williams, Verjanis Andrews Peoples, Stevie Andrews, Tjuana T. Williams, and Marcus D. Andrews, descendants of King Wayne; Rose Wayne, Ronald Wayne, Patricia Wayne Williams, and Stephanie Williams, descendants of John Wayne Sr; Ellis D. Wayne, LaJeane Holley and Mary Will Johnikin, descendants of Moses Wayne; Shirley Wayne, Ralph Wayne, and Larry Wayne, descendants of William Thomas Wayne, Sr.; Hattie Wayne, Donald Wayne Tatum, Saundra Tatum, Rashia Tatum, Jr., Renee Tatum, Michael Tatum, Christopher Tatum, Dawn Michelle Tatum, Nicholas Tatum, Kevin Parks, Cathy Denise Wasson Conwright, and Veronica Lee, descendants of Sandy Wayne, Sr.; John Earl Ellis, Willie Raymond Ellis, and Marcia N. Ellis, descendants of Sam Wayne; and Leola Wayne Taylor, Willie B. Wayne, Albert Jackson, Debra Jackson Gilliard, Margaret Jackson Riley, and DaRandall D. Riley, descendants of Willie Wayne. This family has promoted a continued dedication to education and accomplishment for all those who are a part of the communities that their exceptional careers have impacted.

This family has been and continues to be an inspiration to all those who have benefitted from the contributions the Wayne descendants have made. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the incredible legacy of the Wayne family at Grambling State University, as well as their lasting impact throughout the State of Louisiana and the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FAYETTE COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State, and it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I wish to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Fayette County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Fayette County worth over $4.7 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $9 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be the implementation of a downtown geothermal project through Main Street Iowa dollars, as well as funding to rehabilitate the Bus Barn building in West Union.

Among the highlights: Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This is not just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like West Union to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Fayette County has earned $150,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Fayette County has received $2,145,041 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Fayette County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $216,050.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans

that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Fayette County has received more than $3.2 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to Statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Fayette County's fire departments have received over $1.5 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Fayette County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Fayette County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Fayette County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

JACKSON COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State, and it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Jackson County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Jackson County worth over $5.5 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $16 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memories of working together have to include allocating more than $4.9 million to rehabilitate Lock and Dam 12 on the Mississippi River at Bellevue. According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, each lock and dam produces $1 billion per year in transportation cost savings to ship goods and raw materials, keeping the economy in Iowa moving.

Among the highlights: School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Jackson County has received $642,107 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Jackson County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $82,500.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Jackson County has received over $11 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Jackson County has received more than $1.4 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Jackson County's fire departments have received over $1 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to

contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Jackson County, both those with and without disabilities, and they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Jackson County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Jackson County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 306. An act for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic.

H.R. 3086. An act to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 697. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 306. An act for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2609. A bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5021. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, 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–6440. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael T. Flynn, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6441. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twenty-nine (29) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6442. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General William L. Shelton, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6443. A communication from the Chief Information Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Department of Defense Next Generation Host-Based CyberSecurity System''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6444. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6445. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessment of Fees'' (RIN1557–AD82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6446. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA): Changes to the Section 8 Tenant-Based Voucher and Section 8 Project-Based Voucher Programs'' (RIN2577–AC83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6447. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's management reports and statements on system of internal controls for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6448. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December 31, 2013 and 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6449. A communication from the Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of the U.S. Breeding Population of the Wood Stork From Endangered to Threatened'' (RIN1018–AX60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6450. 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 ''Final Policy on Interpretation of the Phrase 'Significant Portion of Its Range' in the Endangered Species Act's Definitions of 'Endangered Species' and 'Threatened Species'''' (RIN1018–AX49; 0648–BA78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6451. A communication from the Branch Chief, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Yellow-Billed Parrot With Special Rule, and Correcting the Salmon-Crested Cockatoo Special Rule'' (RIN1018–AY28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6452. A communication from the Chief of the Permits and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Permits; Extension of Expiration Dates for Double-Crested Cormorant Depredation Orders'' (RIN1018–AX82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6453. A communication from the Regulations Specialist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—2014–2015 and 2015–2016 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations'' (RIN1018–AY85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6454. 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; Endangered Species Status for Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog and Northern Distinct Population Segment of the Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog, and Threatened Species Status for Yosemite Toad'' (RIN1018–AZ21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6455. A communication from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–6456. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge'' (RIN0960–AH67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6457. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidelines for the Streamlined Process of Applying for Recognition of Section 501(c) (3) Status'' ((RIN1545–BM07) (TD 9674)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6458. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Mid-Session Review Budget of the U.S. Government Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget.

EC–6459. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6460. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133E–4.) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6461. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133B–8.) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6462. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at Nuclear Metals, Inc. in West Concord, Massachusetts, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6463. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6464. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6465. A communication from the National Chairman, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports entitled ''2013 Annual Report of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps'' and ''2013 Financial Statement of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–6466. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A Helicopters (Type certificate currently held by Agusta Westland S.p.A) (Agusta)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0336)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6467. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0984)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6468. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airplanes Originally Manufactured by Lockheed for the Military as Model P–3A and P3A Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1073)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6469. 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–2013–0368)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6470. 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, Inc. (Bell) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0697)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6471. 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–2013–1031)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6472. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0938)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6473. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0334)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6474. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam srl Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0156)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6475. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1056)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6476. 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–2014–0281)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6477. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0141)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6478. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2008–1088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6479. 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 & Co KG Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0882)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6480. 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–2014–0340)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6481. 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–2013–0574)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6482. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiebiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa 'PZL–Bielsko' Model SZD–50–3 'Puchacz' Sailplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0180)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6483. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A (Agusta) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0379)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6484. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0378)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6485. 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, Inc. (BHTI) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0415)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6486. 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; Redmond, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0171)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6487. 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; Newnan, GA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6488. 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; Elkin, NC'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0046)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6489. 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; Mineral Point, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0914)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6490. 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; Conway, AR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0178)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6491. 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; Crandon, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6492. 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; Bois Blanc Island, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0986)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6493. 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 W Airspace; Taylor, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0013)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6494. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments No. (514)'' (RIN2120–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6495. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (49); Amdt. No. 3593'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6496. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (126); Amdt. No. 3592'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6497. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (195); Amdt. No. 3594'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6498. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (38); Amdt. No. 3591'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6499. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (FCC 14–54)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6500. A communication from the Associate Managing Director-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Proposed Amendments to the Service Rules Governing Public Safety Narrowband Operations in the 769–775/799–805 MHz Bands'' ((FCC 13–40) (WT Docket No. 96–86)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6501. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS–2014–0907); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–303. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California calling upon the Congress and the President of the United States to stabilize the federal Highway Trust Fund by developing a long-term plan to promote adequate federal Highway Trust Fund revenues; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 24

Whereas, A safe, efficient, and reliable surface transportation network is vital to California's future economic growth, quality of life, and security; and

Whereas, Inadequate investment in California's highway and bridge infrastructure system is having a dramatic impact on the citizens of California, causing them to spend too much time idling on increasingly congested roads and bridges rather than with their families; and

Whereas, The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21), that authorized the federal highway and public transportation programs, will expire September 30, 2014; and

Whereas, The federal Highway Trust Fund and its user fee-based revenue stream supports all federal investment in highway and bridge improvements and the vast majority of the federal public transportation program; and

Whereas, The federal Highway Trust Fund experienced revenue shortfalls in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2012 that created uncertainty about federal surface transportation investment commitments; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Transportation will begin slowing reimbursements to states for already approved federal-aid projects as early as July of this year to preserve a positive balance in the federal Highway Trust Fund; and

Whereas, The Congressional Budget Office reports the federal Highway Trust Fund will be unable to support any new highway or public transportation spending in the 2015 fiscal year absent congressional action to increase trust fund revenues; and

Whereas, Eliminating federal highway and public transportation investment in one year would threaten hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide and severely disrupt California's long-term transportation improvement plans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges timely action by the President and the Congress of the United States to stabilize the federal Highway Trust Fund by developing a long-term plan to promote adequate federal Highway Trust Fund revenues that achieves all of the following:

(a) Continues an appropriate role for the federal government in sustaining a viable national transportation system.

(b) Contributes to deficit reductions and economic growth.

(c) Ensures the integrity of the surface transportation program and resists funding diversions that have been harmful to public support.

(d) Allows the Congress to pass a reauthorization of the federal highway and public

transportation programs before MAP–21 expires; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM–304. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina urging the United States Congress to pass legislation to protect the Corolla wild horses so that they can survive as a free-roaming wild herd for future generations to enjoy; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1257

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses living along the Outer Banks of Currituck County, North Carolina, are descendants of horses brought to the Americas by Spanish explorers and colonists beginning in the 16th century; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses are known as Colonial Spanish Mustangs; and

Whereas, these Colonial Spanish Mustangs have played a significant role in the history and culture of North Carolina's coastal area for hundreds of years; and

Whereas, in 2009, the General Assembly adopted these Colonial Spanish Mustangs as the official horse of the State of North Carolina; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses freely roam 7,500 acres of public and private land in Currituck County; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses have been managed through a public-private partnership that includes representatives of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the State of North Carolina, Currituck County, and the Corolla Wild Horse Fund; and

Whereas, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is insisting that no more than 60 horses be allowed in the herd; and

Whereas, world-renowned genetic scientists have determined that a herd of at least 110 horses, with a target population of 120 to 130 horses is necessary to maintain the genetic viability of the Corolla herd; and

Whereas, 110 to 130 horses is well within the carrying capacity of the land the Corolla wild horses roam; and

Whereas, the Corolla wild horses are a critical component of the heritage and economy of Currituck County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives:

Section 1. This body urges Congress to pass legislation to protect the Corolla wild horses so that they can survive as a free-roaming wild herd for future generations to enjoy.

Section 2. The Principal Clerk shall transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and the members of the North Carolina Congressional delegation.

Section 3. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

POM–305. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts expressing its support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by certain individuals, and calling for the immediate and safe return of the girls; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, as many as 234 female students, the majority of whom are between 16 to 18 years of age, were kidnapped by armed men from the government girls secondary school in the Federal Republic of Nigeria on April 14, 2014 and efforts by the United States to aid in their rescue are underway;

Whereas, Militants burned down several buildings, then shot at soldiers and police who were guarding the school; and

Whereas, Public secondary schools in Nigeria have been subjected to many attacks in 2014, resulting in hundreds of students being killed; and

Whereas, the militant group known as Boko Haram has taken responsibility for this mass kidnapping; and

Whereas, United Nations has declared that girls' education is a major challenge in Nigeria and, according to the world economic forum's global gender gap index, Nigeria is ranked 106 out of 136 countries based on women's economic participation, educational attainment and political empowerment; and

Whereas, the United States Senate has affirmed that women and girls must be allowed to go to school without fear of violence and unjust treatment so that they can take their rightful place as equal citizens of and contributors to the world; and

Whereas, the Massachusetts Senate has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety, welfare and education of women and girls and to pursuing policies that guarantee the rights of women and girls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby expresses its strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the parents and families of the girls abducted by Boko Haram and calls for the immediate and safe return of the girls; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

POM–306. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to invoke the participation of the International Joint Commission under Article IX, Article X, or both, of the Boundary Waters Treaty to evaluate the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, and similar facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 151

Whereas, Ontario Power Generation is proposing to construct an underground, long-term burial facility for low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste at the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station. This site is less than a mile inland from the shore of Lake Huron; and

Whereas, Placing a permanent nuclear waste burial facility so dose to the Great Lakes shoreline is a matter of serious concern for the inhabitants of the Great Lakes states and provinces. A leak or breach of radioactivity from this waste facility could damage the ecology of the lakes. Tens of millions of United States and Canadian citizens depend on the lakes for drinking water, fisheries, tourism, recreation, and other industrial and economic uses; and

Whereas, Michigan recognizes the duty of the legislative branch of government to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of its citizens and the state's natural resources. Article IV, Section 50 of the Michigan Constitution authorizes the Legislature to regulate atomic energy in view of the safety and general welfare of the people. Article IV, Section 51 declares that the public health and general welfare of the people of the state are matters of primary public concern, while Article IV, Section 52 requires the Legislature to provide for the protection of the air, water, and other natural resources of the state from pollution, impairment, and destruction; and

Whereas, The Michigan Legislature has recognized the inherent dangers of siting a radioactive waste storage facility near the shores of the Great Lakes. Under Public Act No. 204 of 1987, the final siting criteria for a radioactive waste facility containing the same types of waste as would be stored at the proposed Ontario repository includes a prohibition on siting it within 10 miles of one of the Great Lakes, the Saint Mary's River, Detroit River, St. Clair River, or Lake St. Clair; and

Whereas, The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) is a binational agreement to address critical environmental health issues in the Great Lakes region, with the overall purpose of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Great Lakes. Article 6 of the GLWQA acknowledges the importance of anticipating, preventing, and responding to threats to the Great Lakes and recognizes that a nuclear waste facility sited close to the Greg Lakes shoreline could lead to a pollution incident or could have a significant cumulative impact on the waters of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas, The 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty recognizes the immense importance of the Great Lakes as a shared resource between the United States and Canada. The wisdom of the Treaty drafters is reflected in the creation of the International Joint Commission (IJC), composed of three members from the United States and three members from Canada, to act as impartial watchdogs over the boundary waters between the countries. Under Article IX of the Treaty, questions or matters of difference between the countries involving their rights, obligations, or interests along their common frontier may be referred to the IJC for examination and report, upon the request of either country. Under Article X, the IJC may be asked to make a binding decision on an issue of difference between the two countries, upon the consent and referral by both the United States and Canada; and

Whereas, The IJC has frequently been asked to weigh in on major topics of concern to the Great Lakes region. In 1912, a few years after the Treaty's ratification, the IJC was asked to examine and report on the extent, causes, and location of pollution in the boundary waters and to recommend remedies and pollution prevention strategies. In 1999, the IJC was asked to study the international export of bulk supplies of Great Lakes water. The IJC provides an objective and international forum to study Great Lakes issues that affect both countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to invoke the participation of the International Joint Commission under Article IX, Article X, or both, of the Boundary Waters Treaty to evaluate the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, and similar facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the other Great Lakes states and Canadian provinces to adopt appropriate regulations to protect the Great Lakes region from radioactive waste and to petition their respective federal governments to engage the IJC under Article IX, Article X, or both, of the Boundary Waters Treaty to evaluate the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, and similar facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Prime Minister of Canada and the Canadian Parliament to suspend the Joint Review Panel process convened by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission to decide whether to grant Ontario Power Generation a license to construct the underground nuclear waste repository so that it can receive input from the IJC, the Great Lakes Commission, and the state of Michigan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Canada, the United States Secretary of State, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, the Speaker of the Canadian Senate, the Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons, and the governors or premiers and the legislative majority leaders in Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Ontario, and Quebec.

POM–307. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that will lead to the recognition of World War II Coastwise Merchant Mariners as veterans of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1256

Whereas, during World War II, United States Merchant Mariners who served along the coastline of the United States, and were known as Coastwise Merchant Mariners, helped to transport materials, including food, clothing, and weapons, to members of the United States Armed Forces serving on three continents; and

Whereas, the Coastwise Merchant Mariners bravely performed their duties even as they were in danger of attack from German U-boats operating along our nation's coastal waters; and

Whereas, many of the Coastwise Merchant Mariners were elderly, handicapped, women, and underage children who stepped forward in the time of a national crisis to ensure that the members of the United States Armed Forces were sufficiently supplied as they fought enemy forces; and

Whereas, because of administrative rules and decisions made by the United States Navy, many Coastwise Merchant Mariners who served during World War II were not recognized as veterans and thus were not eligible for the veterans benefits they had earned; and

Whereas, in the years following World II, as a result of some changes in federal law and federal rules and regulations, some of the Coastwise Merchant Mariners previously denied veterans benefits were finally recognized as veterans and therefore entitled to the same benefits as other veterans of the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas, despite the past recognition of some Coastwise Merchant Mariners as veterans, as many as 30,000 Coastwise Merchant Mariners may never get that recognition due to the documentation required to prove their service during World War II; and

Whereas, through no fault of these courageous individuals, much of the documentation proving they served their country during World War II as Coastwise Merchant Mariners has been lost or destroyed or was never recorded; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives:

SECTION 1. The House of Representatives honors the brave men, women, and children who valiantly served our country as Coastwise Merchant Mariners during World War II.

SECTION 2. The House of Representatives urges Congress to do the following:

(1) Conduct congressional inquiries into (i) the lack of recognition given to the World War II Coastwise Merchant Mariners who were lost in action without having been recognized by our nation as veterans and (ii) the reason World War II Coastwise Merchant Mariners records that are known to exist have not been moved to the National Records Center for use by families and researchers in accordance with agreements between the National Archives and Records Administration and the Department of Defense.

(2) Enact legislation that expands the types of acceptable documentation that Coastwise Merchant Mariners may use to prove their service during World War II, and to thereafter require that those who can provide the documentation be finally recognized as veterans entitled to the accompanying benefits.

SECTION 3. The Principal Clerk shall transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and the Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the North Carolina Congressional delegation, and the news media of North Carolina.

SECTION 4. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

POM–308. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania expresging support for the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine, and calling on the United States and the European Union to continue to work together to support a peaceful resolution to the crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 284

Whereas, A democratic, prosperous and independent Ukraine is in the national interest of the United States; and

Whereas, Closer relations with the European Union (EU) through the signing of an Association Agreement will promote democratic values, good governance and economic opportunity in Ukraine; and

Whereas, Millions of Ukrainian citizens support closer relations with Europe and the signing of an Association Agreement; and

Whereas, The Government of Ukraine has declared integration with Europe a national priority and has made significant progress toward meeting the requirements for the Association Agreement; and

Whereas, Ukraine has the sovereign right to enter into voluntary partnerships of its choosing, in keeping with its interests; and

Whereas, Ukraine's closer relations with the EU do not threaten any other country and will benefit both Ukraine and its neighbors; and

Whereas, On November 21, 2013, following several months of intense outside pressure, Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych abruptly suspended negotiations on the Association Agreement one week before it was due to be signed at the EU's Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania; and

Whereas, This reversal of stated government policy precipitated demonstrations by hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian citizens in Kyiv as well as in cities throughout the country; and

Whereas, The demonstrators were overwhelmingly peaceful and have sought to exercise their constitutional rights to freely assemble and express their oppositions to President Yanukovych's decision, as well as their support for greater government accountability and closer relations with Europe; and

Whereas, On November 30, 2013, police violently dispersed peaceful demonstrators in Kyiv's Independence Square, resulting in many injuries and the arrest of several dozen individuals; and

Whereas, On December 9, 2013, police raided three opposition media outlets and the headquarters of an opposition party; and

Whereas, On December 11, 2013, despite President Yanukovych's statement the previous day that he would engage in talks with the opposition, police attempted to forcibly evict peaceful protesters from central locations in Kyiv; and

Whereas, United States, European and other leaders, as well as three former presidents of Ukraine, urged restraint, warned against the use of violence against peaceful protesters and called for dialogue with the opposition to resolve the current political and economic crisis; and

Whereas, On January 16, 2014, the Ukrainian parliament passed, and President Yanukovych signed, legislation which severely limited the right of peaceful protest, constrained freedom of speech and the independent media and unduly restricted civil society organizations; and

Whereas, The passage of these undemocratic measures and President Yanukovych's refusal to engage in substantive dialogue with opposition leaders precipitated several days of violence and resulted in several deaths and hundreds of injuries, as well as numerous allegations of police brutality; and

Whereas, In the face of spreading demonstrations, Ukrainian Government representatives and opposition leaders entered into negotiations which on January 28, 2014, resulted in the resignation of the Prime Minister and his cabinet and the repeal of most of the antidemocratic laws from January 16, 2014; and

Whereas, On February 20, 2014, Ukrainian security forces, including heavily armed snipers, fired on demonstrators in Kyiv, leaving dozens dead and the people of Ukraine reeling from the most lethal day of violence since the Soviet era, and many of President Yanukovych's political allies, including the major of Kyiv, resigned from his governing Party of Regions to protest the bloodshed; and

Whereas, On February 22, 2014, the Ukrainian parliament found President Yanukovych unable to fulfill his duties, exercised its constitutional powers to remove him from office and set an election for May 25, 2014, to select his replacement; and

Whereas, On March 2, 2014, Russian troops invaded the Ukrainian territory of Crimea, seizing control of the peninsula, border crossings, government and administrative buildings, key infrastructure and surrounding Ukrainian military bases; and

Whereas, The military intervention by the Russian Federation in Crimea is a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity; and

Whereas, On March 16, 2014, Crimea held a referendum on seceding from Ukraine and acceding to the Russian Federation, which violated the Ukrainian constitution, occurred under duress of Russian military intervention and was not recognized by the international community; and

Whereas, On March 20, 2014, the Russian parliament noted to annex Crimea and Russian President Putin signed the treaty of accession annexing Crimea to the Russian Federation; and

Whereas, On April 7, 2014, protesters occupied government buildings in Ukraine's eastern cities of Donetsk, Luhansk and Kharkiv; and

Whereas, On April 18, 2014, the United States, Russia, Ukraine and the European Union agreed at talks in Geneva on steps to de-escalate the crisis in eastern Ukraine; and

Whereas, On April 22, 2014, Ukraine's acting president ordered the relaunch of military operations against pro-Russian militants in the east after two men were found tortured to death in the Donetsk region; and

Whereas, On May 25, 2014, Ukraine held a presidential election, but most polling stations in the east remained closed; and

Whereas, Pedro Poroshenko was elected President and vowed to bring ''peace to a united and free Ukraine''; and

Whereas, The Senate greatly values the warm and close relationship the United States has established with Ukraine since that country regained its independence in 1991: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania express support for the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate call on the United States and the European Union to continue to work together to support a peaceful resolution to the crisis and to continue to support the desire of millions of Ukrainian citizens for closer relations with Europe through finalizing the signing of an Association Agreement, as well as for a democratic future; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate condemn the unprovoked and illegal Russian military seizure and annexation of the Ukrainian Crimea; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate urge the Government of Ukraine, Ukrainian opposition parties and all protesters to exercise the utmost restraint and avoid confrontation and call on the Government of the Ukraine to live up to its international obligations and respect and uphold the democratic rights of its citizens, including the freedom of assembly and expression, as well as the freedom of the press; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate urge all parties to engage in constructive, sustained dialogue in order to find a peaceful solution to Ukraine's current political and economic crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each house of Congress and each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM–309. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the Congress of the United States to approve the Presidents budget proposal to provide 35 million dollars to help communities process evidence from untested sexual assault kits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NO. 382

Whereas, Sexual violence continues to plague our nation and destroy lives. Women and girls are the vast majority of victims, and nearly one in five women, or about 22 million, have been raped during their lifetimes. Men and boys are also at risk and one in 71 men, or about 1.6 million, have been raped during their lifetimes. Nearly one-half of all female rape survivors were raped before I8 years of age, and over one-quarter of male rape survivors were raped before 10 years of age; and

Whereas, Effective collection of forensic evidence is of paramount importance to successfully prosecuting sex offenders, as is performing sexual assault forensic exams in a sensitive, dignified, and victim-centered manner. Sexual assault forensic examinations are intrusive, lengthy, and complex medical examinations that take an average of three to four hours. A victim who agrees to a sexual assault forensic exam reasonably expects evidence collected from that exam, also referred to as a rape kit, to be analyzed; and

Whereas, The federal government has estimated that hundreds of thousands of rape kits sit untested in police and crime storage facilities across the country in what is known as the rape kit backlog. Crime labs have struggled over the past decade to meet the demand for DNA testing for all types of crimes. With demand continuing to outpace capacity—the Joyful Heart Foundation estimates that every two minutes someone is sexually assaulted in the U.S.—the backlog in testing evidence collected from sexual assault forensic exams will likely continue to grow; and

Whereas, Untested sexual assault kits mean lost opportunities to develop DNA profiles, search for matches, link cold cases, and bring justice and resolution to the victim. DNA can help identify unknown offenders and when the offender is known, it can result in ''cold hits'' connecting the known suspect to other crimes. Failure to test evidence collected from a sexual assault kit in a timely manner can be tragic, from expired statutes of limitation that preclude prosecution even if a suspect is later identified, to additional rape and murder victims of serial rapists; and

Whereas, Local jurisdictions that have attempted to alleviate the rape kit backlog have impressive results to show for their efforts. With federal funding, the Wayne County Prosecuting Attorney's Office along with the Detroit Police Department, has begun to address a backlog of more than 10,000 rape kits. Among those first 1,600 kits tested, there were 455 matches in the DNA database, including matches linking to crimes committed in 22 other states and the District of Columbia. The Prosecutor's Office identified 127 potential serial rapists and obtained 14 convictions of potential serial rapists who are lied to rapes reported in 12 other states and the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, Testing sexual assault kits provides essential evidence. But, equally essential is the investigation and prosecution of identified perpetrators, without which survivors arc denied justice, rapists remain free to assault with impunity, and our communities continue to suffer emotionally and economically; and

Whereas, Reducing the rape kit backlog is a national concern requiring a national response. Federal funding is crucial to help communities in Michigan and other states to test and follow up on untested sexual assault kits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge Congress of the United States to approve President Obama's budget proposal to provide $35 million to help communities process evidence from untested sexual assault kits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–310. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado designating the month of October as ''Safe Schools Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14–031

