United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 2014 No. 5

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 9, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LUKE MESSER 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.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday on January 11, people throughout our country here, people throughout the world will be observing Human Trafficking Awareness Day. The start of this new year I think is a fitting time to focus on the shameful fact that human slavery is not a relic of ancient history, that in fact it is with us today. It is a brutal reality. A reality faced by more than 20 million victims around the world, many of them trafficked for labor, but increasingly for underaged girls. For young women, this is a case where they are exploited in this trafficking as well.

Even in my work as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have learned that human trafficking is no longer just a problem ''over there.'' It is a problem in our communities here. It is a problem in developing economies, but also it is a problem in the United States and in Europe. It is a scourge even in the communities that we serve here and that we represent.

In my own community in the last two years, the Orange County Human Trafficking Task Force assisted 250 victims. Ninety-three percent were women, most of them underage, 80 of them from foreign countries. At our November field hearing in Fullerton, the Orange County district attorney testified that, shockingly—we are speaking now about trafficking, sexual trafficking—''shockingly the average age of a child being trafficked in this country is 12'' years of age. ''A little girl who has not even reached her teens.''

We also heard from one brave survivor, Angela Guanzon, who was trafficked from the Philippines into forced labor in Long Beach, California.

I have heard many other stories from the members of the Human Trafficking Congressional Advisory Committee that I established last year in my Los Angeles district office. The forum for communicating on trafficking between law enforcement, advocates, service organizations, and survivors has contributed profoundly to my own knowledge, my own understanding of this issue. I encourage my colleagues to get to know those on the front lines of the fight against human trafficking. Get to know them in their districts and know of their work. You are going to be informed, challenged, and inspired by what you learn.

This January designated as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month is a perfect time to shine a spotlight on the dark issue of trafficking, but awareness is only a first step. More needs to be done.

To that end, I would urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 3344, the Fraudulent Overseas Recruitment and Trafficking Elimination Act, to combat one critical form of recurring abuse: namely, that is unscrupulous recruiters. By targeting the recruiters we can do a lot—these recruiters who bait foreigners to travel to the United States with promises of good jobs, but trap them in sexual exploitation or forced labor once they arrive.

For example, in my home county, the Salvation Army's Network of Emergency Trafficking Services reports that a full one-third of their clients—33 percent of their clients—were recruited in a foreign country by a labor recruiter. They got here and found it was a very different job than the one they enlisted for. This represents not only an assault on the dignity of the victim but also a subversion of United States labor laws and our nonimmigrant visa system.

In response, this legislation requires that prospective foreign workers be given accurate information about the terms of employment and be given anti-trafficking protections by U.S. laws. It prohibits recruitment fees or hidden charges used as coercive leverage against workers. In other words, once you get here to the United States, you can't find out afterwards, because they didn't disclose to you, that there are fees that you owe. Those fees are no longer allowed. Up front the employer pays those fees.

It requires foreign labor recruiters to register and remain in good standing with the Department of Labor, and it provides new incentives and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that recruiters and employers follow these disclosure and registration requirements.

Printed on recycled paper.

Members may contact the Foreign Affairs Committee to join this important anti-traffic initiative. I encourage you all to sign on to my legislation.

As people of goodwill around the world observe Human Trafficking Awareness Day this weekend, let us move beyond mere awareness, let us abolish this injustice, and protect and restore the dignity of those who have survived such exploitation.

INTERIM AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, our interim agreement with Iran gives us an opportunity to unwind seemingly intractable, interrelated conflicts throughout the Middle East.

There is no reason for Congress to complicate by further enhancing sanctions now that are already working. We have this 6 months to a year window to fashion a longer-term agreement. The fact that we are even talking with Iran is the most encouraging signal that we have seen in 34 years. Let's use this diplomatic window. There are hard-liners in both countries, highly suspicious, very negative, who would like to blow this agreement up.

Unless we are willing to invade and occupy Iran, even repeated bombing will delay the Iranian nuclear effort by, at best, 4 or 5 years, maybe less.

Americans have spent a trillion dollars, lost 4,000 American lives, with tens of thousands of wounded, in more than a decade in Iraq, and the country is still falling apart. Iran is bigger, stronger, and more sophisticated. I don't think you can sell that war to the American people.

Congress should calm down and give diplomacy a chance. Let's learn about this important country, its 4,000-year history, and our past mistakes with Iran, and most important, our common interest.

The Middle East has long been a simmering cauldron, with a conflict suppressed by a lid of repression held down by empire and colonial powers. That started to change a century ago with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and colonial powers trying from afar to influence human behavior by drawing lines on maps from European capitals, irrespective of religious, tribal, or ethnic realities. It set in motion a series of forces that are playing out today with tragic consequences.

Iran as the dominant Shi'a force in the region could play a huge role where we share common interest, in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan for instance.

The current situation is a result of partnerships between Congress and the Obama administration that got us to this point where Iran is willing to negotiate. Strong, effective sanctions would never have worked without careful, artful diplomacy that involved other countries like India to help us squeeze Iran. It has worked. Let's claim credit and move on to the next steps.

We could start by trying to learn about each other. Let's promote an exchange between Iran and the United States with students, religious leaders, maybe even parliamentary members and Members of Congress. Let's focus on our shared interest, like Afghanistan, where we had earlier cooperation with Iran to help overthrow the Taliban. Let's work to make progress with the agreement and beyond.

The Congress can do this most importantly by leaving it alone. Congress shouldn't meddle, Congress shouldn't muddle, Congress shouldn't give the Iranian hard-liners who don't want any agreement at all an excuse to scuttle it.

We have an opportunity to improve the most volatile region in the world and Congress shouldn't blow that opportunity.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, 48 hours, a million-plus Americans received letters in their mailboxes. They weren't overdue tax letters. They were not letters suggesting that you are at fault. It was not a notice to say that you are no longer an American citizen. It was not a letter to say you are now relieved of any responsibility to pay any bills or to provide for your family.

It was a letter denying, or extinguishing, taking away the unemployment insurance that most Americans have come to understand that, as working Americans, having worked in their life, that they would be the recipient of these benefits during a brief lapse or an extended lapse of not being able to find work. The chronically unemployed percentage is the highest that it has been in decades, and therefore, this is not the time to delay.

I hold in my hand as well a resume of a competent worker, a college graduate who has the responsibility to support his family and who has been looking for work for 2 years, earnestly, energetically, and intensely, and cannot find work.

The clock is ticking on the 30 hours in the United States Senate, but the real concern is my friends in this body. Recognizing that these letters deal with people's lives, and to make a representation that all is well, unemployment generally is 7 percent. However, it was lower than that when President Bush signed the unemployment insurance benefits in 2008. These guys, these distinguished Americans, misfits, why can't they find work? Twenty thousand-plus are veterans looking for work, men and women who served in the United States military, or, as we met in the White House on Tuesday, a mother of two distinguished men who are serving in Afghanistan.

So the 1.3 million languish while we are trying to make a determination that may not be able to be made. Frankly, I would ask that we all be reasonable. I would simply make the point that it is an emergency.

I want to pause for a moment and thank the Houston Apartment Association that has worked with me and has sent a letter to all of their members asking for those 12,000, some of whom are residents of apartments in Harris County, to be sensitive and tolerant of those individuals who can document that they were the beneficiaries or the recipients of unemployment insurance that was cut off on December 28. I want to applaud them for their sensitivity in dealing with those particular individuals. I ask mortgage companies and utility companies and city water bill companies to be tolerant as well, to be working with families who are basically without a lifeline.

□ 1015

But the issue before us is the fact that these letters have gone to people such as this woman, who has looked for work every day. She liked her job and was laid off for no fault of her own.

Right now, we have the opportunity to pass a 3-month emergency relief—some of us have introduced bills for 1 year—and then contemplate, discuss, and work with what might be the appropriate way of funding the continuation.

No person unemployed, chronically or not, is happy with an unemployment benefit check. What they are happy with, Mr. Speaker, is the ability to work and to provide for their family.

So I would make the argument that as we discuss privacy issues on the Affordable Care Act, which are already taken care of by CMS, today and tomorrow on the floor we should be passing unemployment insurance. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me, recognizing that Americans want to work. Let's help them transition with a bridge of unemployment insurance.

OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last November, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power, came to meet with my colleagues and me who serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee. In that meeting, Ambassador Power told us that despite U.S. law that prohibits any funding to UNESCO because of its decision to admit a nonexistent state of Palestine to its membership, the administration was going to make it a priority to seek waiver authority to continue U.S. taxpayer funding to UNESCO.

Indeed, this is coming to fruition. There is a congressional push by some to grant the administration this waiver

or to seek other ways to get around this prohibition.

I am here today to voice my unconditional and unyielding opposition to this push, and I urge my colleagues to join me in removing that in the budget that will be before us soon and not allow the administration to yet again circumvent U.S. law and to throw away hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayer money.

The administration is seeking to not only restore $80 million in taxpayer funds to UNESCO for this fiscal year, but it is also seeking to pay nearly $250 million more in arrears—dues—that we owed to UNESCO, an agency that has an anti-U.S. and an anti-Israel agenda.

If we restore funding to UNESCO, we are tacitly agreeing with their support for Abbas, the PA, the PLO, the nonexistent state of Palestine, and the U.N. scheme to undermine the peace process by granting de facto recognition to a Palestinian state without it first coming to an agreement with Israel to resolve this long conflict.

A vote to restore any U.S. funding to UNESCO or to give the administration any waiver authority to circumvent the existing laws that prohibit U.S. funding to UNESCO would not only undermine our credibility and set a dangerous precedent; it would further embolden an already intransigent Abu Mazen and Palestinian Authority.

Why do I say ''intransigent''? Because even as we sit here, Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that a major holdup in the peace negotiations between Secretary Kerry, Israel, and the Palestinian Authority is the refusal by Abbas and the PA to recognize Israel as the Jewish State of Israel. Is that the kind of member that we want to be associated with in UNESCO—one that doesn't even recognize the identity of another state? And not just another state, but our closest ally.

I know that UNESCO is riddled with rogue regimes amongst its ranks, including the likes of Cuba, where the callous, brutal, and murderous Castro regime has been repressing the rights of 11 million Cubans for over half a century; and Syria, where the tyrant Assad has caused the deaths of over 130,000 people and brought the Middle East to the very brink.

But if we restore U.S. funding to UNESCO, we are essentially saying that this is okay, and, oh, by the way, why not add one more in Abbas? There has been a recent spate of terrorist activity against Israel; and rather than act like a true leader that seeks peace and a partner in a negotiated peace settlement, Abbas was definitely silent when it came time to denounce these acts of terror.

The powers that be at UNESCO don't seem to mind this at all. But not us, Mr. Speaker. We are better than that. We aren't about to trade in our credibility and our principles as a country for a plaque and platitudes for this circumvention. We know that if we concede to UNESCO and restore any funding, we would be making a grave mistake, and also wasting hundreds of millions of our constituents' dollars on this anti-U.S. agenda.

I will continue to fight this push to restore funding to UNESCO in any way, and I will continue to rally my colleagues to join me in this fight.

STRONG START FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN ACT

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, study after study has shown us that investment in quality early education leads to better educational outcomes, stronger job earnings, and lower crime rates. Decades of research confirm that quality preschool helps prevent achievement gaps for low-income children, with long-term benefits for our Nation.

But we don't need research to confirm the importance of quality early childhood education. Ask any parent in America if it matters to them. The problem is that not enough children have access to it. That is why I have introduced the bipartisan bill, Strong Start for America's Children Act.

When Congressman HANNA, Senator HARKIN, and I introduced the bill in November, we were joined by the sheriff of Minneapolis, a top private-sector CEO, a retired Air Force General, a parent, and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. These leaders from so many segments of our country understand the need for greater Federal investment in high-quality preschool.

My legislation proposes an innovative Federal-State partnership to increase resources for local school districts and community-based programs that provide quality pre-kindergarten for 4-year-olds. It also allows funding for educating 3-year-olds. It also allows States to spend some of the money on good quality infant and toddler care. The bill improves child care quality for infants and toddlers by supporting partnerships between child care and Early Head Start.

Millions of young children from low-income families lack access to high-quality preschool programs and child care services. They are on waiting lists because of limited public funding. This deepens achievement gaps and impedes the Nation's economic workforce success.

For example, Early Head Start has shown to be an effective, high-quality program; yet the sad truth is that only 3 percent of the eligible children have access to it. Additionally, one in six low-income families eligible for Federal child care services has access.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Democratic issue nor a Republican issue. Babies, toddlers, and preschoolers don't know that political parties exist. In fact, we are seeing that Republican and Democratic Governors from all regions of the country are pushing for more funding for early learning in their States. They want to be partners with the Federal Government.

State legislators from both parties in a wide range of States have led efforts to support quality preschool. Just recently, we received a letter signed by more than 500 State legislators from both parties in support of this issue.

I am also very proud of our partnership with the fellow Republican Members of the House, such as Mr. HANNA and Mr. GRIMM. We all know that the policy makes sense for America's future. We all know what is possible in our communities and in our Nation if kids are given a fair shot at success.

The public understands and believes in early childhood education. A bipartisan poll released in July found an overwhelming majority of Americans supports quality early childhood education and rate it a national priority, second to only increasing jobs and economic growth. Seven in 10 support the Federal plan to help States and local communities provide better early childhood education.

Members of Congress and other policymakers are also getting on board. The bipartisan budget agreement reached last month includes a reserve fund for early childhood education, child care, and voluntary home visitation. That is yet another acknowledgment by another bipartisan group of Members—in this case, budget leaders—that early childhood education should be a top priority for the Federal Government. That acknowledgment is clearly a step forward, but it isn't enough. Our next step must be the enactment of the Strong Start Act.

With the fiscal year 2014 spending deadline less than a week away, I understand that appropriators from both Houses are considering increased funding for preschool, as outlined in our bipartisan bill. I heartily encourage this course.

Despite the language used whenever we in Congress talk about budgets, funding early childhood education isn't spending. It is an investment, and it is an investment that is critical for our Nation's long-term economic strength.

From a better-educated workforce to a reduced need for social services, study after study has documented the enormous return on investment of early childhood education. We can save between $7 and $12 for every dollar invested. These are real savings resulting from less grade repetition, lower dropout rates, less spending on welfare and social services, more tax revenue, and lower incarceration rates.

As Sheriff Rich Stanek said when we launched the Strong Start for America's Children Act:

> I'm the guy you pay later.

Let's stop spending on the back end what we should be investing in the beginning in a child's life.

For all of these reasons, our bill has the support of more than 60 national organizations representing pediatricians, law enforcement, religious

groups, labor unions, business and military leaders, people with disabilities, school principals, civil rights leaders, and literacy advocates. Now is the time to empower the next generation and guarantee a better future for our Nation.

HONORING RON MILLER

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to be here this morning and to share with you and our colleagues the story of an exceptional American, Ron Miller, who I am proud to say lives in Virginia's Second Congressional District, the district I have the privilege to serve and represent.

Ron is 46 years old. He had always planned to go back to school; but at age 33, his life was turned upside down. He was diagnosed with Lou Gehrig's disease, or ALS, a devastating neurodegenerative disease that progressively affects nerves in the brain and the spinal cord. It is a disease for which, at present, there is no cure.

Ron is paralyzed from the nose down; yet he used eye-gaze computer technology to complete his associate's degree in liberal arts, with honors, in a bold and courageous effort to bring attention to ALS.

They have a wonderful staff at the Lake Taylor transitional facility where Ron lives, and where the graduation ceremony took place; and I saw tears coming down several of the staff members' eyes as they watched Ron receive his degree. Actually, the president of Excelsior College made the effort to fly down to be with us that day.

I was deeply honored to be there and to have the privilege of sharing the commencement address, but it certainly wasn't my words that inspired everyone who was there. It was Ron's words that he shared through his computer.

He didn't talk about himself. He didn't talk about how difficult things are for him. He mainly thanked all of those in his life that made the degree possible. He talked about the importance of education and the importance of finding a cure for ALS.

I want to share just a small portion of what he shared that day. I watched his eyes as they guided the cursor on the screen to the ''play'' button. When he hit it with his eyes, it actually started the computer to speak. He put it this way:

> I ask that you all bear with me as I stumble my way through this. At least I can blame the computer if I mispronounce anything.

That got a laugh there. He has got a great sense of humor.

He said:

> Thank you for ensuring I started each class not as a disabled person, but as a differently abled person.

He thanked all the nurses and the nurses' aides there. He said:

> You are my heroes. First of all, it takes a lot of work for me to look this good.

He has a great sense of humor.

He thanked his family and his friends for their love and support.

Speaking of life, he said:

> It isn't always easy—but life never is. I just have a different set of challenges than most.

He left us with this quote by John Wooden:

> Do not let what you cannot do interfere with what you can do.

Powerful words.

To me, Mr. Speaker, Ron's courage and his remarkable achievement represent the very best of the American spirit and the human spirit. It is a strong heart that chooses to be grateful for life's simple blessings, one that values the gift of friendship, one that embraces the pursuit of knowledge, and one that does not rest in a relentless pursuit to lessen human suffering, especially for those who will follow.

So I really count it as a high privilege to know Ron and to count him as a friend. He is fulfilling his mission to ensure that Americans are educated about the challenges that those with ALS face. He has also shown us what a person with ALS can accomplish.

He and many others who are heavily burdened with ALS, and their families, are calling attention to the need for improved access. We have a wonderful facility in Virginia Beach that is a tremendous asset for those who are afflicted with a disease that affects their physical mobility and that includes many of our wounded warriors.

□ 1030

It is JT's Grommet Island. It is right there on Virginia Beach, really the first on the east coast that allows people that are mobility impaired to get down and experience the joy of being on the water and the sun and the sand and just being outside.

There is a lot more work to be done, and I am so proud of our friends, Bruce Thompson and others. His son, Josh, is afflicted with ALS, and he led the effort to build that facility that I just mentioned there. It is called JT's Grommet Island, and it is named in honor of his son, Josh, who is struggling with this, and his family is as well.

I just want to close my comments today with great respect for those who are struggling with this disease and to share with you something that Ron has said about his struggle. It is an outlook on life that I found profound and inspirational, and I posted it in my home where I see it every day. He said this: ''I may have ALS, but ALS does not have me.''

So, Mr. Speaker, may Ron's remarkable achievement and the spirit that he exhibits in his life inspire all of us to join him in this worthy fight to find a cure for ALS.

THE 50-YEAR WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak about unemployment insurance and the extension of it to my Republican colleagues. But there is no one over here to listen, so maybe they will listen to some renowned Republicans talk about what is really important.

How about Newt Gingrich, who recently said, ''I think every Republican should embrace the Pope's core critique that you do not want to live on a planet with billionaires and people who do not have any food?''

Or how about John Feehery, a Republican strategist who said, ''What does the Republican Party actually believe in? What is its purpose? Is it just to have unbridled capitalism without any moral core?''

Mr. Speaker, this 50-year war on poverty has faced setbacks under the leadership of both parties, but the GOP-led House seems to be actively engaged in a war on the war on poverty. Congress' inaction has cut off 1.3 million people from unemployment insurance after Christmas and, unless renewed, will cut benefits for another 1.9 million who are eligible in 2014.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle have claimed that this is just politics, that unemployment insurance was ''intended to be a temporary solution to a very temporary crisis.'' Well, here's a news flash. We have been in this crisis since 2008. This is not temporary. This is long-term and it is chronic, and it has been caused by the greed of billionaires of the likes that we have seen on Wall Street. This is a personal nightmare for many of the constituents of my colleagues across the aisle. Some of their constituents have written to my office because they think their Representative is blind to how they are struggling.