Whereas, Colorado is committed to ensuring safe schools for all students, from early learning to higher education; and

Whereas, Safe schools provide an environment where effective teaching and learning can take place so that all education goals can be achieved; and

Whereas, Safe schools interface with the larger community by providing safe havens and distribution centers in the event of greater community crisis; and

Whereas, Each school day, Colorado school personnel are accountable for the safety of over 875,000 students, or about one-sixth of the total population of the state; and

Whereas, Educators and school personnel are the first responders in the schools, on the routes to and from school, on field trips, and at school-related events; and

Whereas, Schools face a broad range of safety-related threats, including human-caused hazards, technological hazards, and natural hazards; and

Whereas, Schools must adopt guiding principles of readiness and all-hazards emergency management, including prevention, mitigation, protection, preparedness, response, and recovery, in addressing these threats; and

Whereas, Educators and school personnel must communicate, coordinate, and collaborate with professional responders and other community partners in applying these guiding principles; and

Whereas, Schools must keep pace with improvements and changes in safe schools design, crime prevention through environmental design, security systems, communications, information management, training programs, and other resources related to school safety; and

Whereas, Schools must continually evaluate and update policies, standard operating procedures, memoranda of understanding, best practices, lessons learned, and fundraising activities related to school safety; and

Whereas, Schools can improve safety by making sure that climates are welcoming and that responses to misbehavior are fair, non-discriminatory and effective through training staff, engaging families and community partners, and deploying resources to help students develop the social, emotional, and conflict resolution skills needed to avoid and de-escalate problems; and

Whereas, The mission of the Colorado School Safety Resource Center is to assist educators, emergency responders, community organizations, school mental health professionals, parents, and students in creating safe, positive, and successful school environments for Colorado students in all K–12 and higher education schools; and

Whereas, In 2013, the Colorado School Safety Resource Center published nearly 800 announcements in its monthly newsletters on school safety-related topics such as training, grant information, prevention and protection resources, current research and statistical resources, and youth-specific information; and

Whereas, The members of the General Assembly believe that a yearly commemorative month devoted to school safety and a safe school climate can encourage activities that provide awareness about school safety topics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That we, the members of the Colorado General Assembly:

(1) Believe that establishing a commemorative month devoted to school safety and school climate can foster awareness about these important topics affecting our state's children and educators;

(2) Designate October as ''Safe Schools Month'' in Colorado; and

(3) Encourage all educators, community partners, first responders, subject matter experts, members of the private sector, the media, and other stakeholders to coordinate their activities with the Colorado School

Safety Resource Center and to help promote a culture of school safety and positive school climate, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Joint Resolution be sent to the Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States; Vice President Joe Biden; United States Secretary of Education Arne Duncan; United States Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson; United States Attorney General Eric Holder; the office of the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services; United States Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel; United States Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack; United States Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx; Gina McCarthy, Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency; the Honorable John Hickenlooper, Governor of Colorado; Executive Director, Colorado Department of Higher Education, Lt. Gov. Joseph A. Garcia; Kristin D. Russell, Colorado Secretary of Technology and State Chief Information Officer, Governor's Office of Information Technology; Robert Hammond, Commissioner of Education, Colorado Department of Education; Scott Newell, Director, Division of Capital Construction, Colorado Department of Education; Sarah Mathew, Director, Office of Health and Wellness, Colorado Department of Education; Richard Kaufman, Chair, Colorado Commission on Higher Education; Nancy McCallin, President, Colorado Community College System; John W. Suthers, Attorney General, Colorado Department of Law; Susan Payne, Director, Safe2Tell; Kathy E. Sasak, Interim Executive Director, Colorado Department of Public Safety; Paul Cooke, Director, Colorado Division of Fire Prevention and Control; Kevin R. Klein, Director, Division of Homeland Security Emergency Management; Colonel Scott Hernandez, Chief, Colorado State Patrol; Christine R. Harms, Director, Colorado School Safety Resource Center; Reggie Bicha, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Human Services; Dr. Larry Wolk, Executive Director and Chief Medical Officer, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment; John Salazar, Commissioner of Agriculture, Colorado Department of Agriculture; Donald E. Hunt, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Transportation; and to each member of Colorado's Congressional delegation.

POM–311. A joint memorial adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado urging the United States Congress to provide statutory relief to grant Colorado research institutions the authority to conduct controlled clinical and objective medical research trials regarding marijuana's medical efficacy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 14–006

Whereas, Colorado is in a unique situation regarding marijuana use in this country; and

Whereas, Colorado's constitution authorizes the legal use of marijuana for both medical and private adult use, but the use of marijuana is still illegal under federal law; and

Whereas, Because marijuana use has been illegal under federal law since 1937, there is limited modern, scientific-based research regarding the medical use of marijuana; and

Whereas, Without medical research, most information regarding marijuana's medical efficacy is limited in clinical or scientific evidence and is anecdotal or observational; and

Whereas, Several marijuana extracts seem to demonstrate significant benefits for pain control, treatment of childhood epileptic seizures, and other beneficial effects, often with fewer side effects than prescription drugs, and without use dependence; and

Whereas, Colorado has an unprecedented opportunity to provide the United States with scientific-based, peer-reviewed clinical medical research that could lead to a medical consensus regarding marijuana's medical efficacy to treat a number of chronic and debilitating medical conditions; and

Whereas, Colorado is proposing to spend up to $10 million studying marijuana's medical efficacy in Senate Bill 14–155; and

Whereas, Federal law currently significantly restricts state research institutions that receive federal funding from conducting controlled clinical trials regarding marijuana's medical efficacy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That the United States Congress is hereby memorialized to provide statutory relief to grant Colorado research institutions the authority to conduct controlled clinical and objective medical research trials regarding marijuana's medical efficacy, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Joint Memorial be sent to each member of the Colorado Congressional delegation, the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the president of the United States Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 498. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

S. Res. 500. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Alfonso E. Lenhardt, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

*Marcia Denise Occomy, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years.

*Leslie Ann Bassett, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Paraguay.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. WARNER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2612. A bill to simplify and improve the Federal student loan program through income-contingent repayment to provide strong protections for borrowers, encourage responsible borrowing, and save money for taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2613. A bill to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or rep; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2614. A bill to amend certain provisions of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2615. A bill to establish criminal penalties for failing to inform and warn of serious dangers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2616. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 2617. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 2618. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. Res. 503. A resolution designating September 2014 as ''National Child Awareness Month'' to promote awareness of charities benefitting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 504. A resolution to direct the Senate Legal Counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State (S. Ct.); considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to recognize the heritage of recreational fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting on Federal public land and ensure continued opportunities for those activities.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the perfiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1733

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1733, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 1758

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1758, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to Medicare data.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 2092

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2092, a bill to provide certain protections from civil liability with respect to the emergency administration of opioid overdose drugs.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2192, supra.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, supra.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2496, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. 2547

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 2578

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2578, a bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

S. 2599

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2599, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 2605

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2605, a bill to preserve religious freedom and a woman's access to contraception.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2609, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 2611

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2611, a bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 18, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the

Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies or other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state.

S. RES. 498

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 498, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 498, supra.

S. RES. 500

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 500, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2616. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Idaho County in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of Senator CRAPO and myself to introduce the Idaho County Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act.

Idahoans deeply value their Second Amendment rights, and recreational use of firearms for hunting and shooting sports is common. The use of firearms in Idaho is a tradition often passed through the generations, and many use it as an opportunity to teach safe and responsible practices to their children.

We have been working on this matter and on this particular issue since 2010 as it relates to this particular parcel of ground.

Idaho County needs adequate resources to provide this not only for its citizens but also for its law enforcement agencies. The Idaho County Sheriff's Office cannot effectively train their staff in firearms use because they simply do not have the facilities.

Should the Idaho County Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act be enacted, a 31-acre parcel of land in Idaho will be transferred from the U.S. Government to Idaho County for use as a gun range which will be maintained by the county.

It is enthusiastically supported by both the Idaho County Sheriff's Office, the county commissioners, and the citizens of Idaho County.

Passing this legislation will fill the void in Idaho County for firearm training, practice, and shooting sports for citizens and law enforcement by providing quality facilities that will ensure safe and responsible use for years to come.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to pass this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 503—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2014 AS ''NATIONAL CHILD AWARENESS MONTH'' TO PROMOTE AWARENESS OF CHARITIES BENEFITTING CHILDREN AND YOUTH-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND RECOGNIZING EFFORTS MADE BY THOSE CHARITIES AND ORGANIZATIONS ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH AS CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 503

Whereas millions of children and youth in the United States represent the hopes and future of the United States;

Whereas numerous individuals, charities benefitting children, and youth-serving organizations that work with children and youth collaborate to provide invaluable services to enrich and better the lives of children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas raising awareness of, and increasing support for, organizations that provide access to healthcare, social services, education, the arts, sports, and other services will result in the development of character and the future success of the children and youth of the United States;

Whereas the month of September, as the school year begins, is a time when parents, families, teachers, school administrators, and communities increase their focus on children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas the month of September is a time for the people of the United States to highlight and be mindful of the needs of children and youth;

Whereas private corporations and businesses have joined with hundreds of national and local charitable organizations throughout the United States in support of a month-long focus on children and youth; and

Whereas designating September 2014 as ''National Child Awareness Month'' would recognize that a long-term commitment to children and youth is in the public interest, and will encourage widespread support for charities and organizations that seek to provide a better future for the children and youth of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2014 as ''National Child Awareness Month''—

(1) to promote awareness of charities benefitting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States; and

(2) to recognize efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 504—TO DIRECT THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO APPEAR AS AMICUS CURIAE IN THE NAME OF THE SENATE IN MENACHEM BINYAMIN ZIVOTOFSKY, BY HIS PARENTS AND GUARDIANS, ARI Z. AND NAOMI SIEGMAN ZIVOTOFSKY V. JOHN KERRY, SECRETARY OF STATE (S. CT.)

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 504

Whereas, in the case of *Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State*, No. 13–628, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, the constitutionality of section 214(d) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003, Pub. L. No. 107–228, 116 Stat. 1350, 1366 (2002), has been placed in issue;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(c), 706(a), and 713(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(c), 288e(a), and 288*l*(a), the Senate may direct its counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in any legal action in which the powers and responsibilities of Congress under the Constitution are placed in issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to appear as amicus curiae on behalf of the Senate in the case of *Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State*, to defend the constitutionality of section 214(d) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3558. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3559. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3560. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3561. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3562. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3563. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3558. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

''(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.—'';

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking ''and congressional staff with'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with''; and

(B) by striking ''or congressional staff shall'' and inserting '', congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee shall'';

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after ''Congress,'' the following: ''of a committee of Congress, or of a leadership office of Congress,''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this subparagraph, the term 'political appointee' means any individual who—

''(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

''(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

''(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

''(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, a congressional staff member, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointees for coverage under this paragraph.

''(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount for which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

''(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.''.

SA 3559. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ___—PRENATAL NONDISCIMINATION

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act (PRENDA) of 2014''.

SEC. __02. FINDINGS AND CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Women are a vital part of American society and culture and possess the same fundamental human rights and civil rights as men.

(2) United States law prohibits the dissimilar treatment of males and females who are similarly situated and prohibits sex discrimination in various contexts, including the provision of employment, education, housing, health insurance coverage, and athletics.

(3) Sex is an immutable characteristic ascertainable at the earliest stages of human development through existing medical technology and procedures commonly in use, including maternal-fetal bloodstream DNA sampling, amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling or ''CVS'', and obstetric ultrasound. In addition to medically assisted sex determination, a growing sex determination niche industry has developed and is marketing low-cost commercial products, widely advertised and available, that aid in the sex determination of an unborn child without the aid of medical professionals. Experts have demonstrated that the sex-selection industry is on the rise and predict that it will continue to be a growing trend in the United States. Sex determination is always a necessary step to the procurement of a sex-selection abortion.

(4) A ''sex-selection abortion'' is an abortion undertaken for purposes of eliminating an unborn child based on the sex or gender of the child. Sex-selection abortion is barbaric, and described by scholars and civil rights advocates as an act of sex-based or gender-based violence, predicated on sex discrimination. Sex-selection abortions are typically late-term abortions performed in the 2nd or 3rd trimester of pregnancy, after the unborn child has developed sufficiently to feel pain. Substantial medical evidence proves that an unborn child can experience pain at 20 weeks after conception, and perhaps substantially earlier. By definition, sex-selection abortions do not implicate the health of the mother of the unborn, but instead are elective procedures motivated by sex or gender bias.

(5) The targeted victims of sex-selection abortions performed in the United States and worldwide are overwhelmingly female. The selective abortion of females is female infanticide, the intentional killing of unborn females, due to the preference for male offspring or ''son preference''. Son preference is reinforced by the low value associated, by some segments of the world community, with female offspring. Those segments tend to regard female offspring as financial burdens to a family over their lifetime due to their perceived inability to earn or provide financially for the family unit as can a male. In addition, due to social and legal convention, female offspring are less likely to carry on the family name. ''Son preference'' is one of the most evident manifestations of sex or gender discrimination in any society, undermining female equality, and fueling the elimination of females' right to exist in instances of sex-selection abortion.

(6) Sex-selection abortions are not expressly prohibited by United States law or the laws of 47 States. Sex-selection abortions are performed in the United States. In a March 2008 report published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Columbia University economists Douglas Almond and Lena Edlund examined the sex ratio of United States-born children and found ''evidence of sex selection, most likely at the prenatal stage''. The data revealed obvious ''son preference'' in the form of unnatural sex-ratio imbalances within certain segments of the United States population, primarily those segments tracing their ethnic or cultural origins to countries where sex-selection abortion is prevalent. The evidence strongly suggests that some Americans are exercising sex-selection abortion practices within the United States consistent with discriminatory practices common to their country of origin, or the country to which they trace their ancestry. While sex-selection abortions are more common outside the United States, the evidence reveals that female feticide is also occurring in the United States.

(7) The American public supports a prohibition of sex-selection abortion. In a March 2006 Zogby International poll, 86 percent of Americans agreed that sex-selection abortion should be illegal, yet only 3 States proscribe sex-selection abortion.

(8) Despite the failure of the United States to proscribe sex-selection abortion, the United States Congress has expressed repeatedly, through Congressional resolution, strong condemnation of policies promoting sex-selection abortion in the ''Communist Government of China''. Likewise, at the 2007 United Nation's Annual Meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women, 51st Session, the United States delegation spearheaded a resolution calling on countries to condemn sex-selective abortion, a policy directly contradictory to the permissiveness of current United States law, which places no restriction on the practice of sex-selection abortion. The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women has urged governments of all nations ''to take necessary measures to prevent . . . prenatal sex selection''.

(9) A 1990 report by Harvard University economist Amartya Sen, estimated that more than 100 million women were ''demographically missing'' from the world as early as 1990 due to sexist practices, including sex-selection abortion. Many experts believe sex-selection abortion is the primary cause. Current estimates of women missing from the world range in the hundreds of millions.

(10) Countries with longstanding experience with sex-selection abortion—such as the Republic of India, the United Kingdom, and the People's Republic of China—have enacted restrictions on sex-selection, and have steadily continued to strengthen prohibitions and penalties. The United States, by contrast, has no law in place to restrict sex-selection abortion, establishing the United States as affording less protection from sex-

based feticide than the Republic of India or the People's Republic of China, whose recent practices of sex-selection abortion were vehemently and repeatedly condemned by United States congressional resolutions and by the United States Ambassador to the Commission on the Status of Women. Public statements from within the medical community reveal that citizens of other countries come to the United States for sex-selection procedures that would be criminal in their country of origin. Because the United States permits abortion on the basis of sex, the United States may effectively function as a ''safe haven'' for those who seek to have American physicians do what would otherwise be criminal in their home countries—a sex-selection abortion, most likely late-term.

(11) The American medical community opposes sex-selection. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, commonly known as ''ACOG'', stated in its 2007 Ethics Committee Opinion, Number 360, that sex-selection is inappropriate because it ''ultimately supports sexist practices''. The American Society of Reproductive Medicine (commonly known as ''ASRM'') 2004 Ethics Committee Opinion on sex-selection notes that central to the controversy of sex-selection is the potential for ''inherent gender discrimination'', . . . the ''risk of psychological harm to sex-selected offspring (i.e., by placing on them expectations that are too high)'', . . . and ''reinforcement of gender bias in society as a whole''. Embryo sex-selection, ASRM notes, remains ''vulnerable to the judgment that no matter what its basis, [the method] identifies gender as a reason to value one person over another, and it supports socially constructed stereotypes of what gender means''. In doing so, it not only ''reinforces possibilities of unfair discrimination, but may trivialize human reproduction by making it depend on the selection of nonessential features of offspring''. The ASRM ethics opinion continues, ''ongoing problems with the status of women in the United States make it necessary to take account of concerns for the impact of sex-selection on goals of gender equality''. The American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists, an organization with hundreds of members—many of whom are former abortionists—makes the following declaration: ''Sex selection abortions are more graphic examples of the damage that abortion inflicts on women. In addition to increasing premature labor in subsequent pregnancies, increasing suicide and major depression, and increasing the risk of breast cancer in teens who abort their first pregnancy and delay childbearing, sex selection abortions are often targeted at fetuses simply because the fetus is female. As physicians who care for both the mother and her unborn child, the American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists vigorously opposes aborting fetuses because of their gender.''. The President's Council on Bioethics published a Working Paper stating the council's belief that society's respect for reproductive freedom does not prohibit the regulation or prohibition of ''sex control'', defined as the use of various medical technologies to choose the sex of one's child. The publication expresses concern that ''sex control might lead to . . . dehumanization and a new eugenics''.

(12) Sex-selection abortion results in an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance. An unnatural sex-ratio imbalance is undesirable, due to the inability of the numerically predominant sex to find mates. Experts worldwide document that a significant sex-ratio imbalance in which males numerically predominate can be a cause of increased violence and militancy within a society. Likewise, an unnatural sex-ratio imbalance gives rise to the commoditization of humans in the form of human trafficking, and a consequent increase in kidnapping and other violent crime.

(13) Sex-selection abortions have the effect of diminishing the representation of women in the American population, and therefore, the American electorate.

(14) Sex-selection abortion reinforces sex discrimination and has no place in a civilized society.

(15) The history of the United States includes examples of sex discrimination. The people of the United States ultimately responded in the strongest possible legal terms by enacting a constitutional amendment correcting elements of such discrimination. Women, once subjected to sex discrimination that denied them the right to vote, now have suffrage guaranteed by the 19th amendment. The elimination of discriminatory practices has been and is among the highest priorities and greatest achievements of American history.

(16) Implicitly approving the discriminatory practice of sex-selection abortion by choosing not to prohibit them will reinforce these inherently discriminatory practices, and evidence a failure to protect a segment of certain unborn Americans because those unborn are of a sex that is disfavored. Sex-selection abortions trivialize the value of the unborn on the basis of sex, reinforcing sex discrimination, and coarsening society to the humanity of all vulnerable and innocent human life, making it increasingly difficult to protect such life. Thus, Congress has a compelling interest in acting—indeed it must act—to prohibit sex-selection abortion.

(b) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—In accordance with the above findings, Congress enacts the following pursuant to Congress' power under—

(1) the Commerce Clause;

(2) section 5 of the 14th amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on Government action denying equal protection of the laws; and

(3) section 8 of article I to make all laws necessary and proper for the carrying into execution of powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

SEC. __03. DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE UNBORN ON THE BASIS OF SEX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 250. Discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly—

''(1) performs an abortion knowing that such abortion is sought based on the sex or gender of the child;

''(2) uses force or the threat of force to intentionally injure or intimidate any person for the purpose of coercing a sex-selection abortion;

''(3) solicits or accepts funds for the performance of a sex-selection abortion; or

''(4) transports a woman into the United States or across a State line for the purpose of obtaining a sex-selection abortion;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

''(1) CIVIL ACTION BY WOMAN ON WHOM ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—A woman upon whom an abortion has been performed pursuant to a violation of subsection (a)(2) may in a civil action against any person who engaged in a violation of subsection (a) obtain appropriate relief.

''(2) CIVIL ACTION BY RELATIVES.—The father of an unborn child who is the subject of an abortion performed or attempted in violation of subsection (a), or a maternal grandparent of the unborn child if the pregnant woman is an unemancipated minor, may in a civil action against any person who engaged in the violation, obtain appropriate relief, unless the pregnancy resulted from the plaintiff's criminal conduct or the plaintiff consented to the abortion.

''(3) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

''(A) objectively verifiable money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, including loss of companionship and support, occasioned by the violation of this section; and

''(B) punitive damages.

''(4) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A qualified plaintiff may in a civil action obtain injunctive relief to prevent an abortion provider from performing or attempting further abortions in violation of this section.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph the term 'qualified plaintiff' means—

''(i) a woman upon whom an abortion is performed or attempted in violation of this section;

''(ii) any person who is the spouse or parent of a woman upon whom an abortion is performed in violation of this section; or

''(iii) the Attorney General.

''(5) ATTORNEYS FEES FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

''(c) LOSS OF FEDERAL FUNDING.—A violation of subsection (a) shall be deemed for the purposes of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to be discrimination prohibited by section 601 of that Act.

''(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A physician, physician's assistant, nurse, counselor, or other medical or mental health professional shall report known or suspected violations of any of this section to appropriate law enforcement authorities. Whoever violates this requirement shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

''(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the United States district courts, United States courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any matter brought under this section.

''(f) EXCEPTION.—A woman upon whom a sex-selection abortion is performed may not be prosecuted or held civilly liable for any violation of this section, or for a conspiracy to violate this section.

''(g) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY IN COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent the Constitution or other similarly compelling reason requires, in every civil or criminal action under this section, the court shall make such orders as are necessary to protect the anonymity of any woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted if she does not give her written consent to such disclosure. Such orders may be made upon motion, but shall be made sua sponte if not otherwise sought by a party.

''(2) ORDERS TO PARTIES, WITNESSES, AND COUNSEL.—The court shall issue appropriate orders under paragraph (1) to the parties, witnesses, and counsel and shall direct the sealing of the record and exclusion of individuals from courtrooms or hearing rooms to the extent necessary to safeguard her identity from public disclosure. Each such order shall be accompanied by specific written findings explaining why the anonymity of the woman must be preserved from public disclosure, why the order is essential to that end, how the order is narrowly tailored to

serve that interest, and why no reasonable less restrictive alternative exists.

''(3) PSEUDONYM REQUIRED.—In the absence of written consent of the woman upon whom an abortion has been performed or attempted, any party, other than a public official, who brings an action under this section shall do so under a pseudonym.

''(4) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not be construed to conceal the identity of the plaintiff or of witnesses from the defendant or from attorneys for the defendant.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) The term 'abortion' means the act of using or prescribing any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance, device, or means with the intent to terminate the clinically diagnosable pregnancy of a woman, with knowledge that the termination by those means will with reasonable likelihood cause the death of the unborn child, unless the act is done with the intent to—

''(A) save the life or preserve the health of the unborn child;

''(B) remove a dead unborn child caused by spontaneous abortion; or

''(C) remove an ectopic pregnancy.

''(2) The term 'sex-selection abortion' is an abortion undertaken for purposes of eliminating an unborn child based on the sex or gender of the child.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 249 the following new item:

''250. Discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex.''.

SEC. __04. SEVERABILITY.

If any portion of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the portions or applications of this title which can be given effect without the invalid portion or application.

SEC. __05. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to require that a healthcare provider has an affirmative duty to inquire as to the motivation for the abortion, absent the healthcare provider having knowledge or information that the abortion is being sought based on the sex or gender of the child.

SA 3560. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 101, insert the following:

(d) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority granted under subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to any remote seller that is not a qualifying remote seller.

(2) QUALIFYING REMOTE SELLER.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''qualifying remote seller'' means—

(i) any remote seller that meets the ownership requirements of subparagraph (B); or

(ii) any remote seller the majority of domestic employees of which are primarily employed at a location in a participating State.

(B) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—A remote seller meets the ownership requirements of this subparagraph if—

(i) in the case of a remote seller that is a publicly traded corporation, more than 50 percent of the covered employees (as defined in section 162(m)(3)) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of such corporation reside in participating States;

(ii) in the case of a remote seller that is a corporation (other than a publicly traded corporation), more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of such corporation is held by individuals residing in participating States;

(iii) in the case of a remote seller that is a partnership, more than 50 percent of the profits interests or capital interests in such partnership is held by individuals residing in participating States; and

(iv) in the case of any other remote seller, more than 50 percent of the beneficial interests in the entity is held by individuals residing in participating States.

(C) ATTRIBUTION RULES.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the rules of section 318(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply.

(D) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of this paragraph, all persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 of such Code shall be treated as one person.

(3) PARTICIPATING STATE.—The term ''participating State'' means—

(A) a Member State under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement which has exercised authority under subsection (a); or

(B) a State that—

(i) is not a Member State under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement; and

(ii) has met the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) for exercising the authority granted under such subsection.

SA 3561. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102, insert the following:

(i) TRANSFER OF DATA.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring any State to transfer data relating to the audit or collection of sales and use taxes.