Now, Margaret Heffernan is a renowned speaker, and she talks about mindless blindness. And in many respects, that is what I think we are engaged in here, mindless blindness. So here are some of the stories of those impacted by the loss of unemployment insurance who live in districts of my Republican colleagues, because maybe they will hear me and think about who is being hurt by playing politics.

Payne Springs, Texas, resident Linda Mrosko shared her story with me on my congressional Facebook page. Linda was 60 years old when her legal secretary job was eliminated. With more than 40 years of work experience under her belt—this is not someone sitting on a couch at home—40 years of experience as a paralegal secretary, she believed unemployment insurance would protect her if she lost her job. Even while caring for her 80-year-old mother with breast cancer, Linda continued to look for work but got very few interviews. Her 91-year-old father then fell ill and died, but Linda continued to look for work, even while in

mourning and caring for her sick mother. The few interviews Linda does get, she is surrounded by people in their twenties and thirties and thinks that her age might be keeping her from securing a job.

''My unemployment ended on December 28. I have no savings. I haven't paid rent yet, or electricity, or the car payment, or the phone bill because I don't have enough money to make those payments,'' she wrote to me.

Well, Linda, I hope your Republican Congressman reaches out to you immediately to explain to you in his own words why you shouldn't have your unemployment insurance extended after being employed for 40 years in this country.

Unemployment isn't a temporary problem for Daniel Burrow of Beauregard, Alabama. Daniel just hit his 26th week of filed unemployment. He lost his job in the auto industry in 2012 while he was on medical leave. The 45-year-old has exhausted all his unemployment benefits and applied for more than 50 jobs with no luck. His wife worries how the family will afford gas for Daniel to go job hunting or how the family will pay for necessities not covered by food stamps.

In Florida, 49-year-old Jim Lanzerio can barely pay his bills while he raises his 17-year-old daughter on his own. His unemployment insurance will run out in February, and he wonders why Congress cannot reach a deal on extending Federal emergency unemployment insurance. He has been looking for a job every day since early October and is ''not sitting back and waiting. I would go back to work immediately if someone offered me a job.''

This is more than politics for 70,000 individuals in Florida who already lost their unemployment insurance. These are just three stories. There are 1.3 million more that could be shared here today of people who have lost their unemployment insurance on December 28.

Yesterday was the 50th anniversary of President Johnson's announcing a war on poverty. The real question is: Why are our colleagues waging a war on the war on poverty?

THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon B. Johnson's war on poverty.

In 1964, President Johnson stood in this Chamber and addressed a Congress that represented a nation where more than 25 percent of Americans lived in poverty. In his address, President Johnson launched an agenda that led to the creation of Medicare, Medicaid, Job Corps, Head Start, and nutrition assistance for those who struggle to put food on their table.

His war, and its resulting programs, helped move millions out of poverty. From 1967 to 2012, the poverty rate fell from 26 percent to 16 percent, largely because of the strong safety net programs initiated by President Johnson's agenda.

Yet here we are today, 50 years later, and too many Americans are still living on the outskirts of hope because the war on poverty has now become a war on the poor. In the last year alone, Congress has agreed to indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts known as sequestration in an effort to balance the budget, and the House passed a farm bill that cut SNAP by $40 billion. Sequestration hurts the very people who need help the most by greatly reducing critical funding to programs like WIC and Head Start.

Congress drastically cut one of the most powerful antipoverty programs, SNAP, better known as food stamps. That is absurd when, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, SNAP kept 4.9 million Americans out of poverty in 2012 alone, including 2.2 million children.

Congress has also chosen not to extend unemployment insurance. Even though our country continues to lift itself out of the recession, many Americans still need our support. Turning our back on the 1.4 million Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own is unconscionable.

In an interview yesterday, I was asked to respond to a quote regarding unemployment insurance by a Republican, and this is what he said. He said:

> We have to introduce the blessing of work to people who have never seen it.

And let me just say, to be clear, he could not possibly have been talking about unemployment insurance, because you have to have worked to even receive it. So he obviously doesn't know what unemployment insurance is.

And to my colleague, I say that the American people know that they should be blessed with work, but they need meaningful work with a living wage.

I will continue to be a voice for the poor and will always fight on behalf of the 46 million Americans trying to survive in households with inadequate incomes. Americans need us to open the gates of opportunity so they can eat properly, get a quality education, and find good-paying jobs.

So on this 50th anniversary, I am making it clear that the war on poverty might be over, but the fight for the poor is not. We must reinforce the plans of President Johnson that would ensure all Americans can support themselves and their families and have better chances to contribute to our economy and our society. This is the way we build upon the progress we have made over the past five decades, not by taking action to reverse it.

To paraphrase Dr. King, he says, we have an obligation to those who have been left out of the sunlight of opportunity.

FOOTBALL SUCCESS IN NORTH CAROLINA'S TENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, last month was a big one for North Carolina football. You probably are well aware of the exploits of Cam Newton and the Carolina Panthers having clinched a playoff berth, but it was actually in my district, the Tenth District of North Carolina, in western North Carolina that was really the epicenter of football in North Carolina in the month of December.

First, there was Crest High School in Cleveland County representing the Boiling Springs and Shelby area. Crest is a perennial powerhouse in North Carolina high school football. This year's Charger team was under the guidance of Coach Mark Barnes. They rode a 14-game winning streak on their way to winning the North Carolina High School Athletic Association 3AA West title. While they were upset in the State championship game, it was another very impressive season for Coach Barnes and his great team.

While the Crest defeat was disappointing, all was not lost for Cleveland County, as another traditional power, Shelby High School, also played for a State championship. The Golden Lions went 12–4 this year, and capped the season with a 29–7 victory to win the North Carolina 2A State football championship. Coach Lance Ware and his team continued the proud tradition at Shelby as this marked the school's 12th State championship—pretty incredible, considering my high school has had a hard time just getting one or two.

Finally, the football success in North Carolina 10 continued in Catawba County, where Lenoir-Rhyne University, their football team enjoyed their best season in school history. The Bears, coached by Mike Houston, won a school record 13 games on their way to earning a spot in the NCAA Division II championship game in Florence, Alabama. While they lost the championship game, this year's Bears team finished the season ranked second in the Nation and provided a thrilling ride for the Lenoir-Rhyne campus and Hickory, as a whole. Both the faculty and alumni were very excited, and they had a great rally before that game. And it actually brought Lenoir-Rhyne onto the national stage for some attention as well. It is a great university.

So I want to congratulate Crest, Shelby, and Lenoir-Rhyne on their great successes this last football season. Now it is up to Cam and Luke to keep it going for North Carolina football. And, hopefully, the Panthers will win.

Go Panthers.

□ 1045

URGING THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP TO PASS UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE FOR THE LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation marks the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty this week, I rise to urge the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to immediately extend unemployment assistance to the long-term unemployed workers who continue to struggle to find jobs as our economy recovers from one of the worst economic crises in its history.

The declaration of the war on poverty was a historic moment in our Nation's history when we affirmed our national priority to support those in need. The war on poverty helped reaffirm that our government has a responsibility to protect our citizens, especially during times of economic hardship. Providing support and economic opportunity creates a stronger citizenry and a stronger country.

In contrast, the expiration of the emergency unemployment program last month undermines the economic security of our citizens and of our Nation. The expiration of the emergency unemployment program cut off more than 1.3 million Americans from unemployment insurance, with approximately 72,000 additional Americans losing benefits each week during the first half of 2014.

In my home State of Illinois, where the unemployment rate remains high, at 9.2 percent, an estimated 82,000 Illinoisans lost benefits on December 28, with 38,000 of those citizens living in Cook County alone. An additional 89,100, or roughly 3,000 Illinoisans a week, will exhaust regular benefits without access to emergency benefits in just the first half of 2014.

Failing to help these citizens is an unacceptable failure of leadership. Failure to continue emergency unemployment benefits is not a theoretical issue for millions of Americans. It is a daily nightmare.

These Americans lost their jobs through no fault of their own. They tirelessly try to find work when the jobs are few and far between. They struggle to cover basic food, housing, and transportation costs for their families on an average of $290 a week, a pittance which typically replaces only half of the average family's expenditures. Failing to help these citizens is an unacceptable failure.

Failure to continue emergency unemployment benefits poses a realistic threat to our fragile economic recovery, costing over 200,000 much-needed jobs and restricting our economic growth. The expiration drained over $400 million from State economies. In Illinois alone, the loss of an average $313 in the weekly benefit means a negative impact of $25 million for our citizens.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, ''The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little.'' Congress must act quickly to support our citizens and our economic recovery by continuing emergency unemployment benefits. The time to do it is now.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE ANDY JACOBS OF INDIANA

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise to honor the life of a great Hoosier, one of Indiana's finest public servants, Representative Andy Jacobs. I didn't know Andy as well as some of my other Hoosier colleagues, but I met him several times during his three decades representing Indiana in Congress, and I certainly knew Andy by his stellar reputation.

What impressed me most about him on those occasions that we met was the humbleness with which he approached his job and the respect and civility he showed for his constituents and his colleagues, regardless of their party affiliation or political ideology. Andy never took himself too seriously. He drove a beat-up Oldsmobile and dressed like an average guy, which he was.

This humble and decent man was a fierce advocate for civil rights and senior citizens and built a remarkable record of public service on behalf of his constituents. That is why he was held in such unusually high regard by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Andy exemplified all that was right about being a public servant. He could disagree without being disagreeable. He believed you could lift people up without tearing people down. Despite his many years representing his constituents in Congress, he refused to become jaded and allow what is wrong with politics to stop him from doing what is right.

Representative Andy Jacobs never forgot where he came from and personified what being a Hoosier is all about. He was a good man and led a great life that left a remarkable legacy.