SA 3562. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2609, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 101, insert the following:

(d) EXCEPTION FOR REMOTE SELLERS INCORPORATED IN STATES THAT DO NOT HAVE SALES TAX.—A State is not authorized to require a remote seller to collect sales and use taxes under this Act if the remote seller is incorporated in a State that does not collect sales and use taxes with respect to products and services sold in such State.

SA 3563. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. RELEASE OF REPORT ON ENERGY AND COST SAVINGS IN NONBUILDING APPLICATIONS.

Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the report on the results of the study of energy and cost savings in nonbuilding applications required under section 518(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 121 Stat. 1660).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MERKLEY. 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 July 16, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''At a Tipping Point: Consumer Choice, Consolidation and the Future Video Marketplace.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Challenges at the Border: Examining and Addressing the Root Causes Behind the Rise in Apprehensions at the Southern Border.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Improving the Trust System: Continuing Oversight of the Department of the Interior's Land Buy-Back Program.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERAN'S AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veteran's Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''The State of VA Health Care.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''What Makes A Bank Systemically Important?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 3 p.m., to hold a Near Eastern and South Central Asian Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Indispensable Partners—Reenergizing US-India Ties.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a joint hearing with the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Options for Assuring Domestic Space Access.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND WILDLIFE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014 at 3 p.m. in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 16, 2014, in room SD–562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 1:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Hanging Up on Phone Scams: Progress and Potential Solutions to this Scourge.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that fellows in my office: Annie Dreazen and Lemeneh Tefera be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Haley Wilson, be granted privileges of the floor for today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in my office, Lisa Foster, be granted privileges of the floor until the end of September.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Hannah Van Demark, Julia Sferlazzo, and Zachary Nash, interns on the banking committee staff, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEAN AND DAVID GOLDMAN INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION AND RETURN ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 450, H.R. 3212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3212) to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings; sense of Congress; purposes.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

Sec. 101. Annual report.
Sec. 102. Standards and assistance.
Sec. 103. Bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding.
Sec. 104. Report to congressional representatives.

TITLE II—ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Sec. 201. Response to international child abductions.
Sec. 202. Actions by the Secretary of State in response to patterns of noncompliance in cases of international child abductions.
Sec. 203. Consultations with foreign governments.
Sec. 204. Waiver by the Secretary of State.
Sec. 205. Termination of actions by the Secretary of State.

TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Sec. 301. Preventing children from leaving the United States in violation of a court order.
Sec. 302. Authorization for judicial training on international parental child abduction.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Sean Goldman, a United States citizen and resident of New Jersey, was abducted from the United States in 2004 and separated from his father, David Goldman, who spent nearly 6 years battling for the return of his son from Brazil before Sean was finally returned to Mr. Goldman's custody on December 24, 2009.

(2) The Department of State's Office of Children's Issues, which serves as the Central Authority of the United States for the purposes of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (referred to in this Act as the ''Hague Abduction Convention''), has received thousands of requests since 2007 for assistance in the return to the United States of children who have been wrongfully abducted by a parent or other legal guardian to another country.

(3) For a variety of reasons reflecting the significant obstacles to the recovery of abducted children, as well as the legal and factual complexity involving such cases, not all cases are reported to the Central Authority of the United States.

(4) More than 1,000 outgoing international child abductions are reported every year to the Central Authority of the United States, which depends solely on proactive reporting of abduction cases.

(5) Only about one-half of the children abducted from the United States to countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention are returned to the United States.

(6) The United States and other Convention countries have expressed their desire, through the Hague Abduction Convention, ''to protect children internationally from the harmful effects of their wrongful removal or retention and to establish procedures to ensure their prompt return to the State of their habitual residence, as well as to secure protection for rights of access.''

(7) Compliance by the United States and other Convention countries depends on the actions of their designated central authorities, the performance of their judicial systems as reflected in the legal process and decisions rendered to enforce or effectuate the Hague Abduction Convention, and the ability and willingness of their

law enforcement authorities to ensure the swift enforcement of orders rendered pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention.

(8) According to data from the Department of State, approximately 40 percent of abduction cases involve children taken from the United States to countries with which the United States does not have reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or other arrangements relating to the resolution of abduction cases.

(9) According to the Department of State's April 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, ''parental child abduction jeopardizes the child and has substantial long-term consequences for both the child and the left-behind parent.''

(10) Few left-behind parents have the extraordinary financial resources necessary—

(A) to pursue individual civil or criminal remedies in both the United States and a foreign country, even if such remedies are available; or

(B) to engage in repeated foreign travel to attempt to obtain the return of their children through diplomatic or other channels.

(11) Military parents often face additional complications in resolving abduction cases because of the challenges presented by their military obligations.

(12) In addition to using the Hague Abduction Convention to achieve the return of abducted children, the United States has an array of Federal, State, and local law enforcement, criminal justice, and judicial tools at its disposal to prevent international abductions.

(13) Federal agencies tasked with preventing international abductions have indicated that the most effective way to stop international child abductions is while they are in progress, rather than after the child has been removed to a foreign destination.

(14) Parental awareness of abductions in progress, rapid response by relevant law enforcement, and effective coordination among Federal, State, local, and international stakeholders are critical in preventing such abductions.

(15) A more robust application of domestic tools, in cooperation with international law enforcement entities and appropriate application of the Hague Abduction Convention could—

(A) discourage some parents from attempting abductions;

(B) block attempted abductions at ports of exit; and

(C) help achieve the return of more abducted children.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should set a strong example for other Convention countries in the timely location and prompt resolution of cases involving children abducted abroad and brought to the United States.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to protect children whose habitual residence is the United States from wrongful abduction;

(2) to assist left-behind parents in quickly resolving cases and maintaining safe and predictable contact with their child while an abduction case is pending;

(3) to protect the custodial rights of parents, including military parents, by providing the parents, the judicial system, and law enforcement authorities with the information they need to prevent unlawful abduction before it occurs;

(4) to enhance the prompt resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) to detail an appropriate set of actions to be undertaken by the Secretary of State to address persistent problems in the resolution of abduction cases;

(6) to establish a program to prevent wrongful abductions; and

(7) to increase interagency coordination in preventing international child abduction by convening a working group composed of presidentially appointed and Senate confirmed officials from the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Justice.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ABDUCTED CHILD.—The term ''abducted child'' means a child who is the victim of international child abduction.

(2) ABDUCTION.—The term ''abduction'' means the alleged wrongful removal of a child from the child's country of habitual residence, or the wrongful retention of a child outside such country, in violation of a left-behind parent's custodial rights, including the rights of a military parent.

(3) ABDUCTION CASE.—The term ''abduction case'' means a case that—

(A) has been reported to the Central Authority of the United States by a left-behind parent for the resolution of an abduction; and

(B) meets the criteria for an international child abduction under the Hague Abduction Convention, regardless of whether the country at issue is a Convention country.

(4) ACCESS CASE.—The term ''access case'' means a case involving an application filed with the Central Authority of the United States by a parent seeking rights of access.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—The term ''Annual Report'' means the Annual Report on International Child Abduction required under section 101.

(6) APPLICATION.—The term ''application'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the application required pursuant to article 8 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the formal document required, pursuant to the provisions of the applicable arrangement, to request the return of an abducted child or to request rights of access, as applicable; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the formal request by the Central Authority of the United States to the Central Authority of such country requesting the return of an abducted child or for rights of contact with an abducted child.

(7) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(8) BILATERAL PROCEDURES.—The term ''bilateral procedures'' means any procedures established by, or pursuant to, a bilateral arrangement, including a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and another country, to resolve abduction and access cases, including procedures to address interim contact matters.

(9) BILATERAL PROCEDURES COUNTRY.—The term ''bilateral procedures country'' means a country with which the United States has entered into bilateral procedures, including Memoranda of Understanding, with respect to child abductions.

(10) CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—The term ''Central Authority'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the meaning given such term in article 6 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of a bilateral procedures country, the official entity designated by the government of the bilateral procedures country within the applicable memorandum of understanding pursuant to section 103(b)(1) to discharge the duties imposed on the entity; and

(C) in the case of a non-Convention country, the foreign ministry or other appropriate authority of such country.

(11) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means an individual who has not attained 16 years of age.

(12) CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''Convention country'' means a country for which the Hague Abduction Convention has entered into force with respect to the United States.

(13) HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION.—The term ''Hague Abduction Convention'' means the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at The Hague October 25, 1980.

(14) INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''interim contact'' means the ability of a left-behind parent to communicate with or visit an abducted child during the pendency of an abduction case.

(15) LEFT-BEHIND PARENT.—The term ''left-behind parent'' means an individual or legal custodian who alleges that an abduction has occurred that is in breach of rights of custody attributed to such individual.

(16) NON-CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''non-Convention country'' means a country in which the Hague Abduction Convention has not entered into force with respect to the United States.

(17) OVERSEAS MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term ''overseas military dependent child'' means a child whose habitual residence is the United States according to United States law even though the child is residing outside the United States with a military parent.

(18) OVERSEAS MILITARY PARENT.—The term ''overseas military parent'' means an individual who—

(A) has custodial rights with respect to a child; and

(B) is serving outside the United States as a member of the United States Armed Forces.

(19) PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''pattern of noncompliance'' means the persistent failure—

(i) of a Convention country to implement and abide by provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(ii) of a non-Convention country to abide by bilateral procedures that have been established between the United States and such country; or

(iii) of a non-Convention country to work with the Central Authority of the United States to resolve abduction cases.

(B) PERSISTENT FAILURE.—Persistent failure under subparagraph (A) may be evidenced in a given country by the presence of 1 or more of the following criteria:

(i) Thirty percent or more of the total abduction cases in such country are unresolved abduction cases.

(ii) The Central Authority regularly fails to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to—

(I) the Hague Abduction Convention; or

(II) any bilateral procedures between the United States and such country.

(iii) The judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of a Convention country or a bilateral procedures country fails to regularly implement and comply with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable.

(iv) Law enforcement authorities regularly fail to enforce return orders or determinations of rights of access rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of the government of the country in abduction cases.

(20) RIGHTS OF ACCESS.—The term ''rights of access'' means the establishment of rights of contact between a child and a parent seeking access in Convention countries—

(A) by operation of law;

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(21) RIGHTS OF CUSTODY.—The term ''rights of custody'' means rights of care and custody of a child, including the right to determine the place of residence of a child, under the laws of the country in which the child is a habitual resident—

(A) attributed to an individual or legal custodian; and

(B) arising—

(i) by operation of law; or

(ii) through a judicial or administrative decision; or

(iii) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(22) RIGHTS OF INTERIM CONTACT.—The term ''rights of interim contact'' means the rights of contact between a child and a left-behind parent, which has been provided as a provisional measure while an abduction case is pending, under the laws of the country in which the child is located—

(A) by operation of law; or

(B) through a judicial or administrative determination; or

(C) through a legally enforceable arrangement between the parties.

(23) UNRESOLVED ABDUCTION CASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''unresolved abduction case'' means an abduction case that remains unresolved for a period that exceeds 12 months after the date on which the completed application for return of the child is submitted for determination to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, in the country in which the child is located.

(B) RESOLUTION OF CASE.—An abduction case shall be considered to be resolved if—

(i) the child is returned to the country of habitual residence, pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or other appropriate bilateral procedures, if applicable;

(ii) the judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the government of the country in which the child is located has implemented, and is complying with, the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or other bilateral procedures, as applicable;

(iii) the left-behind parent reaches a voluntary arrangement with the other parent;

(iv) the left-behind parent submits a written withdrawal of the application or the request for assistance to the Department of State;

(v) the left-behind parent cannot be located for 1 year despite the documented efforts of the Department of State to locate the parent; or

(vi) the child or left-behind parent is deceased.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

SEC. 101. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an Annual Report on International Child Abduction. The Secretary shall post the Annual Report to the publicly accessible website of the Department of State.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each Annual Report shall include—

(1) a list of all countries in which there were 1 or more abduction cases, during the preceding calendar year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States, including a description of whether each such country—

(A) is a Convention country;

(B) is a bilateral procedures country;

(C) has other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) adheres to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(2) for each country with respect to which there were 5 or more pending abduction cases, during the preceding year, relating to a child whose habitual residence is the United States—

(A) the number of such new abduction and access cases reported during the preceding year;

(B) for Convention and bilateral procedures countries—

(i) the number of abduction and access cases that the Central Authority of the United States transmitted to the Central Authority of such country; and

(ii) the number of abduction and access cases that were not submitted by the Central Authority to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of such country;

(C) the reason for the delay in submission of each case identified in subparagraph (B)(ii) by the Central Authority of such country to the judicial or administrative authority of that country;

(D) the number of unresolved abduction and access cases, and the length of time each case has been pending;

(E) the number and percentage of unresolved abduction cases in which law enforcement authorities have—

(i) not located the abducted child;

(ii) failed to undertake serious efforts to locate the abducted child; and

(iii) failed to enforce a return order rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of such country;

(F) the total number and the percentage of the total number of abduction and access cases, respectively, resolved during the preceding year;

(G) recommendations to improve the resolution of abduction and access cases; and

(H) the average time it takes to locate a child;

(3) the number of abducted children whose habitual residence is in the United States and who were returned to the United States from—

(A) Convention countries;

(B) bilateral procedures countries;

(C) countries having other procedures for resolving such abductions; or

(D) countries adhering to no protocols with respect to child abduction;

(4) a list of Convention countries and bilateral procedures countries that have failed to comply with any of their obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, with respect to the resolution of abduction and access cases;

(5) a list of countries demonstrating a pattern of noncompliance and a description of the criteria on which the determination of a pattern of noncompliance for each country is based;

(6) information on efforts by the Secretary of State to encourage non-Convention countries—

(A) to ratify or accede to the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) to enter into or implement other bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, with the United States; and

(C) to address pending abduction and access cases;

(7) the number of cases resolved without abducted children being returned to the United States from Convention countries, bilateral procedures countries, or other non-Convention countries;

(8) a list of countries that became Convention countries with respect to the United States during the preceding year; and

(9) information about efforts to seek resolution of abduction cases of children whose habitual residence is in the United States and whose abduction occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Unless a left-behind parent provides written permission to the Central Authority of the United States to include personally identifiable information about the parent or the child in the Annual Report, the Annual Report may not include any personally identifiable information about any such parent, child, or party to an abduction or access case involving such parent or child.

(d) ADDITIONAL SECTIONS.—Each Annual Report shall also include—

(1) information on the number of unresolved abduction cases affecting military parents;

(2) a description of the assistance offered to such military parents;

(3) information on the use of airlines in abductions, voluntary airline practices to prevent abductions, and recommendations for best airline practices to prevent abductions;

(4) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train domestic judges in the application of the Hague Abduction Convention; and

(5) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train United States Armed Forces legal assistance personnel, military chaplains, and military family support center personnel about—

(A) abductions;

(B) the risk of loss of contact with children; and

(C) the legal means available to resolve such cases.

(e) REPEAL OF THE HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 2803 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 11611) is repealed.

(f) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON COUNTRIES IN NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall include, in a separate section of the Annual Report, the Secretary's determination, pursuant to the provisions under section 202(b), of whether each country listed in the report has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance in cases of child abduction during the preceding 12 months.

(2) CONTENTS.—The section described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall identify any action or actions described in section 202(d) (or commensurate action as provided in section 202(e)) that have been taken by the Secretary with respect to each country;

(B) shall describe the basis for the Secretary's determination of the pattern of noncompliance by each country;

(C) shall indicate whether noneconomic policy options designed to resolve the pattern of noncompliance have reasonably been exhausted, including the consultations required under section 203.

SEC. 102. STANDARDS AND ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of State shall—

(1) ensure that United States diplomatic and consular missions abroad—

(A) maintain a consistent reporting standard with respect to abduction and access cases;

(B) designate at least 1 senior official in each such mission, at the discretion of the Chief of Mission, to assist left-behind parents from the United States who are visiting such country or otherwise seeking to resolve abduction or access cases; and

(C) monitor developments in abduction and access cases; and

(2) develop and implement written strategic plans for engagement with any Convention or non-Convention country in which there are 5 or more cases of international child abduction.

SEC. 103. BILATERAL PROCEDURES, INCLUDING MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall initiate a process to develop and enter into appropriate bilateral procedures, including memoranda of understanding, as appropriate, with non-Convention countries that are unlikely to become Convention countries in the foreseeable future, or with Convention countries that have unresolved abduction cases that occurred before the Hague Abduction Convention entered into force with respect to the United States or that country.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall give priority to countries with significant abduction cases and related issues.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The bilateral procedures described in subsection (a) should include provisions relating to—

(1) the identification of—

(A) the Central Authority;

(B) the judicial or administrative authority that will promptly adjudicate abduction and access cases;

(C) the law enforcement agencies; and

(D) the implementation of procedures to ensure the immediate enforcement of an order issued by the authority identified pursuant to subparagraph (B) to return an abducted child to a left-behind parent, including by—

(i) conducting an investigation to ascertain the location of the abducted child;

(ii) providing protection to the abducted child after such child is located; and

(iii) retrieving the abducted child and making the appropriate arrangements for such child to be returned to the child's country of habitual residence;

(2) the implementation of a protocol to effectuate the return of an abducted child identified in an abduction case not later than 6 weeks after the application with respect to the abduction case has been submitted to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of the country in which the abducted child is located;

(3) the implementation of a protocol for the establishment and protection of the rights of interim contact during pendency of abduction cases; and

(4) the implementation of a protocol to establish periodic visits between a United States embassy or consular official and an abducted child, in order to allow the official to ascertain the child's location and welfare.

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall submit written notification to the Member of Congress and Senators, or Resident Commissioner or Delegate, as appropriate, representing the legal residence of a left-behind parent if such parent—

(1) reports an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States; and

(2) consents to such notification.

(b) TIMING.—At the request of any person who is a left-behind parent, including a left-behind parent who previously reported an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act, the notification required under subsection (a) shall be provided as soon as is practicable.

TITLE II—ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 201. RESPONSE TO INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote the best interest of children wrongfully abducted from the United States by—

(A) establishing legal rights and procedures for their prompt return; and

(B) ensuring the enforcement of reciprocal international obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or arrangements under bilateral procedures;

(2) to promote the timely resolution of abduction cases through 1 or more of the actions described in section 202; and

(3) to ensure appropriate coordination within the Federal Government and between Federal, State, and local agencies involved in abduction prevention, investigation, and resolution.

(b) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO UNRESOLVED CASES.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—For each abduction or access case relating to a child whose habitual residence is in the United States that remains pending or is otherwise unresolved on the date that is 12 months after the date on which the Central Authority of the United States submits such case to a foreign country, the Secretary of State shall determine whether the government of such foreign country has failed to take appropriate steps to resolve the case. If the Secretary of State determines that such failure occurred, the Secretary should, as expeditiously as practicable—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202; and

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that foreign country to directly address the resolution of the case with senior officials in the foreign government.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State may delay any action described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that an additional period of time, not to exceed 1 year, will substantially assist in resolving the case.

(3) REPORT.—If the Secretary of State delays any action pursuant to paragraph (2) or decides not to take an action described in subsection (d) or (e) of section 202 after making the determination described in paragraph (1), the Secretary, not later than 15 days after such delay or decision, shall provide a report to the appropriate congressional committees that details the reasons for delaying action or not taking action, as appropriate.

(4) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFINGS.—At the request of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall provide a detailed briefing, including a written report, if requested, on actions taken to resolve a case or the cause for delay.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary of State should—

(A) take 1 or more actions that most appropriately respond to the nature and severity of the governmental failure to resolve the unresolved abduction case; and

(B) seek, to the fullest extent possible—

(i) to initially respond by communicating with the Central Authority of the country; and

(ii) if clause (i) is unsuccessful, to target subsequent actions—

(I) as narrowly as practicable, with respect to the agencies or instrumentalities of the foreign government that are responsible for such failures; and

(II) in ways that respect the separation of powers and independence of the judiciary of the country, as applicable.

(2) GUIDELINES FOR ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—In addition to the guidelines under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State, in determining whether to take 1 or more actions under paragraphs (5) through (7) of section 202(d) or section 202(e), shall seek to minimize any adverse impact on—

(A) the population of the country whose government is targeted by the action or actions;

(B) the humanitarian activities of United States and nongovernmental organizations in the country; and

(C) the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 202. ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN RESPONSE TO PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) RESPONSE TO A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to oppose institutional or other systemic failures of foreign governments to fulfill their obligations pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as applicable, to resolve abduction and access cases;

(2) to promote reciprocity pursuant to, and in compliance with, the Hague Abduction Convention or bilateral procedures, as appropriate; and

(3) to directly engage with senior foreign government officials to most effectively address patterns of noncompliance.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COUNTRIES WITH PATTERNS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—

(1) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Not later than April 30 of each year, the Secretary of State shall—

(A) review the status of abduction and access cases in each foreign country in order to determine whether the government of such country has engaged in a pattern of noncompliance during the preceding 12 months; and

(B) report such determination pursuant to section 101(f).

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES.—The Secretary of State shall seek to determine the agencies or instrumentalities of the government of each country determined to have engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under paragraph (1)(A) that are responsible for such pattern of noncompliance—

(A) to appropriately target actions in response to such noncompliance; and

(B) to engage with senior foreign government officials to effectively address such noncompliance.

(c) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE WITH RESPECT TO A COUNTRY WITH A PATTERN OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days (or 180 days in case of a delay under paragraph (2)) after a country is determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A), the Secretary of State shall—

(A) take 1 or more of the actions described in subsection (d);

(B) direct the Chief of Mission in that country to directly address the systemic problems that led to such determination; and

(C) inform senior officials in the foreign government of the potential repercussions related to such designation.

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary shall not be required to take action under paragraph (1) until the expiration of a single, additional period of up to 90 days if, on or before the date on which the Secretary of State is required to take such action, the Secretary determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such additional period is necessary—

(A) for a continuation of negotiations that have been commenced with the government of a country described in paragraph (1) in order to bring about a cessation of the pattern of noncompliance by such country;

(B) for a review of corrective action taken by a country after the designation of such country as being engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under subsection (b)(1)(A); or

(C) in anticipation that corrective action will be taken by such country during such 90-day period.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR ADDITIONAL ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall not be required to take additional action under paragraph (1) with respect to a country determined to have been engaged in a persistent pattern of noncompliance if the Secretary—

(A) has taken action pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), or (7) of subsection (d) with respect to such country in the preceding year and such action continues to be in effect;

(B) exercises the waiver under section 204 and briefs the appropriate congressional committees; or

(C) submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(i) indicates that such country is subject to multiple, broad-based sanctions; and

(ii) describes how such sanctions satisfy the requirements under this subsection.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the Annual Report, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the specific actions taken against countries determined to have been engaged in a pattern of noncompliance under this section.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION COUNTRIES.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the actions by the Secretary of State referred to in this subsection are—

(1) a demarche;

(2) an official public statement detailing unresolved cases;

(3) a public condemnation;

(4) a delay or cancellation of 1 or more bilateral working, official, or state visits;

(5) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States development assistance in accordance with section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n);

(6) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States security assistance in accordance with section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304);

(7) the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of assistance to the central government of a

country pursuant to chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the Economic Support Fund); and

(8) a formal request to the foreign country concerned to extradite an individual who is engaged in abduction and who has been formally accused of, charged with, or convicted of an extraditable offense.

(e) COMMENSURATE ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f), the Secretary of State may substitute any other action authorized by law for any action described in subsection (d) if the Secretary determines that such action—

(A) is commensurate in effect to the action substituted; and

(B) would substantially further the purposes of this Act.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—If commensurate action is taken pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) describes such action;

(B) explains the reasons for taking such action; and

(C) specifically describes the basis for the Secretary's determination under paragraph (1) that such action—

(i) is commensurate with the action substituted; and

(ii) substantially furthers the purposes of this Act.

(f) RESOLUTION.—The Secretary of State shall seek to take all appropriate actions authorized by law to resolve the unresolved case or to obtain the cessation of such pattern of noncompliance, as applicable.

(g) HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.—Any action taken pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) may not prohibit or restrict the provision of medicine, medical equipment or supplies, food, or other life-saving humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 203. CONSULTATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

As soon as practicable after the Secretary of State makes a determination under section 201 in response to a failure to resolve unresolved abduction cases or the Secretary takes an action under subsection (d) or (e) of section 202, based on a pattern of noncompliance, the Secretary shall request consultations with the government of such country regarding the situation giving rise to such determination.

SEC. 204. WAIVER BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of State may waive the application of any of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202 with respect to a country if the Secretary determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the government of such country—

(A) has satisfactorily resolved the abduction cases giving rise to the application of any of such actions; or

(B) has ended such country's pattern of noncompliance; or

(2) the national security interest of the United States requires the exercise of such waiver authority.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than the date on which the Secretary of State exercises the waiver authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver; and

(2) provide such committees with a detailed justification for such waiver, including an explanation of the steps the noncompliant government has taken—

(A) to resolve abductions cases; or

(B) to end its pattern of noncompliance.

(c) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary of State shall ensure that each waiver determination under this section—

(1) is published in the Federal Register; or

(2) is posted on the Department of State website.

(d) LIMITED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State may limit the publication of information under subsection (c) in the same manner and to the same extent as the President may limit the publication of findings and determinations described in section 654(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2414(c)), if the Secretary determines that the publication of such information would be harmful to the national security of the United States and would not further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 205. TERMINATION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

Any specific action taken under this Act or any amendment made by this Act with respect to a foreign country shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of State submits a written certification to Congress that the government of such country—

(1) has resolved any unresolved abduction case that gave rise to such specific action; or

(2) has taken substantial and verifiable steps to correct such country's persistent pattern of noncompliance that gave rise to such specific action, as applicable.

TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

SEC. 301. PREVENTING CHILDREN FROM LEAVING THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF A COURT ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 433. PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

''(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—The Secretary, through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this section as 'CBP'), in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish a program that—

''(1) seeks to prevent a child (as defined in section 1204(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code) from departing from the territory of the United States if a parent or legal guardian of such child presents a court order from a court of competent jurisdiction prohibiting the removal of such child from the United States to a CBP Officer in sufficient time to prevent such departure for the duration of such court order; and

''(2) leverages other existing authorities and processes to address the wrongful removal and return of a child.

''(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction. The group shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed officials from—

''(A) the Department of State;

''(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

''(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an official within the Department of Defense—

''(A) to coordinate with the Department of State on international child abduction issues; and

''(B) to oversee activities designed to prevent or resolve international child abduction cases relating to active duty military service members.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 432 the following:

''Sec. 433. Prevention of international child abduction.''.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIAL TRAINING ON INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall seek to provide training, directly or through another government agency or nongovernmental organizations, on the effective handling of parental abduction cases to the judicial and administrative authorities in countries—

(1) in which a significant number of unresolved abduction cases are pending; or

(2) that have been designated as having a pattern of noncompliance under section 202(b).

(b) STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities described in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to carry out subsection (a).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements under this section.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I don't believe there is further debate on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 3212), as amended, was passed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERINARY MEDICINE MOBILITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 458, H.R. 1528.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1528) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1528) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL CHILD AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 503, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 503) designating September 2014 as ''National Childhood Awareness Month'' to promote awareness of charities benefiting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble 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. 503) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 504.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 504) to direct the Senate Legal Counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, next term the Supreme Court will take up a case presenting the question whether a provision of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, which affects the official identification documents of some American citizens born abroad, is constitutional. In 2002, Congress enacted a law permitting U.S. citizens who are born in Jerusalem to have the Secretary of State specify ''Israel'' as their birthplace on their passports and other consular documents. Under existing State Department policy, passports and other documents of U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem may only record ''Jerusalem'' as their place of birth, not ''Israel,'' regardless of the wishes of the child or the parents.

Although the President signed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003 into law, in his signing statement he stated that, if the section of the law that included that provision, section 214, were interpreted as mandatory, it would ''interfere with the President's constitutional authority to formulate the position of the United States, speak for the Nation in international affairs, and determine the terms on which recognition is given to foreign states.'' Emphasizing that ''U.S. policy regarding Jerusalem has not changed,'' the Executive has continued to record solely ''Jerusalem'' as the birthplace on passports of all U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem, regardless of their preference and notwithstanding the statute.

In accordance with the Executive's policy, the State Department declined a request to place ''Israel'' on the official documents of a young Jerusalem-born U.S. citizen despite the statutory directive. The boy's parents then sued the Secretary of State on his behalf and sought an order to have ''Israel'' recorded as their son's place of birth. Their suit has been before the D.C. Circuit three times and is now in the Supreme Court for the second time.

Both the district court and the court of appeals initially ordered the suit dismissed. The D.C. Circuit held that the parents' claim under the statute ''presents a nonjusticiable political question because it trenches upon the President's constitutionally committed recognition power,'' which the court said, includes ''a decision made by the President regarding which government is sovereign over a particular place.'' Siding with the Executive, the court explained, ''[E]very president since 1948 has, as a matter of official policy, purposefully avoided taking a position on the issue whether Israel's sovereignty extends to the city of Jerusalem. . . . The State Department's refusal to record 'Israel' in passports and Consular Reports of Birth of U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem implements this longstanding policy of the Executive.''

The parents sought Supreme Court review, and in 2011 the Attorney General advised Congress that the Department of Justice would defend the court of appeals' judgment that the case was nonjusticiable, but that it would also argue that, if the claim was found to be justiciable, section 214(d) of the Act unconstitutionally infringes on the President's exclusive authority to recognize foreign states. A number of Senators and Members of the House appeared as amici curiae, or friends of the court, in support of the statute.

The Supreme Court granted certiorari and vacated the court of appeals' holding that the constitutional issue was a political question. The Court found that the case called for nothing more than performing the ''familiar judicial exercise'' of ''deciding whether the statute impermissibly intrudes upon Presidential powers under the Constitution.''

On remand, Members of both Houses again submitted amicus curiae briefs in defense of section 214(d). One judge on the appellate panel found that the plaintiff's argument was ''powerfully'' buttressed by briefs submitted by Members of Congress, among other amici. However, the panel majority observed, ''While an amicus brief has been submitted on behalf of six senators and fifty-seven representatives, they of course do not speak for the Congress qua the Congress.''

Based on its review of constitutional text and structure, precedent, and history, the D.C. Circuit concluded, this time on the merits, that the President ''exclusively holds the power to determine whether to recognize a foreign sovereign'' and that the statute ''plainly intended to force the State Department to deviate from its decades-long position of neutrality on what nation or government, if any, is sovereign over Jerusalem.'' The court found conclusive the Executive's view that, in so doing, ''section 214(d) would cause adverse foreign policy consequences.'' Accordingly, the court found that the law ''impermissibly intrudes on the President's recognition power and is therefore unconstitutional.''

In April of this year, the Supreme Court again granted review in the case, this time focused on the single question: ''Whether a federal statute that directs the Secretary of State, on request, to record the birthplace of an American citizen born in Jerusalem as born in 'Israel' on a Consular Report of Birth Abroad and on a United States passport is unconstitutional on the ground that the statute 'impermissibly infringes on the President's exercise of the recognition power reposing exclusively in him.' ''

This case, accordingly, now presents the Supreme Court with very important questions about the constitutional allocation of power between the branches over foreign affairs. The issues likely to be addressed include the claims of the Executive that the Constitution gives the President exclusive authority over recognition of foreign governments, that this law implicates such authority, and that the statute infringes impermissibly on the President's recognition power.

Contrary to the Executive's claim and the reasoning of the D.C. Circuit,

this statutory provision does not usurp any constitutional power of the President. In particular, it does not infringe on the President's exercise of the power to recognize foreign governments and to voice positions on matters of international sovereignty on behalf of the United States.

In legislating the content of identification documents available to American citizens born abroad, Congress is exercising its plenary powers over immigration and naturalization and its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce. The law does not alter the position of the United States on the status of Jerusalem. Rather, it continues Congress's century-and-a-half-old exercise of legislative authority over the contents and design of identification documents, such as passports, held by U.S. citizens. Congress does so in this case to respect the prerogative of American citizens to identify themselves as American citizens with a birth connection to the State of Israel, should they choose to do so.

Mr. President, Title VII of the Ethics in Government Act authorizes the Senate to appear as an amicus curiae in any legal action in which the powers and responsibilities of the Congress under the Constitution are placed in issue. Appearance as an amicus curiae in this case would enable the Senate to respond to the Executive's contention that this law infringes on the President's constitutional power to recognize foreign governments and to present to the Court the basis for the Senate's conviction that the law is consistent with the Constitution.

This resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to appear in this case in the Senate's name as amicus curiae to support the constitutionality of the statute.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 504) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, July 17; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 438, S. 2244, as provided under the previous order, and I ask that that be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 12 noon tomorrow there will be up to five votes in relation to the TRIA bill. We anticipate three rollcall votes in relation to the Coburn and Flake amendments and then on passage of the bill. There will be two voice votes on the Vitter and Tester amendments. We also expect to lock in an agreement to vote in relation to a circuit judge nomination at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:34 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 17, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*LAURA S. WERTHEIMER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 16, 2014:

THE JUDICIARY

RONNIE L. WHITE, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING SHAWNA MARIE SEARCY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize a special member of my staff. After almost eight years of service, Shawna Marie Searcy will be leaving her post in my Kansas City District Office.

Shawna began working in my campaign office, then joined my District office staff in 2006. She has served as a field representative over the years for many counties, including Clay County, the largest county in the Sixth Congressional District.

Shawna could be relied on to listen to my constituents' concerns and represent me at meetings when I was away in Washington. Shawna has also been instrumental in helping students in my district who are seeking nominations to our nation's military academies through that process. When it came to planning events, I knew Shawna would always put together an excellent event, whether a ribbon-cutting for a new bridge, a reception for the Congressional Art Contest honorees, or the Sixth Congressional District Small Business Expo. She was always at ease speaking publicly for me, while her warm smile and happy heart left an impression with my staff and constituents that they will always remember.

I have received many kind words from constituents praising the outstanding service Shawna has provided. Her professionalism and dedication to serving my constituents was a great example of how government should work. While I am losing a valuable member of my team, I am excited for Shawna to begin the next chapter of her career.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in thanking Shawna Marie Searcy for her many years of service to the people of the Sixth Congressional District. I know Shawna's colleagues, family and friends join with me in thanking her for her commitment to others and wishing her best of luck in all her endeavors and many years of success to come.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the language in this bill, or rather the lack of language, regarding the elimination of funding for the Election Assistance Commission (EAC).

There is nothing more crucial to democracy than guaranteeing the integrity, fairness, and accuracy of elections. Voting should not be an act of blind faith—it should be an act of record, and the EAC helps maintain the integrity of the American electoral process. Too many people across the country lack confidence in the legitimacy of election results, and dismantling the EAC will further erode faith in our democracy.

The EAC helps maintain the integrity of the American electoral process. Too many people across the country have lost confidence in the legitimacy of the election results. In fact, a recent poll from Rasmussen Reports found that 68 percent of likely voters believe that elections are rigged (or favor) incumbents. Dismantling the EAC would further erode that necessary faith in the process.

How quickly have we forgotten the Florida recount with its hanging chads, pregnant chads, and hand counts of ballots to determine voter intent? The 2000 election exposed critical flaws and inconsistencies in how elections were conducted, and in its wake the Congress under the leadership of Whip STENY HOYER approved the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) to assist state and local jurisdictions.

Yet the legislation we are considering today willfully ignores this history. The bill defunds the EAC and assumes that Congress will pass legislation to transfer some of its vital functions of the EAC to the Federal Election Commission (FEC), an agency that does not have the capability or the expertise to do the job. The work of the EAC does not fit into the mission of the FEC.

Additionally, funding for the EAC has always included a set aside for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to continue its work on testing guidelines for voting system hardware and software. Work that will most likely stop as the House has already appropriated NIST funds for Fiscal Year 2015.

I would have liked to offer an amendment to this legislation to reinstate the EAC's Fiscal Year 2014 levels, but unfortunately, the overall budget limitations in this bill make that nearly impossible.

The lack of appropriations takes us in exactly the wrong direction. While millions of Americans are casting their ballots on unauditable voting machines, eliminating the EAC would increase the risk that our electoral process will be compromised by voting system irregularities. Can we afford to take that risk? Certainly not. Do we want problems to go undetected? I would hope not. Less oversight, lesser standards, less transparency in reporting, less testing, fewer audits weakens our democracy. Abolishing the EAC is the wrong way to go.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF IRENE WRIGHT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the ninetieth birthday of one of my noted and civically active constituents, Mrs. Irene Dugan Wright of Dallas, Texas.

Irene was born on July 19, 1924, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and was the oldest of three children. Both of her parents were hearing impaired and, many years later, she would come to serve as an interpreter for the deaf at church. After spending most of her childhood in Philadelphia, Irene graduated from Commerce High School in Springfield, Massachusetts. She went on to work as a secretary for Trinity Church in Springfield and met her husband, Bob, through a church event and they married in 1951.

Irene's life in Texas began in 1954 when the family moved to Dallas on a temporary assignment from the Sun Oil Company. It did not take long for Texas to appeal to the Wrights, and they successfully requested that the assignment in the area become permanent.

Since moving to Dallas, Irene has continuously been very active in our community's civic and political life. The first time she ever voted was for Dwight D. Eisenhower after attending a debate between him and Adlai Stevenson. In 1957, the Wrights were having air conditioning installed in their home when they were asked to host a backyard event to gather and identify Republicans in Dallas County. Since then, Irene attended many state conventions in Texas and was an alternate delegate to the Republican National Convention in her birthplace of Philadelphia in 2000. She has worked on numerous campaigns, including those of John Tower, Jim Collins, and SAM JOHNSON.

Irene also maintains active ties with her faith community. She is not only a member of the Golden Corridor Republican Women's Club but also serves as a chaplain. She is a member of Christ Church in Plano, Texas, and has taught women's Bible Study for thirty-five years. Irene and Bob, who passed away in 2003, had three children together—Susan, Lisa, and John—and she has six grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the ninetieth birthday of one of my most civically engaged constituents, Mrs. Irene Dugan Wright. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating this milestone in her remarkable life.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALEXANDRIA BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the House's attention today to recognize the congregation of Alexandria Baptist Church, which will be celebrating its 100th anniversary with a celebration on August 3.

The Alexandria Baptist Church was organized the first Sunday in April of 1914. There were 22 members of the original church, and the first pastor was Rev. John W. Stewart. After six years of holding services in the Odd Fellows Hall in Alexandria, plans were made to build a church. Four years later, the present church was built.

Many of the early pastors at Alexandria Baptist Church were students from Howard College. Two passenger trains carried these student pastors back and forth from Birmingham each Sunday.

The people of Alexandria Baptist Church live out the church's mission statement, ''To Love God and To Love Others'' each and every day.

On August 3, 2014, Alexandria Baptist Church members will gather with former pastors, leaders, members and staff to commemorate their successful 100 years. Please join me in celebrating this milestone and wishing them many more years of success.

HONORING DR. JON NACHISON

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Dr. Jon Nachison, Ph.D., or Dr. Jon, as he is fondly known, co-founder of the National Stand Down for Homelessness. After twenty-seven years of continuous service as director, Dr. Jon is finally ''standing down.''

Dr. Jon began Stand Down in 1988 when, as Clinical Director of Psychological Services at the Veterans Village of San Diego (then known as Vietnam Veterans of San Diego), he and the Director at VVSD, Robert Van Keuren, convinced the City of San Diego and other community stakeholders to support a new program to address the needs of homeless veterans Through his perseverance, and despite initial community resistance, San Diego embraced what has become an annual event, incorporating as many as 3500 community volunteers who return faithfully year after year. In tribute to his original creativity, over 200 other communities nationwide have adopted the model that Dr. Jon first introduced and perfected.

The term ''stand down'' refers to a military command to move oneself out of a war zone (the streets, in this case) to a safe place to regroup. By design, Stand Down borrows from a long history of therapeutic communities and recreates a bivouac setting of military tents and military organization. Over a three day weekend, it recreates a sense of prior military identity and begins to restore a sense of self-worth. Showers, clean clothes, basic medical care and social services renew the veterans' faith in change being possible. Dr. Jon wants participants to regain the sense of competence and empowerment they had known during their years of military service. The isolation and stress of homelessness recedes amongst friends.

Stand Down becomes a transformational experience and Dr. Jon's energy, vision, and unwavering commitment have been the cornerstone of this program. That he has created a program to address two national problems, homelessness and the successful societal reentry of our returning veterans, establishes him as a treasure, not only for San Diego, but for our Nation. I rise to honor Dr. Jon for his many years of creative service.

RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of what we now know as the Congressional Research Service.

Today's Congressional Research Service—CRS—was first established in the Library of Congress in 1914 as the Legislative Reference Service to provide reference information to Members of Congress to assist in their legislative work. Over the past 100 years, the LRS evolved into today's CRS. Today, CRS employs more than 600 experts to assist Congress with research and analysis.

CRS and its employees provide an invaluable service to Members of Congress and their staff. In an era of political gridlock and partisan rhetoric, CRS consistently provides in-depth, authoritative, and consistently nonpartisan work product in order to ensure that we have an informed legislature.

In the 1950s, the press called LRS ''Congress's right arm.'' I believe that description would be just as accurate about today's CRS. CRS has taken that role seriously—it has continued to modernize and evolve, while maintaining its core mission of independent research and policy analysis. It has kept up with modern technology, updating its website to be more user-friendly and providing Members and staff with quick access to timely reports and detailed analysis.

Mr. Speaker, CRS at 100 is a critical tool to an informed Congress, and I look forward to working with CRS as it embarks on its second century of service.

HONORING THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Congressional Research Service (CRS) on the occasion of its centennial anniversary. For 100 years, the experts at CRS have worked to provide Members and staff with timely information and research to help them serve their constituents, develop legislation and conduct strong oversight.

Since its founding in 1914, CRS has evolved from a small agency providing basic reference services to a group of nearly 600 expert, highly-trained and collaborative professional staff members who are dedicated to supporting the work of the Congress.

I can attest from my time in Congress that the objective, nonpartisan work of CRS is essential to the legislative process. When we face difficult policy problems or international crises, we turn to CRS for reliable information and analyses. CRS enables the Congress to make informed decisions for the United States and its citizens.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating CRS for all of its accomplishments over the last century, and I look forward to strongly supporting the institution as it embarks on its next century of service to our nation.

A TRIBUTE TO MOTHER CORENER HINES-HERRING

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great woman of faith, Mother Corener Hines-Herring. She was a pastor's wife, musician, songwriter, mother, and grandmother from the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin. Mother Hines-Herring was born on September 12, 1937 and passed away on July 10, 2014.

Mother Corener Hines-Herring was born in Haynes, Arkansas to Governor and Corener Harris and had 15 siblings. She was married to the late Reverend Willie L. Hines, Sr., and their union produced 10 children. Reverend Hines, Sr. led the congregation at the Greater Westside Church of God In Christ where Mother Hines served as first lady to the church.

Mother Hines-Herring was a Member of Christian Faith Fellowship Church of God in Christ, Inc., where her eldest son, Bishop Darrell L. Hines, Sr. is pastor. Mother Hines-Herring was a prayer warrior and lived to praise God. She loved to dance before the Lord in church and played the piano.

Mother Hines-Herring would always open her home and heart to those in need. Although she gave birth to 10 children and raised them well, she was a mother to thousands. She was never a complainer but rather a doer.

She leaves behind many friends, admirers and family members to mourn her passing including children: Bishop Darrell L. Hines, Sr. (Pamela), former Milwaukee Common Council President Alderman Willie L. Hines Jr. (Janel), daughter songstress, Phebe Hines Holmes, Janet Hines Samolyk, Daven Hines (Tonya), Robin Hines Young (Harold), Bridgette Hines Flowers (Curtis), Sharon Hines Monroe (Mark), Rhoda Hines Turner (Jason), Richard Hines (Liza) and her husband, Mr. Timothy Herring.

I am honored to pay tribute to Mother Corener Hines-Herring. She was a prayer

leader extraordinaire, a pillar of the church, the matriarch of her family and my friend and mentor. She has made a positive impact on Milwaukee and will be missed.

Mr. Speaker for these reasons I rise to pay tribute to a woman whose legacy will continue to benefit the Fourth Congressional District.

HONORING MR. ROLAND GLENN

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an honorable World War II veteran in my state whose bravery saved the lives of many during combat on Okinawa.

In 1945, Roland Glenn helped to lead the men of his company to capture key Japanese positions by scaling an escarpment in the face of intense resistance. The unit needed the element of surprise, and for the enemy to believe that they were facing a large group of American soldiers (instead of the 35 that made it up the escarpment). The unit's success in this dangerous situation is due, in large part, to Mr. Glenn's leadership and bravery.

The plan to overtake the enemy position was difficult and had little room for error. Many of these soldiers were young men, afraid and far from home. It was not only Mr. Glenn's ingenious plan of attack that saved many lives; he also encouraged them to keep going, empowering them and boosting their morale. Together, these brave men were able to beat the odds and win the battle.

Since his time in the Army, Mr. Glenn has worked as a peace activist, continuing his service to our country. He was then, and continues to be, a great leader and patriot. I wish Mr. Glenn all the best and thank him wholeheartedly for his service to our nation.

HONORING JOSEPH MEIDL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Joseph Meidl. Joseph is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 117, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Joseph has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Joseph has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Joseph has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Joseph Meidl for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE LIVING LEGACY TREE PLANTING PROJECT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership's ''Living Legacy Tree Planting Project.''

This project is an ambitious effort to plant one tree for every one of the 740,000 soldiers who died during the Civil War along the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Scenic Byway, which runs from Monticello, Virginia to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. When completed, the byway will become the world's first 180-mile landscaped alley. More importantly, it will serve as a living memorial to those who died during our nation's most difficult trial and a sober reminder of the enormity of its cost.

Each tree planted will be dedicated to an individual Civil War soldier and will be ''geotagged'' to make a number of historical resources, such as the soldier's pictures and personal writings from the war, electronically available to visitors and researchers. The project has drawn enthusiastic volunteers from communities around the country and has recently partnered with Ancestry.com to supplement the quality of the information provided on each soldier.

I submit the following article from the Washington Post and ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the important efforts being made by the Journey Through Hallowed Grounds Partnership to honor those who paid the ultimate price for freedom and liberty.

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 2014]

A LIVING TRIBUTE TO CIVIL WAR SOLDIERS

(By Wesley Robinson)

The newest trees along U.S. Route 15 come with stories of Civil War troops.

One freshly planted rising sun redbud in Leesburg, Va., honors Joseph T. Bosworth, a young man from Massachusetts who fought with the 1st Rhode Island Cavalry. He died at the Battle of Antietam.

A young sassafras nearby was dedicated to Daniel M. Barringer, who joined the Confederate Army in Corinth, Miss., fought with the 17th Mississippi Company and is buried in Union Cemetery in Leesburg. He was wounded at the Battle of Fredericksburg and died about a month after he was discharged.

They are among 1,413 trees that have been planted so far to commemorate the Civil War dead through the nonprofit Journey Through Hallowed Ground (JTHG) Living Legacy Tree Planting Project. Though organizers acknowledge that the $74 million plan is ambitious, their aim is to plant a tree for each of an estimated 740,000 troops killed in the War between the States.

Cate Magennis Wyatt, founder and president of the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership, said the trees—each funded by a $100 donation—are being planted along a 180-mile stretch from Thomas Jefferson's Albemarle County estate, Monticello, to Gettysburg, Pa.

Visitors can search an interactive online map that shows each tree and includes details about the person it honors.

The tree-planting project came about after then-Gov. Robert F. McDonnell asked communities to plan an unusual way to observe the sesquicentennial of the war, which was fought from 1861 to 1865, Magennis Wyatt said. She said her group, which is dedicated to historic preservation, wanted to do something other than a ''flagpole or another monument,'' eventually arriving at the idea for the tree allée.

''My joke was that God had spoken to her through a burning redwood bush,'' said Peter Hart, an arborist and volunteer with JTHG.

When the project began, Magennis Wyatt noted, the number of Civil War dead was estimated at 620,000. Now historians put it at 740,000. Organizers said they are considering tagging existing trees to advance the goal of recognizing as many troops as possible. At a dedication ceremony last month, at Oatlands Historic Home and Gardens in Leesburg, Magennis Wyatt noted that there was not nearly enough room to plant a tree every 10 feet along the entire 180-mile route.

Many of the trees are redbuds, but the project is also using a variety of maples, eastern red cedars and flowering dogwoods. Hart, who took part in the selection process, said they picked colorful variations but also hearty trees that can flourish next to a well-traveled roadway, where they must withstand heat from the pavement, high winds and road salt.

Christopher Shott of New Bedford, Mass., said he came across the project online and decided to donate a redbud to honor Bosworth.

Shott doesn't have any direct family ties to the Civil War; his relatives came to the United States later. Still, he felt a kinship with Bosworth because they had lived in the same town, Swansea, Mass.

''He made me feel like I have a connection to the Civil War,'' Shott said.

One of the challenges the project faces, organizers said, is collecting information about the slain troops. Magennis Wyatt said about half of the soldiers died anonymously. She said there was no American Red Cross, government-issued dog tags or comprehensive registry. Wartime contributions of Native Americans, African Americans and women went largely unheralded.

The project has joined with Ancestry.com and Fold3.com to provide biographical sketches of the troops. It is uploading biographical information to the Web site and trying to verify information with descendants, historians and others.

At last month's dedication ceremony, for 500 recently planted trees, Jimmy Cunningham, 14, presented his research on Barringer. Jimmy, who lives in Leesburg, has attended a JTHG summer camp for the past three years and will serve as a junior counselor this summer. He was asked to participate in the research project by the JTHG staff and teamed up with his grandmother to investigate Barringer's life.

Jimmy found that Barringer was injured in battle but died after he had been discharged. The death was attributed to ''leprosy'' and ''disease of the head.'' Jimmy also learned that Barringer's father was a wealthy man, which raised questions about why he went to war.

''It stimulated a lot of conversation in our home,'' said MaryKirk Cunningham, Jimmy's mother.

Cunningham said her son's research also helped him become interested in family history. An ancestor on her side, Briscoe Goodhart, was a member of the Loudoun Rangers, a partisan cavalry unit that fought for the Union in the Civil War.

''For us, it's really great. . . . He went beyond our family but stayed connected to his nana through our family,'' Cunningham said.