I want to extend the thoughts and prayers of the people of Indiana's Sixth Congressional District to Andy's wife, children, and to all those who knew and loved him. May God comfort and watch over them and continue to bless the country that Andy so loved.

BIPARTISANSHIP EVERY DAY

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I salute my colleague for those eloquent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the famed English poet Alfred Tennyson once wrote, ''Hope smiles from the threshold of the year to come.'' Indeed, let's hope that this is the spirit that greets us here in the start of the second session of the 113th Congress. Having ended last year on a high note with the passage of the bipartisan budget agreement, we should resolve to keep that momentum going in this new year.

Our first order of business should be delivering on the bipartisan accord reached before the holidays. Thanks to that agreement, we, for the first time, will replace a portion of the indiscriminate cuts of sequestration with a more balanced approach. That is particularly important in communities like my own in northern Virginia which were disproportionately affected because of their strong ties to the Federal Government.

Next week's anticipated appropriations package will increase Federal investments in research, innovation, and transportation. That, in turn, will help unleash business investments and create jobs, which have lagged due to the sense of uncertainty fueled by the political brinkmanship here in Congress. Until those dollars produce results, we need to work together to extend the current safety net, specifically, unemployment insurance and nutrition assistance, to make sure we are not leaving our friends and neighbors behind.

We have made significant strides pushing down the unemployment rate to 7 percent, its lowest point in 5 years. We have added more than 8 million jobs in the past 4 years nationwide. That is still 1.3 million short of the number that were there before the Great Recession.

Equally important, 40 percent of the unemployed are long-term unemployed, 2 years or more. This structural unemployment has been devastating for those individuals and their families in their respective communities. That is why extending emergency unemployment benefits is so critically important. This is a lifeline that families rely on to keep food on the table.

More than 1.3 million Americans, including 9,000 in my own home State of Virginia and another 39,000 in the Speaker's State of Ohio, have already lost benefits because of Congress' inaction. Thousands more will see their benefits cut in the coming months. I remind my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that both unemployment insurance and nutrition assistance provide an immediate and tangible boost to our local economies. Pulling that assistance back now would be devastating in its effects and would undercut the economic momentum we have worked so hard to build these past few months.

Every dollar in assistance provided to the unemployed generates $1.64 in the local economy, and similarly, every dollar provided under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

has a multiplier effect of $1.79. These programs have helped keep generations of families out of poverty even while income inequality is growing worse.

A recent report shows that nearly half of the Nation's schoolchildren now qualify for free and reduced lunches. Those children, who come from low-income homes, account for more than half of all of the students in 17 States, mostly in Republican districts in the South and the West, I might add. A decade ago, just four States reported a majority of their schoolchildren eligible for free and reduced school lunches.

While I and many of my colleagues remain hopeful that the House will extend these vital supports, we are disheartened to see that the very first legislative action scheduled by the House majority in this new year is a return to the cynical attack on the Affordable Care Act. Ironically, just this week, the actuaries for Medicare and Medicaid released a report showing that in the 4 years since the adoption of the Affordable Care Act, for the first time ever, national health care expenditures have grown at the slowest rate since the government began collecting that data 50 years ago. The growth for insurance premiums in particular has slowed more than 60 percent, which equates to real savings for real workers, real families, and for our government.

I want to work with my Republican colleagues to ensure proper oversight and accountability for the Affordable Care Act, but let's hang up this tired routine of trying to chip away or outright repeal these essential benefits and protections for families.

One of our Republican colleagues was quoted in the paper this week as saying, ''A lot of Republicans think the big, bipartisan deal was the budget agreement'' last year. Working together in a bipartisan fashion is not a limited exercise. It is what our citizens expect of us each and every day.

IT IS TIME TO RAISE THE WAGE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and friends, it is no coincidence that President Johnson declared a war on poverty within 6 months after Dr. King gave his ''I Have a Dream'' speech on the Mall in Washington. Whether by accident or whether by design, Dr. King and President Johnson worked in tandem with each other. They had something in common: they were both intelligent in their own right.

But intelligence without courage can be intelligence wasted. They both understood the politics of their time, but understanding the politics of your time without courage can be an understanding wasted. It was courage that made the difference in the lives of people for decades after they each did what they had to do. I thank God that Dr. King and President Johnson acted in tandem and that they both had courage.

The marchers on Washington had 10 demands. Number 8 on that list of 10 demands was a demand to raise the wage to an amount that people could make a living off of, $2 an hour. That $2 an hour, adjusted for inflation today, would be $13.39, more than $13 an hour. Mr. Speaker and friends, it is time to raise the wage.

A UC Berkeley Labor Center report in 2013 connoted, denoted, and showed that families working in the fast food industry are subsidized to the tune of about $7 billion. It is time to raise the wage. That same report showed that 63 percent of all families receiving subsidies had a working member. It is time to raise the wage.

Corporate welfare, corporations paying poverty wages, are indirectly subsidized with tax dollars when tax dollars provide food stamps, SNAP, Medicaid, and other assistance to workers. Indirect corporate subsidies will diminish and tax dollars will be saved when we raise the wage.

Do you like trickle-down economics? If so, you ought to want to raise the wage because by raising the wage, we can assure that the earned trickle will get down to the worker that has earned it. It is time to raise the wage.

Do you think people should pull themselves up by their bootstraps? Then raise the wage, and people will be able to pull themselves up out of poverty with their economic bootstraps.

Can we afford to raise the wage? Mr. Speaker and friends, yes, we can. On February 13, 2013, The Washington Post reported that the United States has one of the lowest minimum wages among developed countries, even though we are among the richest countries in the world. One out of every 60 persons is a millionaire. One out of every 11 households is worth $1 million. According to the AFL–CIO, CEO pay has gone from $42 for every $1 a worker made in 1982 to $354 for every dollar a worker made in 2012. It is time to raise the wage.

□ 1100

According to Forbes, the top 25 CEOs of hedge funds—the top 25 earners at hedge funds—earn more than all 500 of the top CEOs in the Fortune 500 combined. It is time to raise the wage.

In 2007, one CEO made $3 billion; $3 billion is $400 a second. It would take a minimum-wage worker working full-time 198,000 years. Some things bear repeating: it would take a minimum-wage worker 198,000 years to make what that CEO made in 1 year. It is time to raise the wage.

If we can pay CEOs $400 a second, we can raise the wage. If we can pay corporate CEOs 354 times what workers are making, we can raise the wage to $13 an hour.

HONORING ANDREW JACOBS, JR., UNITED STATES MARINE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a fellow Hoosier, fellow marine and fellow patriot died on December 28 in his 81st year. I didn't know Andrew Jacobs, Jr., a gentleman who for 30 years represented the Indianapolis area in the House of Representatives with great distinction. But I am familiar with the qualities of a decent, honorable public servant; and Andy Jacobs deserves to be remembered, honored, and even emulated by those of us who now serve in this body or bother to keep watch on its proceedings.

He was born February 24, 1932, in Indianapolis. After high school, Jacobs joined the United States Marine Corps. He was a plucky marine. His country called him to serve in the Korean war. He responded to the call of duty, fought bravely, and was wounded in action.

When Jacobs returned home to Indiana, he enrolled in Indiana University, graduating in 1955, and 3 years later he graduated from IU's law school.

Jacobs had a passion for public service. So after completing his studies in 1958, the marine kept fighting—fighting for a better America first as a sheriff's deputy, then as a lawyer, then as a State legislator, and then, beginning in 1965, as a Member of Congress.

In Congress, Andy Jacobs was a member of the House Ways and Means Committee where he fought to balance the Federal budget and simplify the Tax Code. He also fought, in the memorable words of journalist Colman McCarthy, to ''oppose wars that he believed couldn't be won, explained or afforded.''

Jacobs is survived by countless admirers, a beloved wife of 25 years, two sons and two sisters. May each of us honor this fallen marine's memory—and his constancy of purpose—by picking up his rifle and doing our part to fight for a better America.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue with our 50 floor speeches marking the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty.

Now, yesterday, we were joined by President Lyndon Baines Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson's eldest daughter, Lynda Johnson Robb, to mark the 50th anniversary of her father's State of the Union speech in which he declared an unconditional war on poverty. She reminded us that this was a bipartisan and bicameral effort led by the White House.

Now, I have shared my own story, reluctantly, in the past of the time in my

life when I depended on our vital social safety net programs during some very difficult times; but my testimony is only one of millions of other Americans. Many of you may be familiar with the Campaign to Cut Poverty in Half in Ten Years, a project of the Center for American Progress, the Coalition on Human Needs, and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. Now, they are doing phenomenal work gathering American stories of those who are living in poverty and have been lifted out of poverty, including our own Congressman POCAN's constituent, Amy Treptow's story.

Amy is here today, and I look forward to hearing Congressman POCAN read her story later on this House floor. Her story, though, is a true representation of the legacy of the war on poverty and the promise of the American Dream fulfilled. Her story is not unlike one of my constituents in Oakland who visited my office here in D.C. last month. After becoming a single mother, Jennifer was forced to stop attending her college courses and take a job making minimum wage as a caregiver. She relied on CalWIC and food stamps to feed her daughters, and her family and friends supported her with her housing and other basic needs.

Today, two of her daughters are graduates of the Head Start program, which prepared them to start elementary school where they are currently doing very well. And Jennifer was able to finish school and is now working to advocate on behalf of other families like hers who had to turn to the American people in her time of need. Also, I am reminded that one of my former district directors was a graduate of the Head Start program. He is doing phenomenal work raising a family and living the American Dream.

These are stories of resilience. They are the stories of millions of Americans who are facing homelessness, hunger and unemployment, if it weren't for a safety net. In my home State of California, 6.3 million people—17 percent—lived in poverty in 2012. And in my district in Oakland, California, 18 percent of the residents live below the Federal poverty level, including one in four children.