Michelle Kellogg, director of the JTHG National Heritage area, said the stretch where the trees are being planted, rich with historic sites, is a fitting place for such a tribute. She noted the region's nine presidential homes and high concentration of Civil War battle sites.

''This region is essential in helping Americans and visitors understand our history,'' Kellogg said.

The Hallowed Grounds partnership was created several years back by Magennis Wyatt, a former Virginia secretary of commerce, and others worried about development's effect on the historic area. They were motivated, in part, by Disney's attempt in the 1990s to create a historic theme park in the region and by proposals to build a casino in Gettysburg and condos near Monticello.

''It was apparent that we were taking a lot for granted,'' Magennis Wyatt said, ''not just the bricks and mortar but the people who lived on this land and created this country.''

Ellen Vogel, a landscape architect with the Virginia Department of Transportation, said another challenge of the project is finding enough space for the trees in the corridor, about half of which is in Virginia. She said VDOT worked to provide the necessary guidance and flexibility.

''It's great that Virginia has a scenic byway. There are so few of those across the country,'' Vogel said. ''But we have a lot of history here. I think it's fitting.''

Hart's great-great-uncles Charles and William Davis and Jason Hart were killed in the war. His great-great-grandfather James Hart was wounded twice but survived.

''You combine my love for my family history and my love for trees and this living legacy project has captured me,'' Hart said.

Shott, who flew to Virginia for the ceremony last month, said he visited Bosworth's grave in Sharpsburg, Md., early that Sunday to pay his respects before going to see the rising sun redbud planted in the soldier's honor.

''I just try to understand why they did what they did to the point they'd die for something they believed in,'' Shott said. ''The least we can do is remember them.''

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT ANTON F. JACKS, LEGION d'HONNEUR FOR U.S. VETERANS RECIPIENT

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Anton F. Jacks for receiving the Legion d'Honneur for U.S. Veterans Award for heroic service in connection with military operations in Lorient, France.

Sergeant Jacks committed an exceptionally heroic action on August 31, 1944, while serving in the Army Corps of Engineers, Company ''A'', 25th Armored Engineer Battalion, in the United States Army.

On that day, Sergeant Jacks was assigned to guard a farm house that served as an allied forces outpost in the vicinity of Lorient. While on guard, Sergeant Jacks made the heroic decision to establish a series of booby traps around the perimeter to provide protection for his unit and innocent French civilians in the area. When a unit of German soldiers attempted to attack and overthrow the farm house, the traps prevented the German soldiers from infiltrating the allied perimeter.

As stated by Captain Richard H. Brooks, ''the outpost was attacked by a numerically superior force of German soldiers. At 0845 the attacking enemy, failing to penetrate the courageous fighting men of the outpost, withdrew.''

Mr. Speaker, without question, Sergeant Jacks is a hero. His personal bravery, and heroic conduct are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the Corps of Engineers, and the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a very grateful nation, please join me in recognizing and thanking Sergeant Anton F. Jacks for his acts of valor.

H.R. 4719, THE AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2014

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act of 2014, and in particular in support of the provision that would make the current tax deduction for the contribution of conservation easements permanent. As a cosponsor of similar legislation, I am pleased to see this provision included in the bill. In my home state of Idaho, I have repeatedly seen the positive impact of conservation easements. One of my favorite stretches of river in Idaho is the South Fork of the Snake, near Idaho Falls, where I live. It is a great place to fish, watch bald eagles, or enjoy the beauty of nature without interruption, and this is due in large part to the fact that conservation easements protect the land on the river from development and created wonderful areas for recreation.

More importantly, however, conservation easements have a significant benefit to our economy in Idaho. Farming and ranching have long been a way of life in my state, but increasingly what was once vast swaths of ranchland is being broken up into smaller parcels for development. The conservation easement tax incentive gives many farmers and ranchers the option to put some of their land into conservation easements, protecting habitat and scenic landscapes, instead of selling to developers. In addition, easements that allow for continued agricultural use provide certainty for those who want to keep ranching and farming.

I am pleased that this provision was included in the bill, and I look forward to seeing it benefit willing landowners who are working together with land management agencies to preserve the open spaces in Idaho.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of a segment of northern Cyprus. This invasion has since morphed into a prolonged occupation in which an estimated 43,000 Turkish soldiers are deployed in the occupied territory, and tens of thousands of Turkish citizens have migrated to the island since 1974. Turkey's invasion and occupation of northern Cyprus has created yet another long-running international conflict, one that continues to destabilize the eastern Mediterranean region.

I agree with those in the international community who assert that a peaceful, long-term resolution of this conflict must include the establishment of a unified Republic of Cyprus, in which the religious, cultural and political beliefs of all Cypriots can be expressed through a truly democratic political process. I am encouraged by the democratic selection of new leadership in the Republic of Cyprus, and reassured by the willingness of Turkish-Cypriot leaders to continue a dialogue about potential reunification. These are signs that a peaceful resolution is possible, but a key component of any long-term settlement must include the withdrawal of Turkish military forces from the island.

A long-term, peaceful resolution of the Cyprus standoff is not simply in the interest of the island's Greek and Turkish inhabitants. A successful resolution of this conflict would remove a major obstacle to Turkey's integration with the rest of Europe, a development that would enhance the security and economic wellbeing of millions of people in the region. Our government should be working daily to facilitate that outcome, and I will certainly use every opportunity available to me to make that point to Administration officials.

RECOGNIZING THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the amount of information that passes through a Congressional office on a daily basis is astounding. While the morning might see me and my staff meeting with one group of constituents on the perils of climate change, and another on the need for universal advanced care directives, the evening may bring a bill on mining rights or international trade to the floor of the House of Representatives. All of these discussions, decisions, and debates require me and my staff to have access to vast amounts of unbiased information that we can trust. We have no greater resource than the Congressional Research Service.

The experts at CRS work with incredible speed and accuracy to get my office the information we need. Whenever we are drafting legislation or looking for more background as we delve into complicated policy, CRS is always a first call. Over the years, we have come back to certain experts again and again and are always increasingly impressed at the depth of their knowledge of their subject matters.

Congratulations to CRS on its 100th anniversary. I hope that this vital institution remains vibrant as our government strives toward a better and more nuanced understanding of the issues and challenges we face as a country.

IN HONOR OF FRANCIS ''FRANK'' BUDD

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the life of Mr. Francis ''Frank'' Budd. Mr. Budd, a New Jersey native, passed away on April 29, 2014 after an accomplished life.

Born on July 20, 1939 in Long Branch, New Jersey, Frank Budd was an outstanding athlete and graduate of Asbury Park High School and Villanova University. He was inducted into the inaugural Villanova Wall of Fame in Villanova Stadium on October 7, 1995 and the Frank Budd Track and Field Meet at Asbury Park High School is held each year in his honor.

After college, Mr. Budd played for the National Football League and the Canadian Football League. Following his football career, Mr. Budd worked for the New Jersey Department of Corrections and the Tropicana Casino in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

At one time distinguished as ''the world's fastest human,'' Frank Budd was a standout track and field runner. He competed for the United States in the 1960 Olympics in Rome, won several individual and team championships while at Villanova, and in 1961 broke the 13-year long record for the 100-yard dash at 9.2 seconds.

Mr. Budd leaves behind a loving family, including his wife of 51 years, Barbara, a son, Frank, Jr., two daughters Kimberly Arzillo and Anitra Speight, siblings, grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Frank Budd for his remarkable athletic achievements, his legacy to Asbury Park, and his service to his community, state and family.

CYPRUS SETTLEMENT TALKS

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to be here today and to have the opportunity to speak about something very important both to me and to many of the constituents I serve in New York's Fifth District: the Cyprus settlement talks. I'm here to tell you that I am following the negotiations carefully—that I am ready to lend my support in any way I can. And I am here to tell you that America wants these talks to be successful—that America is engaged. Mr. BIDEN's visit in May was the first by an American Vice-President in over 50 years, and that says a lot. Finding a fair and mutually acceptable resolution to the situation in Cyprus is a priority at the very highest levels of our government—and we will not rest until we succeed.

I am also here to tell you that I'm hopeful. I have not forgotten the false-starts of the past, nor am I naïve about the difficulties which lie ahead, but I am hopeful that Cyprus has turned a corner—that things are different this time. I'm optimistic that there's a real chance for progress. Not long after Mr. BIDEN departed Cyprus, in fact, Greek Cypriot President Mr. Anastasiades and his Turkish Cypriot counterpart, Mr. Eroglu, agreed to meet at least twice a month to discuss how they could build trust between the two sides. I commend both leaders for taking this step, and I express my utmost support for continuing an open and honest dialogue.

I am also hopeful because at no other time during the 40 years Cyprus has been divided was reaching a settlement so critical. For millennia Cyprus has been at the crossroads of civilization. It has been a hub of commerce and a strategic waypoint for all who transited the Mediterranean. And it remains so today, but with even greater strategic implications. Located at the nexus of Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa, Cyprus is a vital source of stability and security in one of the world's most volatile regions. And with a robust free-market, services-based economy and newly discovered natural gas reserves, Cyprus stands to benefit greatly from increasing ties with the international community, especially the Transatlantic Trade & Investment Partnership—a free trade agreement I strongly support.

But Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike are being denied the bright future they deserve. It is time to come to the negotiating table ready to make compromises, ready to make progress. It is time to reunify Cyprus based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation, as called for by multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions. It is time to turn a page in Cyprus' history and find out what great surprises the next chapter holds in store.

I stand by my friends and colleagues in Cyprus and the Cypriot diaspora—ready to read that next chapter. And America stands by too—determined to deepen the partnership between our two great countries, eager to see just how much we can accomplish when we work together.

HONORING DR. NEYLAND CLARK

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Neyland Clark, who has recently resigned from his post as the superintendent of the South Harrison Community School Corporation after 18 years of exemplary public service. His resignation marks a milestone in a career dedicated to education, including 26 years as a superintendent and more than four decades as an educator.

Over the course of his career, Dr. Clark has been bestowed many accolades and awards that objectify the passion and expertise that he has brought to the field of education. In just the past few years, Dr. Clark has been conferred an honorary degree from Indiana University Southeast, awarded the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) ''Excellence in Educational Leadership Award,'' and honored as the ''District VIII Superintendent of the Year'' by the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents.

Dr. Clark is known in the education world as a capable leader and tireless innovator. Dr. Clark's successes have spanned a wide variety of issues, from combating racism in schools to balancing budgets while also raising teacher salaries. Dr. Clark's district became the first school corporation in the state of Indiana to establish an in-house professional development center in schools. These examples are more evidence of the relentless passion and knowledge Dr. Clark has brought to our education system over the past four decades.

Despite all of the praise, Dr. Clark remains a characteristically humble Hoosier, saying ''There is no magical story for being successful; it is a good, old-fashioned southern Indiana work ethic [that paves the path to success].'' Dr. Clark's work ethic, dedication, and knowledge will be missed as he moves on to new endeavors. Dr. Clark serves as an inspiration for anyone who seeks to make a positive difference in the public sector.

The 9th District of Indiana thanks him for his service.

HONORING BUFFY RENEE SMITH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize a special member of my staff. After more than ten years of service, Buffy Renee Smith will be leaving her post in my Kansas City District Office.

Originally from the Sixth District, Buffy brought an understanding of the people and issues that only someone with her deep roots could bring. Buffy began working in my Washington office in 2004, then later moved back home to Missouri and joined my District office staff. She has served as a staff assistant, field representative, scheduler and Director of Operations for my office over the years.

Buffy could be relied on to keep my office running efficiently and represent me at meetings when I was away in Washington. Buffy managed my schedule both in Washington and in District for many years, helping me represent the people of the Sixth Congressional District. Whether I needed to meet with officials in Platte County during the 2011 floods, manage a bill on the House floor or attend a House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure town hall in Wisconsin, I could count on Buffy to get me there and make sure I had all the information I needed for the event.

I have received many kind words from constituents praising the outstanding service Buffy has provided. Her professionalism and dedication to this office and my constituents was a great example of how government should work. She would often work nights and weekends, while time and again going beyond her job description, all without complaint. While I am losing a valuable member of my team, I am excited for Buffy to begin the next chapter of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in thanking Buffy Renee Smith for her many years of service to the people of the Sixth Congressional District. I know Buffy's colleagues, family and friends join with me in thanking her for her commitment to others and wishing her best of luck in all her endeavors and many years of success to come.

PERMANENT INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act. This legislation makes permanent the ban on state and local taxation of Internet access. This is vital to ensuring continued economic growth powered by the Internet and digital economy.

I am encouraged by the bipartisan support for this legislation and am hopeful that it will be enacted into law before the November 1 expiration date.

As a former state legislator and Minnesota House Majority Leader, I am a strong believer in states' rights. In addition to the legislation before the House today, I would also like to highlight the efforts of my colleagues JASON CHAFFETZ, STEVE WOMACK, SUZAN DELBENE, JACKIE SPEIER, and other members of the Judiciary Committee.

They are working diligently on similar states' rights legislation to address federal law for sales made over the Internet. This is important, because purchasing items on the Internet should not offer tax breaks that are not extended to brick and mortar retailers. States should be encouraged to compete with one another by keeping tax rates low, not by promoting one form of commerce over another.

The Internet Tax Freedom Act has helped e-commerce grow to over $220 billion this year. And with 20 percent annual growth projected through 2017, it's time to update outdated federal interstate commerce laws to ensure all retailers are treated the same.

The tax code should not pick winners and losers. As commerce is conducted on the Internet, we should ensure there is an even playing field for all businesses.

In fact, I've heard from many retailers in my home state of Minnesota about the importance of this legislation to their ability to compete on a level playing field.

Madam Speaker, I'm hopeful this body will also consider this legislation before the end of the year.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,591,980,437,201.71. We've added $6,965,103,388,288.63 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

FOR CYPRUS REUNIFICATION

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for ending the separation of Cyprus which has existed since 1974. It is time to finally end the 40 year division of Cyprus and I am hopeful that the Cyprus settlement talks will accomplish that critical goal. The reunification of Cyprus is among the most pressing foreign policy matters that exist in the world today.

A reunited Cyprus would finally end the occupation and injustice that has existed on the island for far too long. Only by solving this crisis can Greek and Turkish Cypriots live side by side in peace, and work together to improve stability and prosperity in the region. It is critical that Congress express its support for a resolution and that our country stand ready to provide assistance in any way it can. A united and unified Cyprus is in America's interest, with many benefits to our economy, bilateral relations and national security.

I urge all parties involved in reunification talks to continue working towards a lasting solution. While there is not yet light at the end of the tunnel, there are some bright spots peeking through. I look forward to the negotiations moving forward and hope that one day soon, a divided Cyprus will only exist in the history books.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 7, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Wednesday, July 9, 2014: H.R. 4923—Energy and Water Development and related agencies Appropriations Act 2015 Amendments: rollcall No. 371—McAllister Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 372—Hahn Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 373—Gosar Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 374—Wenstrup Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 375—Swalwell Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 376—Byrne Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 377—McClintock Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 378—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Concur in the Senate Amendments "aye."

Thursday, July 10, 2014: rollcall No. 379—McClintock Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 380—Bonamici Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 381—Speier Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 382—Titus Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 383—Schiff Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 384—Quigley Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 385—Chabot Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 386—Titus Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 387—DeLauro Amendment "aye"; rollcall No. 388—King Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 389—Lankford Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 390—Cassidy Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 391—Providing for consideration of H.R. 5016 "aye"; rollcall No. 392—Providing for consideration of H.R. 5016 "nay"; rollcall No. 393—Burgess Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 394—LaMalfa Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 395—Stockman Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 396—Stockman Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 397—McKinley Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 398—Blackburn Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 399—Gosar Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 400—Hudson Amendment "nay"; rollcall No. 401—On Motion to Recommit with Instructions "aye"; rollcall No. 402—On Passage "nay."

Friday, July 11, 2014: H.R. 4718—rollcall No. 403—On Motion to Recommit with Instructions "aye"; rollcall No. 404—On Passage "nay."

CONGRATULATING DANSBY SWANSON, 2014 COLLEGE WORLD SERIES' MOST OUTSTANDING PLAYER

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Marietta native, Marietta High School Alumnus, and Vanderbilt second baseman, Dansby Swanson, on his accomplishments in the 2014 NCAA College World Series.

Swanson was awarded the College World Series' Most Outstanding Player Award and was an incredible asset in helping Vanderbilt clinch its first College World Series Championship.

Throughout the 2014 season, Swanson became one of the key players on Vanderbilt's tremendously talented roster and was key in Vandy's 3–2 victory over the University of Virginia in the final to cap off a landmark 50 win season.

Just a sophomore, Swanson batted .323 with five runs scored and two RBI in Omaha—the most impressive performance of any player in the tournament.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional District, I applaud Dansby for his achievement and look forward to his future successes. I extend my enthusiastic congratulations to him on achieving the highest level of recognition possible in the NCAA College World Series.

HONORING MARVIN HAMMOND

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Marvin Hammond, a friend of mine for more than 50 years, passed away this past Saturday in Knoxville, Tennessee. Marvin was one of the finest men I have ever known.

Marvin was 71 and had a long and successful career as an executive for the Knoxville Utilities Board and as the top official of the Hallsdale-Powell Utility District.

I first got to know Marvin when he was the manager of Holston High School athletic teams. I played a lot of sports and sold programs, popcorn, and soft drinks at many games for the University of Tennessee and Knoxville professional teams. Marvin was at many of these games.

When I was 15, I got my first hourly-pay job working as a groundskeeper at the Holston-Chilhowee ball park. Marvin was 19 and was my first boss. I made $1.00 an hour, and he always joked that I was overpaid.

After high school he became a trainer in the Cincinnati Reds minor league system. I was batboy for the Knoxville Smokies and would see him when his team would come to town. He was always proud of his association with several players who later made it to the big leagues. He especially treasured his longtime friendship with manager Dave Bristol.

The Knoxville News-Sentinel relates a story about how Marvin helped a Cub Scout troop that I led. He spent a full day and went to great lengths to help me and the Cub Scouts, none of which he knew other than my son, John.

He campaigned for me in my first race for Congress. I will never forget a campaign trip one Saturday to Polk County, Tennessee. Lance Cavett was with us and he kept fussing at Marvin about his ridiculously high KUB bill and how he just couldn't believe it.

Marvin became very concerned and then asked Lance how high this terrible utility bill was. When Lance replied that it was $36, Marvin, who was driving, nearly ran off the road.

I was pleased that on the Monday before he died, I had about a 30-minute visit with Marvin at his Hospice room. He held my hand for almost the entire visit.

He seemed so alert and pleasant that I left thinking and hoping that he would recover. Unfortunately, that was not to be.

That day, we talked over old stories and old friends. He assured me that he was not in any pain and that God had greatly blessed him in many ways.

He told me of what he considered to be a miracle during his final illness. He said he had become addicted to pain pills and told his doctor he wanted to stop taking them.

He said his doctor told him that would not be possible—that no one could stand the pain he would experience. Marvin insisted, saying he was turning it over to the Lord. He said from that moment, he became miraculously pain-free.

Marvin had accepted that his death was near and told me he was thankful that he had been given time to say good-bye to his family and friends. He faced his death in a courageous, loving way, showing great Christian faith, and setting a wonderful example for everyone.

Marvin Hammond was a good and kind man. I was told that over 300 friends visited him in his last days and hundreds more attended his receiving of friends and funeral.

This Nation would be a better place if we had more men like Marvin Hammond. To me, he was a great man.

I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the stories about Marvin Hammond that ran in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on July 14, 2014, and the Shopper News on July 16, 2014.

[From knoxnews.com, July 14, 2014.]

FORMER HALLSDALE POWELL CEO MARVIN HAMMOND DIES AT 71

(By Josh Flory)

A prominent former leader of a North Knox County utility district died on Saturday.

Marvin Hammond, 71, was the former president and CEO of the Hallsdale Powell Utility District, and previously a longtime executive with the Knoxville Utilities Board.

Darren Cardwell, Hammond's son-in-law and the current general manager of HPUD, said Monday that Hammond had been in worsening health for several months, and had been receiving hospice care.

Cardwell described Hammond as a mentor, coach and boss, saying that even when they disagreed, they could still ''have a family life, too, and not carry the two together.''

''That taught me a lot over the years in how to grow and be more of not only a husband and father but how to be a leader in the business,'' Cardwell said.

Knoxville attorney John Valliant said that in the last days of his life, many people would ask Hammond how they could help, and he would respond by telling them about other people with needs. ''He was giving people instructions as to how he wanted them to help other people, and he was dying,'' Valliant said.

Hammond's leadership at Hallsdale Powell wasn't without controversy. His tenure coincided with a significant growth phase for the utility, which also drew sharp criticism from some customers over rising utility rates.

In 2012, Knox County Mayor Tim Burchett criticized a $125-an-hour consulting contract approved for Hammond after he stepped down from the HPUD post. That contract was later terminated.

Valliant said Hammond was a selfless person. ''You know people gave him a lot of grief over the rate increases at Hallsdale Powell, but they didn't realize that the EPA was breathing down his throat,'' he said.

Hammond was well-connected in local political circles, and counted U.S. Rep. John J. Duncan, Jr. among his friends. In a written tribute in 2008, Duncan recalled his first hourly-pay job as a 15-year-old groundskeeper at Holston-Chilhowee Ball Park, saying that Hammond was his 19-year-old boss.

''I remember another time when I was a judge, Marvin found that I was Cubmaster of a Cub Scout troop,'' Duncan wrote. ''He told me he could get several canoes from another church and he knew some people who owned a dairy farm 45 miles away with a big lake on it. He spent his whole day getting the canoes, helping the boys tour the farm, do the canoe rides, cook out, and then load everything back up for the return.''

Receiving of friends will take place on Tuesday, July 15, from 4:30 to 8 p.m., at Salem Baptist Church, with funeral services to follow.

[From the Business Shopper news]

MARVIN HAMMOND PROMOTED YOUNG PEOPLE, COMMUNITY

(By Sandra Clark)

Marvin Hammond was the right leader for Hallsdale Powell Utility District when the board of commissioners hired him as only the second general manager in the district's 50-year history.

Did he move too quickly? Maybe. Did he move HPUD in the right direction? Absolutely.

Under his leadership, HPUD upgraded its wastewater plant, upgraded its Beaver Creek water treatment plant, replaced leaking pipes throughout the district, and built a second water plant on Norris Lake.

Under his leadership, HPUD invested in people—whether it was teaching laborers to read and write or encouraging kids to return to college for advanced degrees.

In the picture on this page, Marvin is congratulating Cody Humphrey who had just received his MBA from Lincoln Memorial University while working full time at Hallsdale Powell. Cody, now older, still works for HPUD. He was at Monday's board meeting.

Board chair Kevin Julian paid tribute to Mr. Hammond at that meeting.

''His vision for Hallsdale Powell was already set when I came on the board:'' Julian said. ''Marvin had big shoulders and he took the criticism for rate increases, but he did what he thought best based on 30 years experience in the utility business.

''When it all plays out, people will appreciate his vision. He will be missed.''

When business leaders in Halls were trying to block commercial development on the land that later became Clayton Park, Hammond was there at County Commission to speak.

Developers said their engineers had said filling the wetland on Norris Freeway was OK.

Hammond pointed out that the Titanic was designed by engineers, while Noah's Ark was not.

Everybody smiled and the developers were sent packing.

When Darren Cardwell was promoted to succeed Hammond, he said he hoped to be a blend of his predecessors: Allan Gill and Marvin Hammond.

When Marvin's kidneys malfunctioned, he refused dialysis, saying he did not want to put his family through the strain. ''I'm ready to go,'' he told everyone who came to visit. He lived at Tennova Hospice for less than two weeks, dying July 12, and held court with a steady flow of visitors and friends.

Sen. Lamar Alexander telephoned Marvin and asked if there was anything he could do.

''Get EPA off our backs,'' Marvin told him, concerned about Hallsdale Powell employees and customers until the end.

''Dad will be remembered as a Godly servant leader, a generous southern gentleman, and one who was always showing genuine Christian love for his fellow man, especially for the less fortunate among us,'' his family wrote.

''Dad was a proud alumnus of ETSU where he was member of the baseball and football programs in the 1960s. He also played minor league baseball for the Macon Peaches. He was a U.S. Air Force veteran and held the coveted Eagle Scout and Silver Beaver awards.

''He squeezed every ounce of life he was given whether he was working, fishing, or hunting. He was proud to be known as a conservative, ''deep water'' Baptist and as an unworthy man saved and blessed by God's grace and love.''

U.S. Rep. Jimmy Duncan remembers Hammond as his first boss at the Holston-Chilhowee Rec Center. Jimmy was 15 and earned $1 per hour. Marvin was 19 and ''told me what to do.''

Survivors include wife Kay Hammond; children: Jeff and Missy Hammond, Lisa and Darren Cardwell; brother James (Jim) Hammond; grandchildren: John and Xan Hammond, Amber and Colby Cardwell, and Megan Pratt; great-granddaughter Lucy Rae Pratt.

Services were Tuesday at Salem Baptist Church, led by the Rev. John Holland with eulogies by Bill Landry, John Hill and John Valliant.

HONORING AUSTEN JAMES KNEPPER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Austen James

Knepper. Austen is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Austen has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Austen has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Austen has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Austen organized and led the construction of a trail at the Parkville Nature Sanctuary in Parkville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Austen James Knepper for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO MS. ALICE COACHMAN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great woman, legendary athlete, and outstanding public servant, Ms. Alice Coachman. Sadly, Alice passed away on Monday, July 14, 2014, at the age of 90 in Albany, Georgia. The memorial service is scheduled for this Friday, July 18.

Alice was born the fifth of ten children on November 9, 1923, to the late Fred and Evelyn Coachman in Albany, Georgia. From an early age, Alice spent much of her time running and was quite inventive, using ropes and sticks for improvised high jumps. Her hard work, dedication, and resourcefulness paid off as Alice qualified for the 1940, 1944, and 1948 Olympic Games, although the first two were cancelled due to World War II. At the 1948 Olympic Games in London however, Alice made history when she soared to a record-breaking height of 5 feet, 6 and 1/8 inches in the high jump finals, becoming the first African American woman to win an Olympic Gold Medal. Although the track and field star's career concluded with the London games, Alice's commitment to serving others never ceased.

Before and after her record-breaking victory, Alice dealt with challenges representative of the Deep South during the Jim Crow era. Because of such segregation, Alice was forbidden from using public training facilities. However, she continued to train to ensure her competiveness on the national and international scenes. Throughout her career, Alice won over 20 national track and field championships, and she was named to five All-American teams. It was her unwavering faith in herself and God that guided her along the way as she blazed the trail for countless other female African-American athletes.

In 1954, Alice once again set another record—this time as the first African American woman to endorse an international product when she agreed to serve as Coca-Cola's spokeswoman. The Olympic Champion was also inducted to the USA Track and Field Hall of Fame in 1975 and the U.S. Olympic Hall of Fame in 2004. She was recognized as one of the top one hundred Olympic athletes of all time at the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta.

Alice's title as an Olympic Champion, however, serves as only a fragment of the powerful legacy she leaves behind for current and future generations. She followed her calling to be a teacher in the classroom after the 1948 games and also actively supported youth participation in track and field. In Alice's later years, she established the Alice Coachman Track and Field Foundation to offer assistance to young athletes and former Olympic competitors.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." We are all so blessed that Ms. Alice Coachman passed our way and during her life's journey did so much for so many for so long. She leaves behind a great legacy of service to her beloved family and to all those whose lives she touched. She will truly be missed.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the nearly 700,000 residents in Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to Alice Coachman for her numerous outstanding achievements on and off the track. We extend our deepest sympathies to her family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time and we pray that they will be consoled and comforted by, an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in relation to language in H.R. 5016 addressing Puerto Rico's financial management.

I applaud the effort to work in tandem with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—an island composed of U.S. citizens—to provide lasting improvements to their financial structure and day-to-day management.

I am concerned, however, that the taxpayer funds provided to assist Puerto Rico could potentially be spent in vain. I believe that stronger language holding the government of Puerto Rico to basic economic and democratic standards is essential to providing productive assistance.

Two ongoing issues backed by the government of Puerto Rico give me pause.

One was recently outlined by Mary O'Grady in the Wall Street Journal.

In reference to the current financial woes and the enactment of a new bankruptcy law in Puerto Rico—O'Grady said, and I quote, "so far Puerto Rico's political class seems more inclined to stick it to creditors and keep on keeping on," instead of getting their books straight.

The bankruptcy bill—shepherded and signed into law by Puerto Rican Governor Alejandro Garcia Padilla—allows the restructuring of more than 19 billion dollars of debt by the government owned electricity, water, and highway monopolies.

The constitutionality of this law has also been widely called into question.

This is not the approach you want from a Government facing a potential default, especially one whose debt is 'widely held by mutual funds and individuals'.

It is important that any technical assistance provided by the U.S. Government is predicated on a strong foundation for the rule of law. Investors nationwide will suffer if Puerto Rico's political class does not stalwartly uphold the rule of law.

This is a serious and timely matter. At the end of June—Moody's Analytics reported that Puerto Rico's probability of default within the year is higher than that of Argentina, Venezuela, and Ukraine.

These concerns regarding the political class have already played out through the government's lack of respect for its contractual obligations.

For example, after seven years of agreements between the government of Puerto Rico and a private institution—the Doral Financial Corporation—the government is now refusing to uphold its end of the contractual obligations. Puerto Rico's Government has announced a unilateral decision to annul the contract that required the Government to pay over $200 million in tax refunds to Doral.

This example demonstrates a true lack of regard for the rule of law.

As the U.S. Congress considers providing technical assistance to the Government of Puerto Rico due to the deteriorating economic and fiscal situation—certain assurances must be established to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are spent on achievable, reliable, and long-lasting objectives.

In conclusion, I believe that assurances should be made by the government of Puerto Rico to uphold all contractual obligations and respect for creditor rights in order to receive U.S. Treasury technical assistance.

Moreover, if such assurances are made, I express my support for the collaboration between the U.S. Treasury and Puerto Rico to improve Puerto Rico's financial management.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, this Financial Services Bill seeks to overturn the intent of Dodd-Frank by bringing the Consumer Financial Protection

Bureau under the turmoil of the annual appropriations process.

Bankers have people to look out for their interests, brokers have people to look out for their interests, investors and hedge fund managers have the same. Until the CFPB was created, the same could not be said for the average consumer. The current funding stream for the CFPB, from the Federal Reserve System, to the annual appropriations process, puts politics, not the consumer first.

If we have learned only one lesson from the financial crisis of 2008, it should be this: when we protect consumers, we protect the health of the entire financial system.

It is clear that the consumer credit and housing bubbles of the last decade were the result of unfair and deceptive practices and credit card companies and lenders that steered families into mortgages and financial products that they did not understand and that they could not afford.

In 2010 after an open process that included a now rare House-Senate conference, the Congress passed historic reforms to the nation's financial system. Among these reforms was the creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Indeed, a strong argument could be made that the creation of the CFPB is the most important and most beneficial provision of the Dodd-Frank financial reforms.

Members of the House and Senate, after much deliberation, concluded that in order for the CFPB to effectively protect American consumers, it must be independent.

The Dodd-Frank legislation, which is the law of the land, is clear on this point. This new financial watchdog would be independent, insulated from the partisan fights of Capitol Hill, by deriving its operating budget from non-appropriated funds from the Federal Reserve.

House Republicans are once again attempting to politicize the funding process for the CFPB, handcuffing the CFPB in order to preserve the status quo that benefits big banks at the expense of American consumers.

This legislation would change the nature of the CFPB and make its funding different from other bank regulators which remain independent of the appropriations process.

In an appropriations bill that is already $566 million below last year's funding level, where will Congress find the $500 million, or $400 million, or $300 million in Fiscal year 2016 and beyond? I fear that the answer is that we will not fund it at all. That is not acceptable. That would hurt the American consumer, and would inject more risk into the economy.

Instead we should continue to ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau will have the independence and resources it needs as it continues its critical work of protecting consumers and by extension the entire U.S. financial system.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), a service unit of the Library of Congress. For Members and staff on Capitol Hill, CRS is known as our own think tank, providing invaluable information. Perhaps most importantly, CRS provides data and analyses free from agendas and free from partisanship. They also provide a range of reports, confidential memoranda, briefings, and programs to Members and staff about policy issues and legislative process. We rely on this information to craft legislation, analyze bills pending before Congress, respond to our constituents, and to ensure the accuracy of communications.

The idea of a legislative reference service for Congress was first championed by Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Sr. (served in the House from 1885–1891, and in the Senate from 1906–1925), and Rep. John M. Nelson (served in the House from 1906–1919, and from 1921–1933). Supporters realized their goal through a Senate floor amendment offered by Sen. LaFollette to the Library's 1915 appropriations bill. Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam established the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) in the Library of Congress by administrative order on July 18, 1914. In its early years, LRS provided basic reference services to assist lawmakers in their work.

The research service, in its various iterations, has benefited from the Library's collections for its research, analysis, and dissemination of information and materials to assist the Congress.

By the 1940s and following World War II, demands on LRS had increased significantly. The 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act (LRA) called for an increase in the size and scope of LRS and directed it to hire expert policy specialists to provide information to Congress in subject fields aligned with a new committee system. In 1970, the Service underwent another transformation, which renamed it the Congressional Research Service.

Emphasizing the fact that the research and informational needs of the Congress required the services of highly-skilled experts, the 1970 Act mandated that CRS provide authoritative and objective research and analysis and close support for Members and committees. The Service evolved into a 21st century organization that utilizes formats and delivery methods (e.g., CRS4Congress Twitter, CRS.gov, Congress.gov) for CRS products and services.

Today, CRS provides comprehensive, objective and non-partisan research and analysis to the entire Congress on all legislative and oversight issues of interest. In the Second Session of this Congress, CRS identified over 150 issues of interest to Congress that CRS could support.

CRS has a workforce of over 600 analysts, attorneys, information professionals and support staff. These expert, highly-trained and collaborative professional staff are dedicated to supporting the work of the Congress.

In FY2013, Members and committees received information and analysis from CRS in more than 636,000 responses that took the form of 67,000 requests for custom analysis and research, 9,000 congressional participations in 350 seminars, and over half a million instances of Website services.

I want to congratulate the Congressional Research Service as they celebrate this important milestone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 2014, I mistakenly voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 411. I intended to vote "yes."

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Loring Job Corps Center as it joins 125 other campuses across the nation in celebrating the 50th Anniversary of Job Corps.

The Job Corps program was established in 1964 as the central initiative of President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. The program was established to administer free-of-charge education and vocational training to youth ages 16 to 24. Providing support specifically for young unemployed men and women, the program was modeled after the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the New Deal, which was discontinued after World War II. Since its inception under the Economic Opportunity Act, Job Corps has served more than two million young people, with approximately 60,000 students enrolled annually at centers throughout the country.

The U.S. Department of Labor began developing a Job Corps Center in Limestone, Maine, on the former Strategic Air Command's Loring Air Force Base in 1994. The first students to arrive at Loring in January of 1997 transferred there in order to major in the University of Maine's Outdoor Recreation Associates Degree Program. Since it was first established, Loring has offered an excellent opportunity for students to obtain their GED, receive vocational and technical training, and utilize on-the-job training to find permanent employment—all at no cost.

I am proud to recognize the Loring Job Corps Center for its years of committed service, and I look forward to its continued success in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Loring Job Corps Center as it celebrates 50 years of the Job Corps program.

HONORING NATHAN McCOWN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Nathan McCown of Killeen, TX. Heroism is, in the words of athlete and activist Arthur Ashe, "not the urge to surpass all others at whatever cost, but the urge to serve others at whatever cost." McCown's extraordinary bravery in the face of imminent peril, along with his unwavering commitment to duty, has brought those words to life.

McCown's boyhood dreams of becoming a soldier were realized before he was 18. During extensive and dangerous deployments in Iraq, he distinguished himself as a warrior and leader. On numerous occasions, he put his own safety at risk to protect his fellow soldiers. Sadly, due to injuries incurred during combat he severely damaged his knee and back, and was ultimately medically separated from his beloved military. Yet his faith in his mission, his love of country, and his status as a leader of his fellow soldiers never wavered.

McCown's departure from the military didn't stop his drive to serve, defend, and protect. He soon responded to the noble calling of law enforcement. The road back to service was not an easy one as McCown had to rebuild a body damaged by war. Yet he soon joined the elite Special Weapons And Tactics (SWAT) team of the Killeen, TX Police Department. On occasions too numerous to count, McCown rushed headfirst into peril and put his own safety on the line to protect citizens and fellow officers. A recent incident resulted in further injuries to his knees and has him temporarily out of commission. But anyone who knows McCown is certain he won't be out for long.

I send my deepest and most heartfelt wishes for McCown's speedy recovery so he can resume his life of extraordinary service. Brave men like him remind us all what true heroes are.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of what is now the Congressional Research Service (CRS). Since its founding in 1914, this legislative reference service unit of the Library of Congress has served as a repository of information and expertise for Members of Congress and their staff.

The CRS was an idea first championed by Senator Robert M. LaFollette Sr. and Representative John M. Nelson, and established on July 16, 1914 by former Librarian of Congress, Herbert Putnam. Previously known as the Legislative Reference Service (LRS), this service unit provided basic reference services for Congress in its early years.

As a result of rising demand for LRS services following World War II, the Legislative Reorganization Act (LRA) of 1946 expanded the size and scope of LRS by hiring policy experts in issues consistent with the new committee system. A second transformation of the Service occurred in 1970 when the LRA was amended to mandate that LRS provide reliable and objective research and analysis, and strong support for Members and committees. LRS became what we know today as CRS.

Over the past 100 years, the contributions of CRS have been invaluable to the efficiency and effectiveness of Congress. Today, CRS provides broad, non-partisan research and analysis for members of Congress on all legislative and oversight issues of interest. Its utmost priority is to certify that Congress has uninterrupted access to the nation's best thinking.

The Service employs a diverse workforce of over 600 analysts, data professionals, counselors, and support staff who are dedicated to supporting our Federal legislative process. In Fiscal Year 2013 alone, CRS provided more than 630,000 briefings, reports, and analyses for Members and committees.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the past and present staff of CRS for decades of invaluable contributions and service.

HONORING JACOB CHRISTIAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Christian. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 87, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Christian for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 414 on final passage of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, I would have voted ''aye,'' which is consistent with my position on this legislation.

CONGRATULATING THOMAS W. DEWITT ON HIS ELECTION TO THE NAFCU BOARD OF GOVERNORS

HON. AARON SCHOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Thomas W. Dewitt on his election to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU). This is just the latest chapter in a long and productive career in financial services, and I know he will be a great asset to NAFCU.

The core mission of credit unions is to serve their members, and Thomas Dewitt has embodied that spirit throughout his career. For nearly the past two decades, he has served 130,000 members in Central Illinois and around the country as the President and CEO of State Farm Federal Credit Union, headquartered in Bloomington, Illinois.

In addition to his role at State Farm, Mr. Dewitt has been an active participant in the activities of the NAFCU, most notably in the regulatory and legislative committees. In all, he brings 40 years of financial services experience to his new role at NAFCU, and he has consistently demonstrated his firm grasp and understanding of the issues important to credit unions and their members.

Once again, congratulations to Mr. Dewitt on his election to the Board of Governors, and to NAFCU for gaining such a capable and seasoned addition. I look forward to working with Mr. Dewitt in his new role and wish him all the best.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 40th anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus by Turkish armed forces. While there has been some progress made regarding a resolution, thousands of Greek Cypriots continue to be denied their fundamental right to return to their homes.

Turkey must live up to its international responsibilities and return all of Cyprus' territory to the Cypriots. Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have supported a variety of initiatives in support of this outcome, including sending letters to President Obama applauding the administration's commitment to exercise U.S. leadership in the negotiation for a just solution on Cyprus. This solution should result in a single, sovereign country within a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation. Forty years of discord is long enough; Cypriots deserve a government for them and by them.

I applaud President Anastasiades' proposal from early 2013 that, if adopted, would significantly contribute to creating an atmosphere that would facilitate the negotiating process. Unfortunately, the Turkish side has continued to reject proposals that would enhance cooperation and move the two sides toward a resolution.

Despite continued pressure from the United States, Turkey continues to obstruct Cyprus from exercising its basic sovereign rights including accessing its own natural resources.

With the situation in the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean growing more volatile each day, it is paramount that Turkey and Cyprus come back to the negotiating table, and that Turkey return occupied territory back to the people of Cyprus.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. LILLIAN K. KURTZ

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of Mrs. Lillian K.

Kurtz. I join her family members and friends who gather on August 2, 2014, in Minneapolis to commemorating this special day. Lillian Kurtz was born August 1, 1914, in Minneapolis, MN. She started life in Northern Minnesota on her father's farm where she attended school in a one-room school house.

Lillian's outlook on life was molded by the Great Depression and World War II. During World War II, she traveled as an officer's wife and lived in many areas around the country. She did volunteer work for the Red Cross. After the war, she and her husband settled in South Minneapolis where she has lived ever since.

She worked as a floral designer for Bachman's in South Minneapolis while raising her family. Her husband of over 62 years, George Kurtz, was a noted attorney, Workers Compensation Judge and Air Force Reserve Colonel. She has two children Kathleen and Michael, seven grandchildren, five great grandchildren and three great-great grandchildren.

She is still living on her own at the Walker Place in South Minneapolis. She continued her volunteer work at the Walker until recently.

Lillian has led an outstanding life, highlighted by her love of family and service to her community. I wish her many more years of health and happiness.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress. Throughout the past 100 years, the Congressional Research Service has been of great importance to members of Congress. It has provided insightful research analysis necessary to effectively legislate.

CRS professionals have expertise in a range of matters spanning across foreign and domestic affairs. Their reliable and efficiently prepared analyses provide all members of Congress with a deeper understanding of the important issues that challenge our country every day. As evidence of their fine work, the CRS website holds nearly 10,000 reports that are easily accessible and well organized.

I speak now with great gratitude for CRS's dedicated analysts, legislative attorneys and information professionals. I hope that the beneficial relationship between the CRS and Congress only enhances in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, July 20th, will mark the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of the island of Cyprus. This is not a happy anniversary, Mr. Speaker. It marks 40 years of invasion, occupation, and the forcible division of Cyprus. The time has come to end this tragic conflict, which the people of Cyprus have endured for far too long.

Thousands of Greek Cypriots are still being denied their fundamental human right to return to their homes because of Turkey's continuing occupation of northern Cyprus. Greek Cypriot properties are constantly being illegally confiscated or sold without their owners' consent. Turkish troops remain stationed on the island, and thousands of colonists from mainland Turkey have been moved to this occupied area. Freedom of worship is severely restricted, access to religious sites blocked, religious sites continue to be systematically destroyed, and large numbers of religious and archaeological objects stolen.

Turkey continues to obstruct the process to determine the fate of missing persons—military and civilian—since the 1974 invasion. It prohibits the exhumation of remains from mass graves that are located in areas that Turkey has classified as "military areas," even when such a process would take place under the supervision of the United Nations. On this grave and poignant humanitarian matter, I urge the U.S. government to exert its influence over Turkey, allow these exhumations to take place so that the bodies in mass graves might be identified, and so that families may finally, after 40 years, be allowed to grieve the loss of their loved ones and respectfully lay their remains to rest. This is not too much to ask of any government, anywhere in the world.

I applaud the fact that the Cyprus Government remains fully committed to the U.N.-sponsored process to reach a sustainable and enduring settlement that would reunify Cyprus based on a bizonal, bi-communal federation, in accordance with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. I hope the United States will continue to press the Government of Turkey to move forward with advancing confidence-building measures and initiatives to achieve a final, just and lasting settlement to reunite Cyprus.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of the Republic of Cyprus. On July 20, 1974, Turkish forces occupied over a third of the northern part of Cyprus leading into the forcible division of the country.

Turkey's occupation of the northern part of Cyprus divided the country between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. Currently, Greek Cypriots are not given the freedom to return to their homes and are having their property and religious sites destroyed. The people of Cyprus are experiencing a violation of their human rights and the country continues to pursue an ethnically segregated state.

The U.N. Security Council has been assisting the Cyprus government with the process of reaching a sustainable settlement that would unify Cyprus. In addition, President Anastasiades introduced a proposal that aims to rebuild a relationship between Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities, which the U.S. has accepted. I urge Turkey to contribute in the process of reuniting the Republic of Cyprus.

Members of Congress and the international community must work together to solve the ongoing conflicts and reach a comprehensive settlement that will unify the country. We must strongly urge Turkey to resolve the continuing humanitarian issues the people are facing.

The United States strongly supports the sovereign rights of the Republic of Cyprus. The Cyprus Government's commitment towards working with the United States will ease the process of finding possible initiatives that will further mend the country's division. I believe the international community must focus on reunifying the Republic of Cyprus and support the ideals of freedom and justice.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, July 20th marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. In 1974 over 200,000 Greek Cypriots were driven from their homes, becoming refugees in their own country. The legacy of this occupation still weighs heavily on the northern third of the island, which remains occupied by Turkish troops.

There is consensus in the international community that a unified, sovereign Cyprus is the only solution to rectifying decades of injustice. I believe the United Nations-led negotiations currently underway are the best means to achieve a fair and permanent settlement which will reunify the island. We are at a critical juncture in the pursuit of peace and prosperity for all Cypriots, and I urge all parties to move toward a peaceful resolution and reunification effort that will build a more united and prosperous Cyprus.

Cyprus is a strategically important ally of the United States, and Cyprus has proven itself to be a reliable partner in efforts to counter terrorism. I look forward to a reunified and prosperous Cyprus where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can live together in peace, security and stability.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, four of the seven appropriations bills considered by the House this year have passed with bipartisan support. Those votes harken back to the spirit of cooperation that brought an end to last year's reckless government shutdown and the subsequent Bipartisan Budget Agreement that restored some of the harmful cuts from sequestration. Unfortunately, this week's consideration of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for next year diverges sharply from that practice. I have multiple objections with the agenda House Republicans are advancing with this bill, and I want to highlight a few of them.

For starters, this bill continues the Majority's assault on the mission and personnel of the Internal Revenue Service. The bill, as introduced, cuts $340 million from the IRS and comes on heels of $850 million in cuts over the past four years. Making matters worse, an amendment was adopted during debate Monday night that would cut another $788 million or 10% from IRS enforcement activities. I remind my colleagues that the IRS plays a critical role in helping taxpayers to understand and comply with our nation's complex tax code and ensuring that those tax laws are enforced fairly.

Unfortunately both of those activities have suffered in the last few years because of these punitive cuts. Basic assistance for taxpayers has dropped off sharply because of a reduction in workforce of 8,000 positions, and training for those that remain has been cut 87% in the last four years. As a result, caller wait times have almost doubled and the number of unanswered calls has increased by half. It's no wonder public frustration has increased. Tax enforcement has also suffered. The amount of staff devoted to enforcing our tax laws has been cut by 15% since 2010. As a result, revenue collected by enforcement actions has fallen off by $4 billion during that time.

Yet, some of my colleagues have shown no shame in criticizing the IRS for not maintaining its email files when it is their actions that have left the agency stretched so thin. Rather than adequately fund the IRS—which generates nearly $6 in revenue for every $1 invested—House Republicans have starved the agency, crippling its ability to meet demands and leaving $300 billion to $400 billion per year in uncollected taxes. That's more than half of the projected deficit of $583 billion for this fiscal year.

In addition to that contradiction, Mr. Chair, I would note that the conservative crowd that says, ''the level of government closest to the people governs best,'' is poised to overturn a decision by the local government right here in the District of Columbia. Twenty-three states—nearly 1/3rd of which have Republican governors—and the District have decriminalized the limited use of marijuana. In fact, the home state of this provision's sponsor is one of those states, but the reach of Congressional Republicans under this bill does not allow them to interfere with the decision of his home state or that of other states. They can, however, restrict the use of funds provided to DC, and so we're doing so simply because we can. There is no merit or consistency in this action, which is nothing more than a raw power grab by House Republicans, who continue to block attempt by the citizens of the District of Columbia to exercise local control.

Finally, Mr. Chair, I take exception to the fact that this bill does not sufficiently support the Administration's Information Technology Oversight and Reform initiative, known as ITOR. That program is funded $11 million below the request of $20 million—a relatively modest amount in light of the considerable savings of $2.4 billion this office has already achieved in the last four years. Under the direction of the U.S. Chief Information Officer, ITOR is leading the Federal Government's efforts to improve the effectiveness of digital services to provide citizens and businesses with world class user experiences; reduce waste in Federal IT acquisitions; and identify savings that can be re-programmed to better serve taxpayers and optimize the use of scarce agency resources.

In addition to these important activities, ITOR also supports recruiting and training the next generation of talented Federal IT personnel, and it supports the Office of Management and Budget's coordination of Federal cybersecurity programs. As the recent cyber breach at the U.S. Office of Personnel Management highlights, we must be vigilant in continuously monitoring Federal IT systems to safeguard sensitive information national security information.

As the Committee notes, ITOR has notched commendable achievements in enabling agencies to more efficiently utilize cloud computing and begin optimizing and consolidating Federal data centers. Of course, much work remains to be done. I appreciate and share the Committee's concern over recent Federal IT failures. In recent decades, taxpayers have been forced to foot the bill for massive IT program failures that ring up staggeringly high costs but exhibit astonishingly poor performance. The deplorable rollout of the HealthCare.gov site last year is a symptom of a broader disease that ITOR is helping to address—the broken Federal IT acquisition process. The annual price tag of this wasteful spending on IT programs is estimated to be approximately $20 billion. That status quo is unacceptable and unsustainable.

That is why I joined the Chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to develop a comprehensive, bipartisan, Federal IT acquisition reform legislative proposal—commonly referred to as the Issa-Connolly bill, or ''FITARA.'' Our bipartisan bill represents the most dramatic overhaul of Federal IT procurement policy since the seminal Clinger-Cohen Act was enacted nearly two decades ago, and it would directly support and complement the mission and aims of ITOR. It enhances CIO authorities, empowers CIOs to recruit and retain talented IT staff, and accelerates data center optimization and strengthens the accountability and transparency of Federal IT programs The Issa-Connolly bill has now passed the House three times—twice as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act and once as a standalone bill. The Senate recently passed a similar version of the bill, and we are working with our Senate colleagues to harmonize the differences.