While the richest segments of our population continue to prosper nationally, income inequality traps millions of the working poor in poverty. Many low-wage workers must rely on food stamps and Medicaid just to survive—which our colleague Congressman AL GREEN just brilliantly laid out—just to survive while CEOs are making megabillions with government subsidies.

As a recent study by the National Poverty Center at the University of Michigan showed, in any given month, 1.7 million households live on a cash income of less than $2 per day. Now that is comparable to many living in the developing world. Yes, $2. I said $2 per day. Now, that is here in America, the richest Nation on this Earth.

In an economy that, despite recent gains, there are three unemployed for every one job opening, it is really a shame and a disgrace that 1.3 million people lost their lifeline as Republicans continue to refuse to extend emergency unemployment compensation. Now, these individuals' checks should arrive or should have arrived this week. Unfortunately, they did not. What in the world are people going to do now? This is heartless, it is mean-spirited, and, of course, to add insult to injury, many of these people lost about $35 in food stamp benefits last November.

Yes, the economy has gotten better for some, but has left millions behind. Fifty years ago, the safety net was put in place just for times such as these. That is why it is so important to share stories like Jennifer's and like Amy's. Vital social safety net programs are still needed. We need to stop this war on the poor. We should have a cease-fire on the war on the poor. We have a moral and we have an economic obligation to make investments in economic opportunity and jobs.

NAFTA AT 20

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 20th anniversary of NAFTA's going into effect. The North American Free Trade Agreement was a hard-fought fight here in this Congress with a very close vote. In 1994, when it narrowly passed under a rule not allowing amendment, called Fast Track, America was promised that NAFTA would be a great jobs boon for our country and our economy. Exactly the reverse has happened.

The NAFTA promises made have all been broken. First, on jobs: the administration at the time promised that NAFTA would initially create 200,000 new jobs. In reality, America has now lost, after 20 years, about 1 million jobs related to NAFTA's impact, and the old sucking sound actually happened. Our jobs were off-shored, sucked away. More than 680,000 American jobs have gone to Mexico alone. Yes, that great sucking sound continues to happen.

About 60 percent of the jobs lost, of the million jobs lost overall, were lost to Mexico in the manufacturing sector. These were middle class jobs that came from places like Cleveland, Toledo, Pittsburgh, Chicago and Buffalo, and the list goes on. They were good paying jobs in our country that had provided living wages, medical benefits, and employer contributions to retirement programs.

America was also promised that NAFTA would fuel dynamic trade in tearing down trade barriers and creating trade surpluses for our country which means that we actually would export more than we imported with jobs created as a result. Well, guess what, the trade barriers that NAFTA was supposed to tear down have actually created massive trade deficits—red ink—for our country.

If one looks back at the passage of NAFTA, prior to its passage, America actually had a trade surplus with Mexico. That is more U.S. exports out that Mexico imports in. But then with NAFTA's passage, we began to start really going deep into the hole of jobs being off-shored. And then with other trade agreements like free trade with communist China—which isn't free by any measure—we see that America's trade deficits have accumulated annually to historic levels never experienced by this society before.

The cost of this has been huge. Since NAFTA took effect, the annual U.S. trade deficit has increased by 5 times, a 500 percent increase from $98 billion in the red to $534 billion in the red. Each billion dollars of trade deficit accounts for anywhere between 5,000 and 10,000 lost jobs depending if it is in the retail sector or the industrial sector. Our cumulative trade deficit over the 20 years due to NAFTA—get ready for this—is $1.5 trillion. If you want to understand why America has a job deficit and a budget deficit at the Federal level, it is because we have off-shored so many jobs through these trade agreements that are passed under the Fast Track procedure.

The year before NAFTA took effect, America actually had a $1.6 trillion trade surplus with Mexico; but every year after NAFTA took effect in 1995, that trade surplus with Mexico was turned into a $15.8 billion trade deficit in the first year. And every single year, it has simply gotten worse. By 2012, our trade deficit with Mexico ballooned to $61.6 billion. So every year, the hole got deeper. What a failure NAFTA is on the jobs front and on the trade front.

Finally, supporters of NAFTA claimed that NAFTA would open markets for American exports to Mexico. I will tell you one thing Ohio saw. Ohio saw pork production that used to happen in Ohio platformed down near Mexico City where environmental regulations, if they exist at all, are certainly not enforced. And we look at companies like Mr. Coffee that were sucked out of Cleveland and moved to Mexico. We saw suppliers in the automotive industry being relocated from our country to Mexico and Canada with U.S. middle class jobs just vaporized one factory, one farm at a time. It is as though the lights are being shut out from coast to coast in neighborhood after neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 191, the NAFTA Accountability Act, basically says that these trade agreements have to work in America's interest, starting with NAFTA; and where these agreements have failed, adjustments must occur in order to stem the off-shoring of any jobs so we can begin re-creating middle class jobs in this country again. The NAFTA trade model must be replaced, fast track must be sidetracked, and jobs in America must be created again to rebuild our middle class.

□ 1115

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this week, in this very Chamber, President Lyndon Johnson declared an ''unconditional war on poverty.'' The mission the President outlined was grand, but his goal for each and every American was modest:

> Help them fulfill their basic hopes—their hopes for a fair chance to make good; their hopes for fair play under the law; their hopes for a full-time job on full-time pay; their hopes for a decent home for their family in a descent community; their hopes for a good school for their children with good teachers; and their hopes for security when faced with sickness or unemployment or old age.

Fifty years later, the results speak for themselves:

The number of children living in poverty has dropped by 10 percent; the number of seniors living in poverty has plummeted by 32 percent; tens of millions of Americans have health insurance because of Medicare and Medicaid; the percentage of adults completing high school has skyrocketed from 56 percent to 88 percent; the share of women in the workforce has increased from 42 percent to 64 percent; and each and every single day, millions of school children go to school with full stomachs because of nutrition assistance.

We have much as a Nation we can be proud of; and the best way, the very best way we can celebrate and honor that progress is to rededicate ourselves to the challenges remaining. Because the truth of the matter is there are still too many Americans out of work, and there are still too many Americans working in jobs that don't pay enough to raise a family, and there are still too many Americans working harder for less.

I don't pretend that there are easy solutions to these problems. There is no cure-all, there is no silver bullet Congress can fire, but we simply cannot stand down; and we cannot, as President Johnson warned, ''fritter and fumble away our opportunity in needless, senseless quarrels between Democrats and Republicans.''

Sound familiar?

So, Mr. Speaker, on this 50th anniversary of the start of the war on poverty, it comes down to one simple question we should have the courage to ask ourselves: Are we doing everything we reasonably can to strengthen the middle class and help those working to get into it? Let me repeat that. Are we doing everything we reasonably can to strengthen the middle class and help those working to get into it? And I think we should also have the courage to answer that question honestly, and I think we all know the answer. It is ''no.'' But we also all know that we can. That is the question of our time.

The question of the day is whether or not we are going to help in this way by extending unemployment compensation benefits. The business case for this is exceedingly strong. The fact of the matter is that there are three people looking for work for every job available. The fact of the matter is that long-term unemployment is nearly twice as high as it was at each of the times that we ended emergency unemployment compensation over the last couple of decades. The business case for this is very strong, for those 1.3 million people already affected and the 2.6 million or so or more that will be affected in this calendar year. The business case is very strong.

There are those, of course, who will suggest that there are those who abuse unemployment compensation. I am not going to quibble about that, but I am going to reject the principle that Americans don't want to work, don't need to work, and that we are not hardwired to work, and I can prove it to you. I can absolutely prove it to you. Stop right now and ask yourself, what is the first thing you ask someone when you meet them?

''What do you do?''

We define ourselves by our work. It gives us pride. It helps us support our family. It makes our communities and neighborhoods stronger. Americans want to work. And when they cannot, we ought to be there to help them. We can, and we should.

MARKING 50 YEARS OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Johnson declared in this Chamber the war on poverty, and this is one war that we must continue to wage.

I want to thank my neighbor in Alameda County who represents Oakland and San Leandro and Alameda and Berkeley, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who is Congress' greatest champion today to continue fighting President Johnson's war on poverty, and I am grateful to have a mentor in Congresswoman LEE who has guided and helped me as I have worked to do my part.

Since President Johnson's declaration, we have made real progress. Using an accurate measurement of who is poor in America shows we have cut the rate from 25.8 percent in 1967 to 16 percent in 2012, reducing by millions the number of Americans who are poor. Unfortunately, this war is not yet won. Almost 50 million Americans still live in poverty, including over 13 million children. In such an abundant society as ours, there is only one word to describe these stark facts, ''unconscionable,'' and we can do better.

This Congress should make it a priority to help the poor, the economically downtrodden, and the jobless. Their path to economic opportunity still remains dim. But this Congress, the people in this House, can be their light. If we are going to win the war on poverty, there are many battles today that we must win:

First, we should start by extending unemployment insurance now and not putting 1.3 million Americans out in the cold;

Second, we need to raise our minimum wage so those working hard and trying to earn a living can actually do so;

Third, we must fight harsh cuts to SNAP and Head Start to make sure everyone has equal opportunity.

These are just a few of the small battles that we must win right now in the larger war on poverty.

This is no time to turn back or to retreat. This is a time for a surge in our war against poverty. Millions of Americans, including children, are counting on us, and we must ask ourselves a few questions:

Has this war been won?

Has poverty been eradicated across America?

And is our middle class built out?

If the answer to any of these questions is ''no,'' then we know what we must continue to do. We must fight on, and we must keep fighting until we win the war on poverty.

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 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

At the beginning of this new day, we are grateful as individuals and as a Nation for the blessings we have been given.

We ask Your blessing upon the Members of this people's House. May they anticipate the opportunities and difficulties that are before them, and before so many Americans, with steadfast determination to work together toward solutions that will benefit their countrymen.

Grant that they be worthy of the responsibilities they have been given by their constituents and truly the people You have called them to be.

May the walls of disagreement that have divided this assembly be put aside and replaced with a spirit of respect

and dignity. And may Your spirit, O God, be in all of our hearts and minds and encourage us to do the works of peace and justice, now and always.

May all that we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FORBES 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.

MILITARY COMMISSARIES

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to media reports that have suggested the closure of military commissaries in the United States and that that may be under consideration by the Department of Defense.

Our national defense, and the men and women who volunteer to serve, are not the cause of our current financial fiscal crisis. Proposals that ask them to carry the weight of solving it are unacceptable.

Commissaries are a vital recruitment and retention tool essential to maintaining the all-volunteer force. President Obama recognized this fact earlier this year when he visited Camp Pendleton during a furlough day and said commissary closures are ''not how a great Nation should be treating its military and military families.''

Each year, commissaries provide an average 31 percent savings for military families. Additionally, by allowing the Defense Commissary Agency, based out of Fort Lee, Virginia, to purchase products at higher volumes, the 178 commissaries in the United States bring down costs across all our commissaries.

I urge my colleagues to oppose any effort to close our commissaries, a system that is highly valued by our servicemembers and part of the commitment we make to take care of them during and after their time volunteering in service to our Nation.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the San Joaquin Valley of California, I know our economic recovery has been uneven at best. Unemployment remains unacceptably high in areas like my district.

Those on unemployment are not socking taxpayer dollars away for a rainy day. Today already is their rainy day. Their benefits go back into our economy immediately for basic needs, like food and rent, while they look for work.

After 27 years at an insurance company, Jacqueline of Atwater, California, was let go last May. Since then the 53-year-old has struggled to find work.

Another constituent of mine, Luis in Fresno, lost his unemployment insurance at the end of December. This father wrote:

> If I don't find a job in the next couple of weeks, then I will not be able to pay my rent or pay for food for my family.

With all the talk about restoring certainty to our economy, we cannot forget that American families drive this economy.

Now is not the time to take money out of their pockets as they are also struggling to recover. Let's restore unemployment with a bipartisan effort.

TODAY'S ECONOMY

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, while home for Christmas, I reflected on the economic challenges America faces and the parallels today's economy has with the one Ronald Reagan inherited from Jimmy Carter in 1981. Both were characterized by high unemployment and low labor-force participation.

I will paraphrase some of what President Reagan said in first Inaugural address:

> Idle industries have cast workers into unemployment, causing human misery and personal indignity. Those who do work are denied a fair return for their labor by a tax system which penalizes successful achievement and keeps us from maintaining full productivity.
>
> For decades, we have piled deficit upon deficit, mortgaging our future and our children's future for the temporary convenience of present.

By the end of Ronald Reagan's Presidency, America's unemployment rate was 5.4 percent and our economy was the envy of the world. It is time we learn from history. As President Reagan said, Government is the problem. Individuals, free from the heavy hand of Big Government to pursue their dreams, they create prosperity. It is time we revisit the simple, sacred truth.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday was the first time in months that 1.3 million out-of-work Americans went to their mailboxes and did not find an unemployment check.

People like Kaitlyn Smith from my State of California, a Marine Corps vet and mother of two young children, she said that she had been searching for work for months but has not had success. California is starting to recover, but it still has 400,000 fewer jobs than it did before the downturn. It is especially hard to find jobs in the high desert where she lives; but the family can't move because her husband, a veteran of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, must remain near the combat center until he is discharged from the Marines in July.

The loss of her benefits will cut even more deeply into the couple's income. Kaitlyn says the family is already skimping on basics, including heat. She says:

> I have to keep the house at 55 degrees, even though I have two little girls, ages 2½ and 1½.

For Kaitlyn and others like her, we must extend unemployment benefits, and we must extend them now.

VISIT TO CHARLIE NORWOOD VAMC

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this week I went to Augusta, Georgia, to participate in an oversight hearing with Chairman JEFF MILLER of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This visit was the result of multiple deaths and delays in care reported in the Augusta veterans hospital. We must find out what exactly went wrong.

As both a U.S. Marine and a current medical doctor in the Navy Reserves, I take reports of poor care for our veterans very seriously. I questioned hospital staff on how, when, and why these lapses in care occurred, and who is ultimately responsible.

While it appears that under new leadership the hospital is heading in a positive direction, this is just the beginning of a full investigation. We have made promises to our veterans. It is vital that we fulfill these promises.

I have pledged to work to hold those responsible and the VA accountable. I am fully committed to making sure that our veterans receive world-class health care in Augusta, as well as VA hospitals all across the country.

FULL FUNDING FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Bridge, located along the northern border of my western New York district, facilitates the transport of over $30 billion in commerce annually. However, increasing wait times and delays pose a significant threat to our Nation's economy.

While I am encouraged by the start of the preinspection pilot at the Peace Bridge for commercial vehicles, which would allow trucks entering the United States to be prescreened on the Canadian side of the border, I am concerned about staffing levels with Customs agents at the border.

I have called on Customs and Border Protection to increase staffing levels at the bridge to facilitate easier accessibility at northern border crossings and also encouraged the FY 2014 Homeland Security appropriations budget to include full funding for Customs and Border Protection officer staffing requests.

The streamlined flow of people and goods across the border is critical to the western New York economy and to the Nation's economy. I am committed to fighting to preserve and improve our relationship with Canada and our economic relationship.

OBAMACARE SECURITY

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate enough that ObamaCare has increased the cost of health care for families across the country. On top of the skyrocketing premiums, limited choices for doctors and coverage, and regulatory burdens on small business, it is worrisome that people's personal information is now being subjected to potential fraud in the ObamaCare exchanges.

The security problems with healthcare.gov go far beyond error messages and connection issues. In many cases, the people in charge of collecting and processing our most sensitive information haven't been fully trained or vetted; and although the administration knew the Web site hadn't been properly tested, they launched it anyway, leaving the American people vulnerable.

That is why I introduced H.R. 3652, the No Identity Theft in Health Care Act, which would increase penalties for those who abuse their access to personal information that Americans are forced to submit when signing up for ObamaCare to commit identity theft. I also look forward to supporting the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act later this week.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that people's personal information is at risk. The administration needs to address this.

REPEAL OF CUT TO COLA FOR MILITARY RETIREES UNDER 62

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, I introduced H.R. 3804, legislation to repeal an ill-conceived provision of the budget bill that reduced the cost-of-living adjustment for military retirees.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I believe our servicemembers, veterans, and their families must receive the benefits they have so honorably earned and deserve. These benefits are owed to them without equivocation.

We should not balance the budget on the backs of military retirees who served our country so bravely for decades. They should not be punished because of Congress' failure to get our fiscal house in order. That is why I urge Speaker BOEHNER to allow a vote today on my bill, H.R. 3804, and repeal this egregious provision.

Clearly, there is substantial bipartisan support to correct this. Let's vote on H.R. 3804 for our military retirees today.

OBAMACARE'S SECURITY RISKS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last October, a constituent living in Columbia received a frightening phone call from a gentleman in North Carolina. It appeared the constituent's security information was obtained by a stranger while enrolling for health insurance under the government health care Web site.

The American people should not have to worry about personal information being compromised due to the government's inability to keep a Web site secure. Had the gentleman from North Carolina not contacted this South Carolinian, he may have never realized his information was being breached.

ObamaCare is flawed and must be repealed. Because the President and Senate refuse to join us in these efforts, the House continues to act. Tomorrow, the House will vote on a bill that requires Health and Human Services to notify individuals when their personal information is stolen or unlawfully accessed.

We must continue to work to repeal ObamaCare by replacing it with a plan to preserve the doctor-patient relationship, as long proposed by Congressman TOM PRICE.

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

□ 1215

CLIMATE CHANGE DENIERS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to recognize the devastating consequences of air pollution, which is causing, or at least contributing to greatly, the drastic changes in the Earth's climate.

Last year we experienced severe record-setting weather across the country, yet Republicans and climate deniers argue that no single weather event can be proven to have been caused by climate change. Paradoxically, climate deniers are now using the extreme cold snap as evidence to support their cause, which is to do away with all laws and regulations that protect our precious air quality.

The maddening denial of the link between air quality and climate change is reckless, and it is a denial of scientific fact. Our posterity deserves more. We know, and 95 percent of scientists agree, that climate change leads to more severe weather overall, and the evidence is overwhelming.

Now is the time for a real debate on climate change before another devastating year of extreme weather that takes lives, destroys communities, and wreaks havoc on our society and our economy.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of January 2014 being National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

Human trafficking victims suffer repeatedly with no apparent way out. An estimated between 100,000 and 300,000 children each year become victims in America of this abhorrent practice.

Many runaway children become victims of human trafficking within 48 hours of leaving home, and it is crucial that we, as Americans, are aware of our surroundings and immediately contact authorities when we see anything suspicious around children. Traffickers can be found at airports, parking lots, schools, malls, and other places where they search for young victims.

Two years ago, I authored a bill which this House passed, the Senate passed, and the President signed at the end of 2012 eliminating trafficking on our military bases around the world and our State Department facilities around the world.

We, as Americans, believe every person has value. Every person has rights that are given to them by their creator. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage every American, if they come into contact with someone that they suspect is a victim of human trafficking, to contact the National Human Trafficking

Hotline at 888–373–7888. Let's help our fellow Americans.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans this week felt as though they were living on the North Pole. There was a condition called ''the polar vortex'' that became part of our common vernacular. Normal routines were disrupted. Schools closed, water mains ruptured, car batteries failed, and, tragically, weather-related deaths went up. So it didn't take long for conservative commentators to offer this cold weather phenomenon as proof that the planet isn't warming, that this is all a hoax or some left-wing liberal ideology.

But the fact is that scientists have told us that the real and measurable decline of Arctic sea ice that is the direct result of warmer weather and climate change is creating this polar vortex that allows weather conditions that normally remain fixed over the Arctic to spin out of control. They slip south and they subject us to Arctic-like weather conditions.