While I am pleased that a bipartisan consensus is finally forming around the urgent need to streamline and strengthen how the Federal government acquires and deploys IT, this bill would actually under fund in those programs that are proven to save money over the long term.

Mr. Chair, as I said at the outset, this bill veers sharply from the bipartisan model we had been working toward. By attempting to disinvest in the IRS, House Republicans are actually disinvesting in our taxpayers and undermining our efforts to enforce the law and reduce the deficit. They are further eroding the notion of local control by continuing to meddle in the local decision making of the District of Columbia. And they are making a shortsighted decision to not invest more in IT reforms that have proven to save money. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the bill before us today.

RECOGNIZING SECOND LT. ELLEN AINSWORTH

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Second Lt. Ellen Ainsworth for her bravery, service and sacrifice on February 10th, 1944, in Anzio, Italy.

Second Lt. Ainsworth hailed from the small Wisconsin town of Glenwood City, where she is remembered for her service. In 1942 she entered the United States Army Nurse Corps and deployed to Tunisia, then to Anzio, Italy. Although the risk of serving in this high actions area was great, Lt. Ainsworth did not waiver from her commitment to serve her country.

On February 10th, 1944 Lt. Ainsworth's hospital tent came under heavy artillery fire in an area many described as ''hell's half acre''. With complete disregard for herself, she brought to safety forty-two patients to lessen the chance of their further injury. Lt. Ainsworth was hit by enemy fire and succumb to her wounds six days later. At just twenty-four years old she was the only Wisconsin service woman to make the ultimate sacrifice during World War II, due to enemy fire.

Second Lt. Ellen Ainsworth was recognized posthumously for her gallant actions by being awarded with a Silver Star, Purple Heart, and a Red Cross Bronze Medal.

As Glenwood City and the town of Anzio, Italy commemorate the 70th anniversary of her death this year, Lt. Ainsworth's courageous actions are witnessed today by the children of the soldiers she saved, who would not be with us if not for her heroic sacrifice. She personified American heroism and for that, Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Lt. Ainsworth for her acts of valor.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY PHI BETA SIGMA FRATERNITY RESOLUTION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity's centennial anniversary. My good friend, the Gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), is sponsoring the Senate companion to this resolution.

As a Sigma brother, I am proud that this fraternity has grown into a worldwide institution.

One hundred years ago, A. Langston Taylor, Leonard F. Morse, and Charles I. Brown founded the fraternity at Howard University. These men were committed to the idea of ''Culture For Service and Service for Humanity.'' They believed that all potential members ought to be judged by their own merits. Family background, wealth, race, and nationality are irrelevant to a prospective brother's worth; instead, the fraternity built a brotherhood of individuals who shared a deep commitment to service, education, and brotherhood.

Today, Phi Beta Sigma continues to build upon its founding principles and expand its legacy across the country and around the globe. With more than 150,000 college-educated Sigma brothers and 650 chapters, the fraternity organizes many service projects and missions. These include: Sigma Beta Club, equipping youths with leadership skills; Project Vote, which encourages voter registration; Sigma Wellness: Living Well Brother-to-Brother, an initiative seeking to eliminate health disparities for men of color; and the Ghana School Project, which provides vocational opportunities for children worldwide. As many of you know, these are just a few examples of Sigma contributions to American society and our brothers and sisters around the world.

This week, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity's historic centennial anniversary and congratulating the Sigma brothers for a century of service to all Americans.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, on Wednesday, July 16, 2014, the House will complete its consideration of H.R. 5016, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill. The bill includes two amendments that would weaken important consumer product safety protections. I strongly oppose both provisions, as well as the underlying bill.

One of the provisions would reduce funding for the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) by $2 million and increase funding for the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) by $1 million. If that money would be dedicated to strengthening the CPSC's efforts to protect consumers, I might support it. However, it is the sponsor's intention that those additional CPSC funds be used to support the Commission's analysis of third-party testing to determine whether those requirements should be eased. That analysis has already been conducted by the CPSC. It sought public comment, reviewed the comments it received, and has so far not decided to revise its third-party testing requirements—a decision that is allowed under the statute. Throwing more money at the CPSC to redo an analysis it has already completed is a waste of taxpayer dollars, and it would do nothing to further the Commission's role of promoting the safety of American consumers.

The other provision would prohibit funds from being used by the Commission to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed ''voluntary recall'' rule. It would limit the CPSC's ability to explore possible changes that could reduce or eliminate recall delays, make recall notices more effective, or address the small number of firms that do not follow through on agreed-upon corrective action plans. While we have seen significant improvements in recalls since the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act was signed into law almost six years ago, there is no justification for preventing the CPSC from continuing to enhance the voluntary recall process.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission plays a critical role in protecting all Americans from hazardous products. This mission is too important for Congress to constrain CPSC's flexibility in determining, through an open and responsive process, the best way to carry out its goals.

CONGRATULATING THE LANCASTER FESTIVAL ON ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lancaster Festival on its 30th Anniversary.

The Lancaster Festival has the mission of celebrating the artistic creativity of all cultures and serves as a foundation for year-round community efforts to promote participation in the arts. The festival is committed to encouraging the growth of the Lancaster Festival Orchestra as the cornerstone of classical music programming, as well as supporting and providing visibility for local artists, being all-inclusive in the appeal to the community, and being an advocate of arts education for children.

On August 5, 1984, The Columbus Symphony Orchestra played its first concert held at Ohio University-Lancaster's outdoor auditorium. The Lancaster Festival was first held in 1985, lasting eight days and including multiple concerts from The Columbus Symphony Orchestra and a full week of community arts and music events. By 1987, The Columbus Symphony Orchestra withdrew from the festival and Maestro Gary Sheldon was hired to create the Lancaster Festival Orchestra.

Today, the Lancaster Festival has gained increased recognition throughout the state for its excellence in promoting the arts. Over the years, the festival has expanded and today it lasts 10 days, and includes a wide variety of art and music events, including two feature performances by major music artists and the orchestra. Additionally, Maestro Gary Sheldon has continued to serve as the Artistic Director for the festival and as the Conductor of the Lancaster Festival Orchestra.

Throughout its 30-year history, the Lancaster Festival has been unwavering in the promotion of arts in our community. I would like to thank all those involved with the festival for their dedication, as well as offer my congratulations on reaching the 30th Anniversary milestone.

HISTORY OF THE WEST PALM BEACH VETERANS ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CLINIC

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I submitted this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 2001 and resubmit it today, July 16, 2014 on the 42nd anniversary of the passing of Pfc. John Mica.

Mr. Speaker, The West Palm Beach Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Florida was inspired by the life, military service and death of Pfc. John Mica. Army Corpsman Mica was born on April 3, 1915 in Binghamton, NY, served as a private in the U.S. Army from 1943–44, and died July 16, 1972 in a crowded veterans hospital in Miami, Florida.

Because of the circumstances of John Mica's death in that veterans facility, which was strained to capacity, his son Daniel A. Mica made construction of a new South Florida veterans hospital one of his goals when elected to the U.S. Congress. From 1978 to 1988, Congressman Daniel Mica, a member of the House Veterans Committee, cited the need for additional veterans medical facilities in Florida at every meeting of that Congressional panel over the decade of his service.

Congressman Daniel Mica, on February 8th, 1983 during the 98th Congress, introduced H.R. 1348, ''A bill to construct a new Veterans Administration hospital in the State of Florida.'' Construction of the Palm Beach County Veterans' hospital was completed in 1994.

This history has been submitted by Congressman JOHN L. MICA in memory of his father, Pfc. John Mica, and also in recognition of his brother Daniel's contribution to the veterans of the State of Florida.

IN MEMORY OF EAST HARTFORD LEGEND, FREDERICK W. LEONE, JR.

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following is a heartfelt eulogy that was delivered by Mary Ann Oliva Leone on the life and passing of my dear friend and East Hartford legend, Fred Leone. It is an honor for me to submit her beautiful remarks that so eloquently capture this great American:

EULOGY FOR MY HUSBAND FRED

Good morning. We would like to thank everyone for attending today to celebrate the life of my husband Fred, better known as ''Rick'' to his family and others. I know many of you have traveled a long distance on this bitter, cold, wintry day to be here today. I know too, Rick probably had his hand in this storm, as he loved this kind of ''put on your fur trappers hat and fire up the snow blower'' weather. If he couldn't be in his beloved state of Vermont, then he was going to bring Vermont to him! Rick was always intrigued by the weather, especially the makings of a good storm. We were appreciative of

all efforts at Glastonbury HealthCare Center to have his bed by the windows so he could watch the day's weather unfold into the night.

January 18, 1969: On a cold Sunday similar to this one, I walked into this St. Rose Church to attend the 10:30 am Mass. The church was very crowded back then and I sat in the same seat in the back that I always took right under the Station of Cross of ''Veronica wiping the face of Jesus.'' This particular morning however, I felt a presence next to me. I could not concentrate on the Mass; I could barely breathe and I could not wait to go to Communion, just to regain my composure. Returning back from Communion, I could not find the pew that I had always sat in . . . then I see this about 6 foot or so, tan camel hair coat, white t-shirt wearing guy laughing and pointing to the seat right next to him! Embarrassed, little did I know that I was standing next to my future husband. As the story goes, Fred offers me a ride home from church. Now keep in mind, the Oliva homestead was less than 5 minutes from the church's front steps! I accepted the ride anyway . . . Fred in the driver's seat and his Mom in the middle of course, and then myself. That seating arrangement would remain that way for a very long time with Marjorie in the middle. A week later we went on our first date, two weeks later Fred went to the Military Academy for a visitation to attend West Point. He instead chose the University of Vermont and I, Central Connecticut.

July 30, 1977: Fred and I marry here at St. Rose Church where we first met. Prior to marriage, you have to provide your baptismal certificate. When I came across the certificate, attached to it was a clipping from the St. Rose Church bulletin dated April 1951, stating Fred and I were both baptized together here at St. Rose. We were born a week apart; Fred on April 1st and I on April 8th. Also, Fred's cousin Kip was baptized that day as they both shared the same birthday. Further research showed that Fred and I received the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion the same day here at St. Rose. We also both received the sacrament of Confirmation together at St. Isaac Jogues Church because they happened to be remodeling St. Rose at the time. All our sacraments together here in this Church!

Being born on April Fool's Day gives you a certain role to fulfill, and Fred took it very seriously. Senior year in high school he was elected Class Comedian. At the University of Vermont he was written up in several publications as a ''Super Fan.'' Allow me please, to read one such article from the Burlington Press entitled, ''SUPER FANS'' by Wally Johnson:

''The stands at the UVM rink are filled to capacity for games, and the students yell their lungs out. One student, a freshman football player, is sort of an unofficial cheerleader, and when he gets people fired up in one section of the stands, the excitement is usually contagious. The gridder is Rick Leone, from Hartford, Conn. And he was the guy waving his coat and shirt around in the cold confines of the hockey rink during the Catamounts upset of UNH. Leone, who also has some pretty good monologues about all sorts of subjects, is loud, wears the wildest purple hat ever made, and is funny as well as a big sports fan. ''You just can't get mad at the guy, he's too funny,'' a UVM student who sat behind Rick during the last game said. Every school has its own Rick Leone, be it at high school or college and this type of person, perhaps best described as a ''super fan,'' is an asset every coach would like to have at his side.''

Fred did not love April Fool's Day because it was his birthday, but because it was a full continuous day of sharing his stories, pranks and jokes with everyone. Former employees would tell you the front counter of the liquor store was his ''pulpit'' where he did what he loved best . . . interacting with everyone. A funny story, joke, or local happening passed on from one customer to another. Fred loved going to make his morning deposits at Webster's bank where another audience of the girls and customers waited for his ''joke of the day.'' Sunday mornings at Stop & Shop where he regularly checked in with Jeff ''the butcher,'' meeting and greeting neighbors and customers as he shops. I, however, ruined the shopping experience for him. I just wanted to go in, get my groceries and return home so I could start cooking Sunday dinner. So we left Sunday shopping for Fred to enjoy his weekly adventure!

Fred was a brilliant man with background knowledge on almost any subject that was brought up in conversations. We attribute that to his love of reading. Out attic, cellar and shelves at home are filled with books. If Fred could not pass a book along then it got shelved in one of these places. When Gianni was in second grade, I remember Fred reading Gianni, ''The Old Man and the Sea'' by Ernest Hemingway. Explaining details as he read aloud to his grandson and it was Fred's own personal copy he had back when he was in school! Vermont and National Geographic were his favorite magazines. When our daughters were much younger they too awaited the monthly issues of National Geographic because their father had made a game out of checking the covers of each issue. The best was when he was the baboon, gorilla, or other exotic creatures from who knows where on the covers, and you knew it was happening when Fred would announce holding up the magazine . . . ''Look everyone—your mother made the cover of National Geographic again!'' The girls would crack up laughing . . . Very funny, Fred!

Then there was a serious side of Fred, a man of great faith, the importance of attending mass and participating in the church community. When our family was younger we attended pot luck suppers, organized bake sales and arts and crafts and tag sales. Our life for one week in July revolved around Fred co-chairing the popular St. Rose Carnival with the Futtner and Ramsey families. Our wedding anniversary always fell during carnival week and Fred would joke ''What more do you want on our wedding anniversary, Mary? We have games, entertainment, music (from the carousel), good food (sausage and peppers and fried dough)—all on the grounds of the church we were married!'' We always later celebrated at a very nice restaurant.

Family . . . What more can I say? Rick's loyalty and love for his grandparents and their rich traditions . . . how he loved to retell stories about life on the tobacco farm. Following into his father's footsteps with his help and guidance as he sat in on business meetings . . . to move forward into the future . . . all for the love of his family; so proud of his daughters Marisa and Vanessa in their accomplishments in life. Gianna and Angelina were the special joys of his life; how he loved taking Gianni to Boy Scout campouts and events. He introduced him to the Three Stooges. He enjoyed taking and picking up Angelina from preschool. Fred introduced her to Tom & Jerry cartoons! A special place in Fred's heart he had for all his nieces and nephews . . . especially when Ted and Josh took their Uncle Fred to a Jethro Tull Concert . . . He loved it! Fred would relive their performance every time he heard one of their songs!

As Fred's illness progressed, and it did very rapidly, he continued to stay involved in everything the best he could and gradually we came to him now to accommodate his needs and wants. Nothing made him happier than all your lines of communication; texts, emails, Caring Bridge, phone calls, cards, notes and visits . . , for our dear friends and family I thank every one of you!

Thank you to Mom, Dad, Tom, Camille, Marisa, Gianni and Angelina for all your support and for standing by me these last few months. I could not have done this without you. This was a group effort of love and you did it beautifully—with me.

Before Fred went on the respirator a couple of weeks ago, he said to me, as I was giving him ice chips to soothe his dry mouth, ''Mary I think I now know how Jesus felt.'' I said, ''What do you mean, Fred?'' ''The pain Jesus must have felt being nailed to the cross and when they took a cloth soaked with vinegar and applied it to his lips . . . How he must have suffered!''

You—my dear husband will now suffer no more.
Until we can breathe deeply again,
Enjoy the fruits of the vine again,
And hold each other's hand again,
I wish you peace.
Please watch over us, guide and protect us.
And I ask this through Christ our Lord.
Amen and God Bless.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE CENTENNIAL

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) and to pay tribute to the dedicated men and women of CRS.

Established in 1914 as the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) thanks to the efforts of Senator Robert LaFollette, Sr. and Congressman John Nelson, the organization's early mission was to provide basic reference services to lawmakers. Researchers benefited then, as they do today, by being housed in the Library of Congress and having access to its unparalleled collection.

Over the course of its 100 years, CRS has evolved time and time again to meet the needs of the Congress and the American people. From its inception as a relatively small division of the Library of Congress in 1914, to its pivots and expansions in 1946 and 1970—the latter of which included renaming the institution as the Congressional Research Service—the organization has distinguished itself as a world-class source of objective and authoritative research and analysis.

Today, CRS continues to thrive as it meets the demands of the 21st century Congress. With a workforce of more than 600, CRS has the unique ability to bring interdisciplinary scholarship to bear on complex issues of policy by recruiting scientists and engineers to work alongside policy analysts and attorneys. It is this melting pot of expertise and backgrounds that allows CRS to provide comprehensive, objective and non-partisan research to the entire Congress on all legislative issues.

Through the House Democracy Partnership (HDP), I have witnessed firsthand the ability of CRS professionals not only to share their expertise with members of Congress, but to

teach others about the inner workings of Congress and to assist parliamentarians in establishing and improving their own research bureaus. As a Commission working with 16 developing democracies, the Partnership has found an essential partner in CRS.

All this began over twenty years ago with the Frost-Solomon Commission's work with emerging parliaments of Central and Eastern Europe. CRS employees were absolutely critical to our efforts, giving extraordinary time and effort in consulting with these parliaments as they set up libraries and research services.

More recently, CRS has supported HDP in establishing research operations and services in Afghanistan, Indonesia, Georgia, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Peru and Timor-Leste.

Just last month, as we hosted delegations of parliamentarians from five partner nations for a seminar on committee operations, several of our sessions were ably led by senior CRS experts, including the Director herself. Not surprisingly, when we asked our guests what lessons they learned at the end of that seminar, every last one of them commented how lucky we are to have the Congressional Research Service supporting us in our work.

That is just a small testament to the importance of CRS to the work that we all do here, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the Congressional Research Service on its 100th anniversary.

HONORING GAYLE CARLTON

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Gayle Carlton of Cedar Park, TX who became an angel on May 24, 2014. My thoughts and prayers are with her family and friends during this difficult time.

Gayle was married to J. Preston Carlton, the love of her life, for nearly 52 years. During their joyous half century together, they lived, loved, and prospered as one. Proud parents of two children and grandparents of seven, Gayle and Preston kept family at the center of their lives. As beloved pillars of the Cedar Park and Austin areas, they watched and helped those communities grow from quiet towns to the very modern and cosmopolitan cities they are today.

An avid reader, Gayle had an insatiable intellectual curiosity and lived by da Vinci's words, ''Learning never exhausts the mind.'' In her 60s, when most women her age were tending to grandchildren, she graduated with a perfect GPA from St. Edward's University. She embraced the challenge of researching her genealogy and was intensely proud of her family's rich heritage. Gayle was a great storyteller and, like all Texans, was wise enough to never let the truth get in the way of a good yarn.

While we mourn Gayle Carlton's passing, her presence was a blessing for all who knew her. The positive impacts she had on the lives of others will live on and remain in our hearts forever.

THE KIDNAPPING OF 300 NIGERIAN SCHOOL GIRLS

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 3 long months since nearly 300 Nigerian school girls were kidnapped and have since been held captive by Boko Haram. One day is too long, but yet 3 months have dragged on since this unconscionable crime and these families are still broken. I stand here now—with as much urgency as ever—with Nigerians, with the girls' parents, and with the rest of the world asking please bring back our girls.

We must not lose focus, we must send a clear message that these acts will not be tolerated and we will join on a multi-national front in order to reunite these girls with their families. As a father of 3 young women I can only imagine the heartache and pain of the affected parents and communities and the terror felt by the girls, it is for them that I stand here today. This unthinkable crime is not only an unconscionable act against humanity but also against international law and we must stay vigilant until Boko Haram is brought to justice.

I am encouraged by the leadership of President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry in their commitment of resources to help find these girls. I will continue to support any action that the U.S. can take to ensure their safe return. I stand strong with Nigerians, and those protesting internationally, to bring back our girls and make sure their deplorable captors are brought to justice.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE 2014 UNITED HEALTH FOUNDATIONS DIVERSE SCHOLARS

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, continuing to modernize the health care system requires improving the quality and delivery of health care, the backbone of which is the health care workforce. I am pleased to have the opportunity today to talk about a group of students from across the country who represent some of the brightest individuals preparing to enter the health care workforce. This year's United Health Foundation Diverse Scholars Initiative scholarship recipients represent 28 states. They are working hard in their undergraduate and graduate programs—whether they are studying to be doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, public health specialists, or technicians—to increase the number of skilled professionals entering the health care workforce.

Beyond their academic achievements, I would also like to recognize their commitment to making the health care system more culturally relevant and their dedication to improving the health outcomes of the individuals they will one day serve. Research shows that when people are treated by health professionals who share their language, culture, and ethnicity, they are more likely to accept and receive medical treatment. This will be a great asset to our nation's health care system.

Next week, these scholars will be joining us in Washington, DC to examine some of the nation's most pressing health care problems and potential solutions as part of the United Health Foundation's Annual Diverse Scholars Forum. Since 2007, the United Health Foundation has helped more than 1,400 multicultural students from across the country realize their dream of pursuing careers in health while focusing on the needs of local communities through the Diverse Scholars Initiative.

To these exceptional scholars, congratulations and best wishes for success in all of your future endeavors. I know that our nation's health care system will benefit from your hard work and talent.

Jason Russell, Alabama's 2nd Congressional District; Cadijah Allen, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Mycolette Anderson, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Carlene Black, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Tierra Jishie, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Wayne Nez Jr., Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Lavalerie Tsinnajinnie, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Fallon Yazzie, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Miranda Yellowhorse, Arizona's 1st Congressional District; Danelle Cooper, Arizona's 9th Congressional District; Brian Daniel, California's 11th Congressional District; Bonnie Chen, California's 12th Congressional District; KaiShan Li, California's 12th Congressional District; James Salazar, California's 12th Congressional District; Rebecca Sedillo, California's 12th Congressional District; Lois Chen, California's 13th Congressional District; Hector Zamudio, California's 13th Congressional District; Qianwen (Polly) Zhang, California's 13th Congressional District; James Yang, California's 16th Congressional District; Monserrat Baeza, California's 19th Congressional District.

Kenia Flores, California's 21st Congressional District; Taylor Jackson, California's 30th Congressional District; Angie Milian, California's 31st Congressional District; Oswaldo Hasbun Avalos, California's 32nd Congressional District; Jennifer Leiva, California's 32nd Congressional District; Samantha Perez, California's 34th Congressional District; Luis Suarez, California's 35th Congressional District; Juan Ramirez, California's 37th Congressional District; Kristy Vang, California's 3rd Congressional District; Tumai Nguyen, California's 41st Congressional District; Elia Salazar, California's 44th Congressional District; Christopher Zermeno, California's 44th Congressional District; Tomas Zurita, California's 45th Congressional District; Jovy Mann, California's 48th Congressional District; Cabiria Lizarraga, California's 50th Congressional District; Abraham Avila, California's 51st Congressional District; Sophia Jimenez, California's 51st Congressional District; Jasmine Nguyen, California's 53rd Congressional District; Jennifer Villalobos, Colorado's 1st Congressional District; Shawntira Johnson, Florida's 20th Congressional District.

Hermán Powery, Florida's 20th Congressional District; Emmanuel Adejo, Florida's 24th Congressional District; Evelande Gedeon, Florida's 24th Congressional District; Stephany Feijoo, Florida's 26th Congressional District; Isabella Masieri, Florida's 26th Congressional District; Bricia Santoyo, Florida's 9th Congressional District; Sharmori Lewis, Georgia's 13th Congressional District; Valencia Johnson, Georgia's 4th Congressional District; Marcqwon Day, Georgia's 5th Congressional

District; Ray Hill, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Ashley Martinez, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Whitney C. Nwagbara, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Nicholas Kenji Taylor, Georgia's 5th Congressional District; Ambra Jordan, Georgia's 6th Congressional District; Mayra Estrada, Idaho's 2nd Congressional District; Chiemela Ubagharaji, Illinois' 5th Congressional District; Alma Guzman, Illinois's 4th Congressional District; Emily Soza, Kansas's 2nd Congressional District; Marcus Rushing, Kansas's 3rd Congressional District; Walter Ford, Louisiana's 2nd Congressional District.

Andy Tran, Massachusetts's 5th Congressional District; Maria Loza-Lopez, Michigan's 8th Congressional District; Linda Kerandi, Minnesota's 5th Congressional District; David Koffa, Minnesota's 5th Congressional District; Katherine Laddusaw, Missouri's 4th Congressional District; Nohemi Alvarez, Missouri's 5th Congressional District; Rebecca Espinoza, Nevada's 4th Congressional District; Vivienne Meljen, New Hampshire's 2nd Congressional District; Rose Parks, New Jersey's 1st Congressional District; Genel Wright, New Jersey's 3rd Congressional District; Tatiana Londoño Gentile, New Jersey's 6th Congressional District; Lesley Eldridge, New Mexico's 1st Congressional District; Sheridan Cowboy, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; D'Ayn DeGroat, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Patricia Dixon, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Martina Martinez, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Katrina Morgan, New Mexico's 3rd Congressional District; Natasha Ramsey, New York's 12th Congressional District; Rick Aguilar, New York's 13th Congressional District; Adrial A. Lobelo, New York's 13th Congressional District.

Karen Mendez, New York's 17th Congressional District; Aira Domingo, New York's 22nd Congressional District; Edgar Flores, New York's 3rd Congressional District; Saera Fernandez, New York's 7th Congressional District; Maya Bryant, North Carolina's 5th Congressional District; Kane Banner, North Carolina's 8th Congressional District; Davontae Willis, Ohio's 3rd Congressional District; Evelyn Gutierrez, Oklahoma's 2nd Congressional District; Jalane Jara, Oregon's 3rd Congressional District; Sophia Barrios, Pennsylvania's 1st Congressional District; Chiemeka Onyima, Pennsylvania's 2nd Congressional District; Jorge Jaramillo, South Carolina's 4th Congressional District; Elizabeth De La Rosa, Texas's 14th Congressional District; Emily Gao, Texas's 14th Congressional District; Brian Ibarra, Texas's 16th Congressional District; Stephen Igwe, Texas's 18th Congressional District; Isis Reyes, Texas's 18th Congressional District; Joann Sorn, Texas's 18th Congressional District; Rio Reyna Pilar, Texas's 20th Congressional District; Duy Bui, Texas's 24th Congressional District.