Now, this is a fact that we need to recognize and do something about or weather conditions are going to become far more common and far more severe.

ONE OF THE BEST BCS CHAMPIONSHIP GAMES EVER

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the college football season culminated in one of the best BCS Championship games ever played when the Auburn Tigers took on the FSU Seminoles.

Even though I am a resident of Florida, I am a graduate of Auburn and was, of course, rooting for my Tigers.

I want to commend Auburn's coach, Gus Malzahn, for taking Auburn from worst to first in the SEC and leading his team to play for the national championship game. His efforts were nothing short of incredible. He made believers not only of his players, but also believers out of all of us. He showed us that persistence, discipline, self-confidence, and faith in God will lead to success, both individually and as a team.

I also want to congratulate my friend, Coach Jimbo Fisher of Florida State. Coach Fisher is not only a great coach, but he obviously married well because his wife, Candi, is also an Auburn alumnus.

While my heart is always in Auburn, my hat goes off to the Florida State Seminoles for a well-earned victory. Congratulations.

War Eagle.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate a milestone in our Nation's history. Fifty years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson stood before Congress and declared an unconditional war on poverty.

As we reflect on this war, I am inspired by the progress we have made in 50 years. We have expanded economic opportunity, and we have made the American Dream a reality for millions. But this is not enough. Recent events, like allowing unemployment insurance to expire, remind us that the war is not over.

Even though our economy is recovering from a recession, 10.9 million Americans are still struggling to find work. Meanwhile, 16 million children live in poverty. And now the 1.3 million Americans who lost unemployment insurance have no means to provide for their family while they look for work.

This cannot continue. No child should go to bed hungry, and no family should struggle to keep a roof over their heads.

Fifty years ago we started a war, and yes, we have won many battles. But it is time to win the war, and we must start by making sure that Americans can continue to meet basic needs as they pursue their dreams. So I urge my colleagues to stand with me and extend unemployment insurance.

THE PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight yet another of the unintended consequences of the Democratic health care law.

Because of the employer mandate in ObamaCare, our volunteer fire departments and emergency response organizations are at risk of having their volunteers be considered employees and are, therefore, being forced to choose between retaining those volunteers and using their precious resources to comply with this mandate or cutting those volunteers and the vital services they provide to our communities.

As I have heard from people in my district, Cattaraugus County Office of Emergency Services, the impact would be absolutely detrimental to critical services in rural areas like Cattaraugus County.

I ask Congress to fix this unfair burden on our emergency volunteers and support H.R. 3685, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act, introduced by my good friend, Representative LOU BARLETTA.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT COMPANY

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the 90th anniversary of the Sikorsky Aircraft Company, one of the lynchpins of our State's advanced industrial base, a pillar of our national defense, and the world's premiere helicopter manufacturer.

Ninety years ago, Russian-born inventor Igor Sikorsky opened the Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corporation for business on Long Island. Since then, the history of this pioneering company has been a string of firsts.

Sikorsky built the first practical helicopter, the VS–300, in 1939. Five years later, a Sikorsky vehicle performed the first helicopter combat rescue in history, saving soldiers in Burma during World War II. In 1945, a Sikorsky helicopter took part in the first-ever civilian helicopter rescue, rescuing survivors from a sinking vessel in Long Island Sound. And in 1957, Dwight Eisenhower took the first Presidential ride in Sikorsky-made Marine One, long one of the defining symbols of the American Executive.

Today, in my State of Connecticut, Sikorsky continues to build the best helicopters in the world, including the Black Hawks so critical to our national security, and to move the technology of rotor-powered aircraft forward.

To UTC leadership and the almost 16,000 hardworking men and women of Sikorsky, congratulations on this anniversary, and here's to many more.

WE CAN'T WAIT ANY LONGER

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this country has 10.9 million people out of work, many of whom have been out of work for over 6 months. We can't wait any longer. Families want to work. They want a job that will allow them to put food on the table, take family vacations, and save for their children's education. And $300 a week just won't cut it.

As we speak, the President has a permit on his desk, one that has been ready to sign for almost his entire tenure in office. The Keystone XL pipeline is a rare project supported by labor, business, and the hardworking taxpayers of this country, and one that has been studied and dissected more than most.

This project is ready to go, and, with the stroke of a pen, Mr. President, you can create 40,000 good-paying, stable jobs across this country that American families want and deserve. All they need is your signature.

Let's finally create the jobs that politicians love to talk about. Get families back to work, where they want to be, and off unemployment.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, as of the new year, 1.3 million Americans, including 17,600 Nevadans, are without a critical economic lifeline—the emergency unemployment insurance that has helped men and women stay out of poverty and keep their families afloat as they look for a job.

By allowing this program to expire, those already struggling to make ends meet are now facing even greater hardship as they are left to wonder how to put food on the table, keep a roof over their families' heads, or put gas in the car.

Denying this vital lifeline is not only morally indefensible, it is also economically shortsighted. Unemployment insurance benefits not only help the individual and their families who receive them, but they also boost our economy. Failing to renew this program will weaken economic growth and cost our country 240,000 jobs, including almost 3,000 in Nevada.

So, for the thousands of Nevadans who lost emergency unemployment insurance at the beginning of the year and the 842 more who stand to lose their benefits at the end of this week, inaction is unacceptable. I urge Speaker BOEHNER to bring this to the floor and vote in favor.

TAKE ACTION ON EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to urge the Republican leaders to allow a vote on extending unemployment insurance benefits to the thousands of workers in my central New York district and the 1.3 million workers across the country who have lost these benefits.

Because Congress has failed to act, hundreds of thousands of families are not having a happy new year. This important relief provides a lifeline to people who worked hard, they played by the rules, and they are out of work through no fault of their own. By providing this vital but temporary assistance to unemployed workers, this program ensures workers and their families are able to make ends meet during their job searches.

Extending unemployment insurance should not be a partisan issue. In fact, this program was signed into law by President George W. Bush and has been reauthorized several times by members of both political parties during the time of economic recovery. If there are reforms needed to help get people back to work, then let's make those reforms, but don't toss out the whole program.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is still recovering and thousands of hardworking central New Yorkers are still struggling to find a job. Failure to extend unemployment insurance hurts the economy across central New York and across this country. The Senate has already taken bipartisan action on extending unemployment insurance. It is time for the House to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand why we don't just have a vote. It would help the economy, and it would help our families.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXPIRATION

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many people, a new year marks a time of hope and optimism. But millions of Americans are, instead, beginning this year with fear and worry. They are wondering how they are going to make ends meet, pay their rent, or put food on the table. That is because they woke up just a few days after Christmas to find that their emergency unemployment assistance had been terminated, cutting them off from a needed lifeline.

Now, that is just about the cruelest thing I can think of happening. It is mean. It is unnecessary. It is kicking people who are already down. It is just plain shameful. It is shameful. And it is not the kind of America I believe in.

Shouldn't we be embracing policies like unemployment insurance that keep families afloat? Shouldn't we be looking at our communities, our neighbors, and saying, yes, America will be there for you in your time of need?

Yes, we should say that.

To every one of my colleagues, I say join us in doing the right thing and restoring these needed benefits today. We need to do the right thing and not the wrong thing, and we need to do that now.

□ 1230

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
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 January 9, 2014 at 9:42 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 667.

That the Senate passed S. 1171.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2279, REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3362, EXCHANGE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3811, HEALTH EXCHANGE SECURITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 455

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final

passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3362) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3811) to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 455 provides for the consideration of three important bills which were reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee: H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013; H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act; and H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014.

H.R. 2279 is a bill to address the burdensome and outdated deadlines for certain rulemaking activities conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. This provides flexibility for the Environmental Protection Agency in order to streamline a process critical to cleaning up sites contaminated with certain toxic or hazardous chemicals.

It further requires the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate existing State or other Federal financial insurance requirements to determine whether additional requirements are, in fact, necessary.

Finally, it requires the owner or operator of a chemical storage site to report the presence of such chemicals to the State emergency response commissions.

It is a commonsense piece of legislation to help clean up areas that have been polluted and allows for their reclamation or development. This could bring jobs and economic benefits to neighborhoods which have been so affected.

As the two health care-related pieces of legislation, these are targeted bills to address just a few of the massive problems the American public has witnessed over the last few months pertaining to the calamitous rollout of the Federal www.healthcare.gov Web site. The data obtained by www.healthcare.gov is one of the largest collections of personal information ever assembled. It links information between seven different Federal agencies, State agencies, and government contractors.

In promising lower costs and widespread health coverage for Americans, President Obama failed to mention that the Affordable Care Act's mandates and requirements will create large-scale disruption of the entire health insurance market. The resulting cancelation of insurance plans and high cost for employers to continue providing insurance for their workers has left millions of Americans with no choice other than to purchase health insurance through the Affordable Care Act's exchanges, subjecting their personal information to the vulnerable security infrastructure.

The initial launch of www.healthcare.gov on October 1, 2013, was plagued with glitches and errors. Not only did the administration fail to establish basic functionality of the Web site, but the initial problems really only break the surface of the deeper security threats in the underlying law. A multitude of gaps remain in the Web site's security infrastructure, making the Web site a wide-open target for hackers and identity thieves. These flaws continue to pose a threat to the security of Americans' personal data.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that the administration was not alerted to these security concerns on the Web site prior to the launch. MITRE Corporation, a contractor for the Department of Health and Human Services, alerted the agency that 19 unaddressed security vulnerabilities plagued the Web site prior to its launch on October 1. Top officials at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, including the chief information security officer, Teresa Fryer, along with the Web site's project manager, Tony Trenkle, both refused to sign the Authority to Operate license that was necessary to actually launch www.healthcare.gov. Despite these known issues, the director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Marilyn Tavenner, continued to launch the Web site.

This is much more than a faulty Web site. This is about the American people, who cannot trust their government to certify that their personal information will be safe on a government-run Web site.