Tina Anh Huynh, Texas's 27th Congressional District; Valeria Salazar Balli, Texas's 34th Congressional District; Laura Benavides, Texas's 5th Congressional District; Mohammad Ali, Texas's 7th Congressional District; Andrea Burgess, U.S. Virgin Islands, At-large; Yajaira Peralta, Utah's 1st Congressional District; Jose Mendoza, Washington's 4th Congressional District; Sandra Valencia, Washington's 4th Congressional District; Harpreet Singh-Gill, Wisconsin's 4th Congressional District.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 17, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 22

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine abuse of structured financial products, focusing on misusing basket options to avoid taxes and leverage limits, including a set of transactions that utilize financial engineering and structured financial products.

SH–216

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the United States Tax Code.

SD–215

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 13, 2006, and signed by the United States of America on June 30, 2009 (the ''Convention'') (Treaty Doc.112–07).

S–116

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety

To hold hearings to examine coal miners, focusing on black lung claimants.

SD–430

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine anti-semitism, racism and discrimination in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) region, including xenophobia, discrimination against Christians, and members of other religions, and intolerance and discrimination against Muslims.

SD–562

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine leveraging America's resources as a revenue generator and job creator, focusing on the state and local government benefits in terms of revenue generated and jobs created from natural resource production.

SD–366

2 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Robert Alan McDonald, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SR–418

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development

To hold hearings to examine building economically resilient communities, focusing on local and regional approaches.

SD–538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine S. 1340, to improve passenger vessel security and safety, focusing on improving consumer protections for cruise passengers.

SR–253

3 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on International Development and Foreign Assistance, Economic Affairs, International Environmental Protection, and Peace Corps

To hold hearings to examine United States security implications of international energy and climate policies and issues.

SD–419

JULY 23

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine meeting the challenges of feeding America's school children.

SR–328A

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed carbon pollution standards for existing power plants.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight

To hold hearings to examine saving for an uncertain future, focusing on how the ''Achieving a Better Life Experience Act'' (ABLE) can help people with disabilities and their families.

SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider H.R. 2083, to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees, S. 315, to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008, S. 2154, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, S. 531, to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Human Services of physical activity guidelines for Americans, S. 2405, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, S. 2406, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents, S. 2539, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research, S. 2511, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations, and any pending nominations.

SD–430

Committee on Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine S. 2516, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, focusing on the need for expanded public disclosure of funds raised and spent to influence Federal elections.

SR–301

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine H.R. 412, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1189, to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, S. 1389 and H.R. 1501, bills to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System, S. 1520 and H.R. 2197, bills 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, S. 1641, to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, S. 1718, to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, S. 1750, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, S. 1785, to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in the States of Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, S. 1794, to designate certain Federal land in Chaffee County, Colorado, as a national monument and as wilderness, S. 1866, to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy, S. 2031, to amend the Act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, to adjust the boundary of

that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, S. 2104, to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown, S. 2111, to reauthorize the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, S. 2221, to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan, S. 2264, to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, S. 2293, to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, S. 2318, to reauthorize the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Act, S. 2346, to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, S. 2356, to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve, S. 2392, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 2576, to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and S. 2602, to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

SD–366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight

To hold hearings to examine a more efficient and effective government, focusing on the National Technical Information Service.

SD–342

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine empowering women entrepreneurs, focusing on understanding successes, addressing persistent challenges, and identifying new opportunities.

SH–216

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian gaming, focusing on the next 25 years.

SD–628

JULY 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

SD–366

JULY 30

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the next steps for the ''Violence Against Women Act'' (VAWA), focusing on protecting women from gun violence.

SD–226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine responses to natural disasters in Indian country.

SD–628

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 5016, Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4513–S4569

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2612–2618, and S. Res. 503–504. **Page S4557**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 498, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

S. Res. 500, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity. **Pages S4557**

Measures Passed:

Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act: Senate passed H.R. 3212, to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4563–67**

Veterinary Medicine Mobility Act: Senate passed H.R. 1528, 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. **Pages S4567–68**

National Child Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 503, designating September 2014 as "National Child Awareness Month" to promote awareness of charities benefitting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States. **Page S4568**

Direct the Senate Legal Counsel to Appear: Senate agreed to S. Res. 504, to direct the Senate Legal Counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in *Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State* (S. Ct.). **Pages S4568–69**

Measures Considered:

Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2578, to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions. **Pages S4513–14, S4528–45**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 228), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4535**

Senator Reid entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4535**

Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 17, 2014, Senate begin consideration of S. 2244, to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, as provided under the previous order of July 10, 2014; that the debate time with respect to the bill and consideration of the amendments in order to the bill be modified as follows: Coburn

Amendment No. 3549—30 minutes equally divided; Vitter Amendment No. 3550—20 minutes equally divided; Flake Amendment No. 3551—10 minutes equally divided; and Tester Amendment No. 3552—30 minutes equally divided; that any remaining time until 12 noon be equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; that at 12 noon, Senate vote on or in relation to the amendments as provided under the previous order; that upon disposition of Tester Amendment No. 3552, Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended; and that there be two minutes equally divided prior to each vote and all after the first vote be ten minute votes; with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect. **Page S4569**

Carnes Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit. **Page S4545**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, July 18, 2014. **Page S4545**

Birotte Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California. **Page S4545**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit. **Page S4545**

Rosenberg Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida. **Page S4545**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Andre Birotte, Jr., of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California. **Page S4545**

DeGravelles Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of John W. deGravelles, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana. **Pages S4545–46**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Robin L. Rosenberg, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida. **Page S4546**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 53 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 227), Ronnie L. White, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. **Pages S4514–27, S4569**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 54 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 226), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4519**

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination were discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Laura S. Wertheimer, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, which was sent to the Senate on May 22, 2014, from the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. **Page S4569**

Messages from the House: **Page S4551**

Measures Referred: **Page S4551**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S4513, S4551**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4551–53**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S4553–57**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4557**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4557–59**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S4559**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4549–51**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4559–62**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S4562–63**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4563**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—228) **Pages S4519, S4527, S4535**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:34 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 17, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4569.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

STRENGTHENING TRADE ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine strengthening trade enforcement to protect American enterprise and grow American jobs, after receiving testimony from John Wagner, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, and Richard DiNucci, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Office of International Trade, both of Customs and Border Protection, and Lev Kubiak, Assistant Director of International Affairs, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, all of the Department of Homeland Security; Rick Blume, Nucor Corporation, Charlotte, North Carolina; Edward T. Hayes, Leake & Andersson, LLP, New Orleans, Louisiana; Joe Sanroma, American Honey Producers Association, Bunkie, Louisiana; and John C. Steinberger, Adduci, Mastriani & Schaumberg, L.L.P., Washington, DC.

BANKS SYSTEMIC IMPORTANCE

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection concluded a hearing to examine what makes a bank systemically important, after receiving testimony from Richard J. Herring, University of Pennsylvania Wharton School, Bryn Mawr; James B. Thomson, University of Akron College of Business Administration, Akron, Ohio; Robert DeYoung, University of Kansas School of Business, Baldwin City; and Paul H. Kupiec, American Enterprise Institute, Fairfax, Virginia.

DOMESTIC SPACE ACCESS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces to examine options for assuring domestic space access, including how acquisition best practices can benefit future efforts, after receiving testimony from Alan Estevez, Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, and General William L. Shelton, Commander, Air Force Space Command, both of the Department of Defense; Robert Lightfoot, Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Cristina Chaplain, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office; Major General Howard J. Mitchell, USAF (Ret.), The Aerospace Corporation, and Yool Kim, RAND Corporation, both of Arlington, Virginia; and Daniel L. Dumbacher, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

THE FUTURE OF THE VIDEO MARKETPLACE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine consumer choice, consolidation and the future video marketplace, after receiving testimony from David L. Cohen, Comcast Corporation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Justin Hurwitz, University of Nebraska College of Law, Lincoln; John T. Stankey, AT&T Inc., Dallas, Texas; Jeffrey H. Blum, DISH Network L.L.C., and Gene Kimmelman, Public Knowledge, both of Washington, DC; and Shawn Ryan, Writers Guild of America, West, Inc., Sherman Oaks, California.

WATER AND WILDLIFE BILLS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife concluded a hearing to examine S. 571, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a deadline for restricting sewage dumping into the Great Lakes and to fund programs and activities for improving wastewater discharges into the Great Lakes, S. 1153, to establish an improved regulatory process for injurious wildlife to prevent the introduction and establishment in the United States of nonnative wildlife and wild animal pathogens and parasites that are likely to cause harm, S. 1175, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program to provide loans and loan guarantees to enable eligible public entities to acquire interests in real property that are in compliance with habitat conservation plans approved by the Secretary of the Interior under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, S. 1202, to establish an integrated Federal program to respond to ongoing and expected impacts of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, restoring, and conserving the natural resources of the United States, and to maximize government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments and other entities, S. 1232, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes, H.R. 1300, to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, S. 1381, to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, S. 1650, to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaska Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, S. 2225, to provide for a smart water resource management pilot program,

S. 2530, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or exportation of mussels of certain genus, and S. 2560, to authorize the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to seek compensation for injuries to trust resources and use those funds to restore, replace, or acquire equivalent resources, after receiving testimony from Senators Kirk, Blumenthal, and Heller; Michael H. Shapiro, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Water, Environmental Protection Agency; Steve Guertin, Deputy Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Tony Wasley, Nevada Department of Wildlife Director, Reno; and Bruce A. Stein, National Wildlife Federation, and Chad W. Lord, National Parks Conservation Association, both of Washington, DC.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Robert W. Holleyman II, of Louisiana, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, who was introduced by Senator Landrieu, and Cary Douglas Pugh, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

The Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and its Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990 (Treaty Doc.113–04);

The Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 13, 2013, at Warsaw (Treaty Doc. 113–05);

H.R. 4028, to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom;

S. 2577, to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014;

S. Res. 498, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization;

S. Res. 500, expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity; and

The nominations of Alfonso E. Lenhardt, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, Marcia Denise Occomy, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank, and Leslie Ann Bassett, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay, Department of State.

REENERGIZING U.S.-INDIA TIES

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs concluded a hearing to examine reenergizing United States-India ties, after receiving testimony from Nisha D. Biswal, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs; Amy Searight, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; and Frank G. Wisner, Squire Patton Boggs, Richard M. Rossow, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Vikram J. Singh, Center for American Progress, and Lisa Curtis, The Heritage Foundation, all of Washington, DC.

CHALLENGES AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine challenges at the border, focusing on examining and addressing the root of the causes behind the rise in apprehensions at the Southern Border, after receiving testimony from Michael Shifter, Inter-American Dialogue, Eric L. Olson, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Latin American Program, Eric Farnsworth, Council of the Americas, and Richard Jones, Catholic Relief Services, all of Washington, D.C.; and Bryan Roberts, Econometrica, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S LAND BUY-BACK PROGRAM

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Department of the Interior's land buy-back program, after receiving testimony from Michael L. Connor, Deputy Secretary of the Interior; Carole Lankford, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Pablo, Montana; Susan Waukon, Ho Chunk Nation Legislature, Black River Falls, Wisconsin; Jennifer M. Keough, The Garden City Group, Inc., Seattle, Washington; Helo Hancock, Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Plummer, Idaho; and George Waters, George Waters Consulting Services, Washington, DC.

STATE OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS HEALTH CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the state of Veterans' Affairs health care, after receiving testimony from Sloan D. Gibson, Acting Secretary, and Philip Matkowsky, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Administrative Operations, Veterans Health Administration, both of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

PHONE SCAMS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine phone scams, focusing on progress and potential solutions, after receiving testimony from Lois Greisman, Associate Director, Division of Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Joseph S. Campbell, Deputy Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Kevin Rupy, United States Telecom Association, Washington, D.C.; and a public witness, Cincinnati, Ohio.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 5119–5128; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 107; and H. Res. 671–672 were introduced. **Pages H6351–52**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6352–53**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 4871, to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–523). **Page H6351**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fleischmann to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6299**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:25 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6302**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H6311**

Reception in the House Chamber of Former Members of Congress: Agreed by unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the former Members program held earlier in the day be printed in the Congressional Record and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks. **Pages H6302–11**

Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015: The House passed H.R. 5016, making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 427. Consideration of the measure began on July 14th. **Pages H6316–33**

Rejected the Nolan motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No. 426. **Pages H6331–33**

Agreed to:

Engel amendment that prohibits funds from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011; **Pages H6316–17**

Garrett amendment that prohibits funds from being used to designate any nonbank financial company as "too big to fail", as a "systemically important financial institution", or make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States; **Pages H6317–18**

Lankford amendment that prohibits funds from being used to study, promulgate, draft, review, implement, or enforce any rule pursuant to section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act or amendments made by such section; **Pages H6322–23**

Meehan amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014) that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being used to modify or rebuild any portion of the White House bowling alley, including using phenolic synthetic material (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw the request for a recorded vote to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the earlier voice vote thereon); **Page H6323**

Gosar amendment that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being used to pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service (by a recorded vote of 282 ayes to

138 noes with 1 answering ''present'', Roll No. 416); **Pages H6324–25**

Heck (WA) amendment that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being used, with respect to specified States, to penalize a financial institution solely because the institution provides financial services to an entity that is a manufacturer, producer, or a person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling marijuana or marijuana products and engages in such activity pursuant to a law established by a State or local government (by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 418); **Page H6326**

DeSantis amendment that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being used by the Internal Revenue Service to create machine-readable materials that are not subject to the safeguards established pursuant to section 3105 of title 44, United States Code (by a recorded vote of 351 ayes to 71 noes, Roll No. 419); **Pages H6326–27**

DeSantis amendment that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being obligated or expended by the Internal Revenue Service for conferences (by a recorded vote of 264 ayes to 157 noes, Roll No. 420); **Page H6327**

Blackburn amendment that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being used to provide funds from the Hardest Hit Fund program established by the Secretary of the Treasury under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to any State or local government for the purpose of funding pension obligations of such State or local government (by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 422); **Pages H6328–29**

Blackburn amendment that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being used, with respect to specified States, by the Federal Communications Commission to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws with respect to the provision of broadband Internet access service by the State or a municipality or other political subdivision of the State (by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 200 noes, Roll No. 423); **Page H6329**

Blackburn amendment that was debated on July 15th that prohibits funds from being used by the Consumer Product Safety Commission to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices'' (by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 424); and **Pages H6329–30**

Massie amendment that prohibits funds from being used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to enforce any provision of the Firearms Registration Amendment Act of 2008, the Inoperable Pistol Amendment Act of 2008, the Firearms Amendment Act of 2012, or the Administrative Disposition for Weapons Offenses Amendment Act of 2012 (by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 425). **Pages H6318–20, H6330–31**

Rejected:

Ellison amendment that sought to reduce funding for salaries and expenses of the Supreme Court of the United States by $2.13 and increase funding for salaries and expenses of The White House by the same amount; **Page H6320**

Crowley amendment that sought to reduce funding for salaries and expenses of the Supreme Court of the United States by $7.25 and increase funding for salaries and expenses of The White House by the same amount; **Pages H6321–22**

Fleming amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of July 14, 2014) that was debated on July 15th that sought to prohibit funds from being used to implement guidance FIN–2014–G001 (relating to BSA Expectations Regarding Marijuana-Related Businesses) issued on February 14, 2014 (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 415); **Page H6324**

Grayson amendment that was debated on July 15th that sought to prohibit funds from being used to pay any individual at an annual rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2, Step 1 or 2 as defined in the ''Salary Table 2014–GS'' published by the Office of Personnel Management, or to pay any individual at an hourly basic rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2, Step 1 or 2 (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 417); and **Page H6325**

Blackburn amendment that was debated on July 15th that sought to reduce each amount made available by the bill by 1%, with the exception of specified accounts (by a recorded vote of 168 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 421). **Pages H6327–28**

Withdrawn:

Gallego amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to implement or enforce Revenue Ruling 2012–18 (or any guidance of the same substance); **Page H6318**

Rokita amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to propose, make, finalize, or implement any rule, regulation, interpretive rule, or general statement of policy issued after the date of enactment of this Act, that is issued pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code; and **Pages H6320–21**

Lankford amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used by the Federal Communications

Commission to make any changes to its policies with respect to broadcast indecency. **Pages H6322–23**

H. Res. 661, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5016) and (H.R. 4718), was agreed to on July 10th.

Recess: The House recessed at 1:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2:10 p.m. **Page H6323**

Notice of Intent to Offer Motion: Representative Barber announced his intent to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230. **Page H6333**

Motion to Instruct Conferees: The House debated the Gallego motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H6333–38**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, July 17th. **Page H6338**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H6302.

Senate Referral: S. 517 was held at the desk. **Page H6302**

Quorum Calls Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and 12 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6324, H6324–25, H6325, H6326, H6326–27, H6327, H6328, H6328–29, H6329, H6329–30, H6330, H6332–33 and H6333. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 649, directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011. The resolution was ordered reported, without amendment.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 OCO BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2015 OCO Budget Request. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Defense officials: Michael J. McCord, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller); Admiral James A. ''Sandy'' Winnefeld, Jr., USN, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Robert O. Work, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

UNMANNED CARRIER-LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE REQUIREMENTS ASSESSMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing on Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) Requirements Assessment. Testimony was heard from Ronald O'Rourke, Specialist in Naval Affairs, Defense Policy and Arms Control Section, Congressional Research Service; and the following Department of Defense officials: Mark Andress, Assistant Deputy Chief of Operations for Information Dominance; Vice Admiral Paul A. Grosklags, U.S. Navy Principal Military Deputy, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisitions; and Brigadier General Joseph T. Guastella, U.S. Air Force Director, Joint Requirements Oversight Council; and public witnesses.

THE LONG-TERM BUDGET OUTLOOK

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Long-Term Budget Outlook''. Testimony was heard from Douglas W. Elmendorf, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

REVIEW OF CDC ANTHRAX LAB INCIDENT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Review of CDC Anthrax Lab Incident''. Testimony was heard from Thomas R. Frieden, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Jere Dick, Associate Deputy Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services, Department of Agriculture; Nancy Kingsbury, Managing Director, Applied Research and Methods, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

FAILURE TO VERIFY: CONCERNS REGARDING PPACA'S ELIGIBILITY SYSTEM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Failure to Verify: Concerns Regarding PPACA's Eligibility System''. Testimony was heard from Kay Daly, Assistant Inspector General, Office of Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; and Joyce Greenleaf, Regional Inspector General, Office of Evaluation and Inspections, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy''. Testimony was heard from Janet L. Yellen, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Iran's Destabilizing Role in the Middle East". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE GROWING CRISIS OF AFRICA'S ORPHANS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled "The Growing Crisis of Africa's Orphans". Testimony was heard from Robert P. Jackson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; Nancy Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development; and public witnesses.

PORT OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE: HOW DOES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PRIORITIZE INVESTMENTS?

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security held a hearing entitled "Port of Entry Infrastructure: How Does the Federal Government Prioritize Investments?". Testimony was heard from John Wagner, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Michael Gelber, Deputy Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; and Oscar Leeser, Mayor, City of El Paso, Texas.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 646, directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Justice that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; and H.R. 744, the "STOP Identity Theft Act of 2013". H. Res. 646 was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 744 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 277, to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Sachuest Point Unit RI–04P, Easton Beach Unit RI–05P, Almy Pond Unit RI–06, and Hazards Beach Unit RI–07 in Rhode Island; H.R. 916, the "Federal Land Asset Inventory Reform Act of 2013"; H.R. 1810, to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Gasparilla Island Unit in Florida; H.R. 2158, the "Expedited Departure of Certain Snake Species Act"; H.R. 3572, to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in North Carolina; H.R. 3806, the "Great Smoky Mountains National Park Agreement Act of 2013"; and H.R. 4751, to make technical corrections to Public Law 110–229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 277, H.R. 916, H.R. 2158, H.R. 3572, and H.R. 3806. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1810 and H.R. 4751.

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS: IS SUPPORTING CANDIDATES AND CAMPAIGN FUND-RAISING AN APPROPRIATE USE OF A GOVERNMENT OFFICE?

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee began a hearing entitled "White House Office of Political Affairs: Is Supporting Candidates and Campaign Fund-Raising an Appropriate Use of a Government Office?". The Chairman and Ranking Member made statements, and the hearing was recessed before the witnesses gave any testimony. There is no date set for continuation.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on a discussion draft of a House Resolution providing for the authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President inconsistent with his duties under the Constitution of the United States. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STATUS OF REFORMS TO EPA'S INTEGRATED RISK INFORMATION SYSTEM

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight; and Subcommittee on Environment held a joint subcommittee hearing entitled "Status of Reforms to EPA's Integrated Risk Information System". Testimony was heard from Kenneth Olden, Director, National Center for Environmental Assessment, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

BARRIERS TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP: EXAMINING THE ANTI-TRUST IMPLICATIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Barriers to Entrepreneurship: Examining the Anti-Trust Implications of Occupational Licensing". Testimony was heard from Andrew

Gavil, Director, Office of Policy Planning, Federal Trade Commission.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions; H. Con. Res. 103, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; H.R. 3044, to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi; H.R. 5078, the ''Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014''; H.R. 4854, the ''Regulatory Certainty Act''; H.R. 5077, the ''Coal Jobs Protection Act of 2014''. The General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions were approved. The following bills and concurrent resolution were ordered reported, without amendment: H. Con. Res. 103, H.R. 3044, H.R. 4854, and H.R. 5078. The following bill was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5077.

CREATING EFFICIENCY THROUGH COMPARISON: AN EVALUATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR BEST PRACTICES AND THE VA HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Creating Efficiency through Comparison: An Evaluation of Private Sector Best Practices and the VA Health Care System''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ADVANCING THE U.S. TRADE AGENDA: THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled ''Advancing the U.S. Trade Agenda: The World Trade Organization''. Testimony was heard from Michael Punke, Deputy United States Trade Representative and U.S. Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the World Trade Organization, Office of the United States Trade Representative.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to mark up proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense, 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of General Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., USMC, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commandant of the Marine Corps, Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance, to hold hearings to examine accountability and corporate culture in wake of the General Motors (GM) recalls, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Federal reserve portfolio, focusing on capitalizing on investments in research and development, 2 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the role of trade and technology in 21st century manufacturing, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine Central America in crisis and the exodus of unaccompanied minors, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Marcia Stephens Bloom Bernicat, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of Bangladesh, David Pressman, of New York, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, George Albert Krol, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan, Allan P. Mustard, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Turkmenistan, and Erica J. Barks Ruggles, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda, all of the Department of State, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging, to hold hearings to examine the need to improve patient safety and reduce preventable deaths, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Pamela Pepper, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Brenda K. Sannes, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York, and Patricia M. McCarthy, of Maryland, and Jeri Kaylene Somers, of Virginia, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''Russian Violations of the INF Treaty: After detection—what?'', 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The President's Funding Request for Overseas Contingency Operations'', 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology; and Subcommittee on Health, joint subcommittee hearing entitled ''21st Century Technology for 21st Century Cures'', 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''A Legislative Proposal Entitled the 'Bank Account Seizure of Terrorist Assets (BASTA) Act' '', 9:45 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled ''Guilty until Proven Innocent? A Study of the Propriety & Legal Authority for the Justice Department's Operation Choke Point'', 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs, hearing entitled ''Examining the Justice Department's Response to the IRS Targeting Scandal'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled ''Policies to Spur Innovative Medical Breakthroughs from Laboratories to Patients'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 9 a.m., 304–HVC. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of S. 2244, Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. At 12 noon, Senate will vote on or in relation to Coburn Amendment No. 3549, Vitter Amendment No. 3550, Flake Amendment No. 3551, Tester Amendment No. 3552, and final passage of S. 2244, Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, July 17

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 4719—Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2014 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E1173
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1172
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1168
Carter, John R., Tex., E1173, E1179
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1170
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1175
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E1166
Duffy, Sean P., Wisc., E1168, E1176
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E1170
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E1173, E1174
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1166, E1170
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1165, E1167, E1169, E1171, E1174
Holt, Rush, N.J., E1165, E1168, E1172, E1174
King, Peter T., N.Y., E1175
Larson, John B., Conn., E1177
Lewis, John, Ga., E1176
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E1175
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1170
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1175
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1165
Meeks, Gregory W., N.Y., E1169, E1179
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E1170
Mica, John L., Fla., E1177
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E1173
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1166
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1169
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E1170, E1179
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E1167
Price, David E., N.C., E1178
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1166
Ross, Dennis A., Fla., E1172
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1175
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1177
Schock, Aaron, Ill., E1174
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1168
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1177
Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E1174
Williams, Roger, Tex., E1174
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1166, E1167
Young, Todd C., Ind., E1169

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.