The security threat goes beyond just an individual's primary application. Once an individual's personal information is entered into the system, the exchange has the ability to access information within the Department of Homeland Security, the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security, and the Treasury Department. The administration has opened numerous Federal agencies to data breaches and unauthorized access.

Just before the holidays, the entire Nation saw firsthand what a massive security breach looks like. Over 40 million Target customers, their personal data was compromised by computer hackers who pilfered personal financial information and identification.

Target has gone out of their way to alert customers of the security breach. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has no such obligation under the law. This is a point that I don't think most people are aware of. It is not required. It is not a mandate that you have a Target charge card or that you shop at Target, but it is certainly required and a mandate that you buy your insurance through www.healthcare.gov. This is a coercive Federal policy that now is pulling people into its Web site and refuses to provide them the very same protection that we demand that the private sector do for a voluntary purchase.

Instead of following the same requirements placed on the private sector, the Federal Government has gone out of their way to avoid imposing this basic due diligence in their own exchanges. Even when a notification requirement was specifically requested during the rulemaking process on the exchanges, the administration just simply refused.

In the March 27, 2012, Federal Register, Department of Health and Human Services responded, stating:

> We do not plan to include the specific notification procedures in the final rule. Consistent with this approach, we did not include specific policies for investigation of data breaches in this final rule.

Furthermore, State laws required that many of the 14 State-run insurance exchanges, that they do disclose such information. No such law exists for the federally run exchange. Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that 36

States rely upon the federally run exchange.

Look, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, taxpayer dollars. The American people deserve to know that their personal information is protected and to be notified if that protection lapses.

Let's be honest: www.healthcare.gov is the most talked about Web site in years. The massive amounts of personal information that is collected through www.healthcare.gov and its ability to access multiple government databases creates the perfect environment for targeting by hackers.

Over 16 attempts to hack into the system have already been reported, not to mention the many stories that have been reported in the press on the mishandling and sharing of individuals' data. Identity theft is a threat not only to an individual's credit rating and personal finances but also to overall United States security. Most Americans would be shocked to learn that this level of protection is not already in place for an initiative the size of the Affordable Care Act. Well, today the House is working to correct this injustice, protecting Americans when the administration has refused to do so.

The Obama administration has consistently refused to disclose detailed data on how many Americans have actually completed the Obama Care enrollment process. Now it is more than 3 months after the launch of the exchanges, and we just simply do not know how many Americans are enrolled in the exchange plan.

It was the administration who initially defined the success of the exchange as the number of Americans who actually enroll in the program. The number of enrollments are the only way to evaluate whether the more than $1 trillion that was spent on this thing by the administration is actually working.

The President's commitment to an open and transparent government, repeated so many times during the passage of the Affordable Care Act, represents yet one more broken promise in a long string of broken promises.

□ 1245

Where this administration has failed, the bill before us will require the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to provide detailed weekly reports to the American people about the enrollment number on healthcare.gov. The American people deserve to know what they are getting for their hard-earned tax dollars that they have spent on the demands of this administration.

It is the American people who are suffering because of the mismanagement and failures of this administration. Today—today—we have the opportunity to provide transparency and protect Americans' personal information.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the majority and the minority for each of the bills contained in the rule. The minority is further afforded the customary motion to recommit on each piece of legislation.

I want to encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills and stand with the millions of Americans who are asking and who are demanding that we protect their privacy.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. BURGESS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today under which three bills are being brought to the floor: H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act; H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act; and H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. You wouldn't know by their names what those bills actually do. I discuss that, and, more importantly, I plan to discuss, Mr. Speaker, what these bills fail to accomplish.

These misguided and superfluous bills were brought under a very restrictive process. Two of them are being brought to the floor under a completely closed rule that blocks all efforts by Members to improve the legislation. Democrats yesterday on the Rules Committee proposed an open rule for these bills allowing Members from both sides of the aisle to offer their ideas to make them better, and it was voted down in the Rules Committee in a partisan vote.

Instead of moving forward and tackling challenges like extending unemployment, which has been talked about, or passing a jobs bill or an infrastructure bill or fixing our broken immigration system or reforming our tax system, again, we are discussing bills relating to the Affordable Care Act that don't seek to improve the act and make it work better for the American people but only add more paperwork and bureaucracy and cost to the health care system we already have by putting additional requirements on Federal workers and others that are working hard to ensure that ObamaCare works for America every day. Of the 112 legislative days we have left this year, we need to ensure that we spend them wisely, and I don't think that these three bills are a good way for us to use 2 days of our time.

The first bill, H.R. 3362, calls on HHS to publish weekly reports on consumer interactions with healthcare.gov, including the details of all calls received by the call center. Now, much of this information is already available monthly. There are already reliable updates on enrollment numbers and numerous updates on the Web sites and issues consumers have encountered. Look, while you are fixing the Web site and getting it working is not the time to put additional requirements on those that are laboring to ensure that Americans can sign up for affordable health care. Again, it is more information about who is calling and what they are doing weekly rather than monthly will provide an additional workload for those who are trying to make sure that the Web sites are functioning for America.

It will actually make it harder for the Web sites to function by having to divert some effort if this were to become law simply to building reporting requirements that were mandated by Congress. It is almost as if this bill was designed to make the Web site work worse, Mr. Speaker, by moving developers and others, without any additional resources, away from making the necessary improvements towards building entirely new reporting systems just so people can have information weekly instead of monthly.

It would be great, first of all, to have information weekly. I would love to have information daily. I would love to have information realtime. I used to run an Internet company. It would be wonderful to have that information. You have to weigh the costs and benefits and say, Is it worth building into this system realtime reporting? What are we forgoing by doing that? Is it worth it to say we want the information weekly instead of monthly?

Again, if you are building it from scratch and perhaps if the Republicans had offered this as an amendment into the original Affordable Care Act, maybe this could have been incorporated in 3 years ago and we could have built a system with either realtime or weekly reporting. But here where we are today, clearly the top priority needs to be that this Web site works well for the American people so they can get affordable health care for themselves and their family. That is what the American people want.

Now, let's talk about security and safeguards for consumer information. Again, you have the germ of a good idea. Of course, when the government has our personal information, we need to make sure that there are adequate safeguards. That goes for the IRS, it goes for military personnel files, and it goes for the Affordable Care Act, just as we want to make sure that when the private sector and companies have our personal information that they institute the proper safeguards. And there are examples of failure. Mr. BURGESS mentioned Target as a private-sector example of failure.

We certainly hope that we have the infrastructure and security in place to ensure that there is not a failure of security with regard to the Affordable Care Act. But when we are talking about identity theft and how to address it, we need to look at where the real problem is. What is the leading cause of identity theft? Is it the IRS? Is it the Affordable Care Act? Is it the military? No. One of the biggest causes of breaches of personal information is our

broken immigration system, the fact that many immigrants in our country are here with fake paperwork, fraudulent Social Security numbers they have purchased or stolen—and H.R. 15, the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform package, which in a very similar form has already passed the Senate, would address this.

So if we actually want to reduce identity theft and breaches of security and safeguard, Mr. Speaker, personal information for the American people, we should address the real problem rather than one of many hypothetical problems that, again, is no doubt worthy of discussion, but let's address where immigration—where identity theft actually occurs.

According to the Center for Immigration Studies, which has done a lot of work on identity theft from those who are here illegally, experts suggest that 75 percent of people who are here illegally and working use fraudulent Social Security cards to obtain employment. Again, Americans are the victims of this theft. Children are prime targets. Their report indicates that in Arizona it is estimated that there are thousands of children that are victims of identity theft. H.R. 15 contains mandatory E-Verify, which the Center for Immigration Studies says would curb and stop virtually 100 percent of child identity theft.

So, I mean, if we are serious, Mr. Speaker, about doing something about the fact that drivers licenses and Social Security numbers are being stolen, well, let's pass immigration reform. Let's make sure that people who are working in our country and have a role here have some kind of provisional work permit, some prospect of a pathway to citizenship over many years or decades, and that we have a mandatory E-Verify mechanism of checking, a way of verifying at the employer level that their paperwork is authentic and it is not, in fact, stolen from an innocent American, as it is today. So that would address identity theft. That would address fraud.

We have people today that actually, under our current laws, are incentivized to steal information—personal information—from American people. Our immigration system is clearly broken. We need to fix it. H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill, would create a mandatory employment eligibility verification program. Currently, only 7 percent of employers in our entire country are enrolled in E-Verify to do workplace authentication of those who work here.

So, let's bring this bill to the floor if that is the issue we want to address rather than discuss something that is hypothetically of concern. Yes, of course, we care about secure information in the Affordable Care healthcare.gov site. We care about it in military records, and we care about it in the IRS. But, meanwhile, there are hundreds of thousands of identities being stolen every day, and that is going to continue because this body refuses to bring H.R. 15 to the floor of the House, which would make that number almost zero.

Mr. Speaker, the final bill that this rule brings to the floor is H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act. It is really a package of three bills that would weaken hazardous waste laws like Superfund and the Resource Conservation Recovery Act. It would actually limit the EPA's oversight to ensure that the American people are safe and healthy.

Do we need to remind this body that the reason Congress enacted these safeguards and Superfund is because of tragedies like Love Canal where a residential neighborhood was built on top of 22,000 tons of hazardous waste, and due to the exposure, the residents suffered very high rates of miscarriages, cancers, and birth defects? The situation was so dire that the Federal Government wound up having to evacuate the entire community. That is not the America I want to live in, Mr. Speaker. I oppose H.R. 2279 because it could lead to more situations like Love Canal rather than making sure that the American people are safe and healthy in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not really about reporting requirements. It is about making healthcare.gov function less effectively. It is not really about breaches of our personal information. We can solve a big chunk of that by bringing H.R. 15 to the floor of the House. It is not really about improving our competitiveness by removing unnecessary EPA regulations. It is about risking the health of our families.

We need to focus on rebuilding our infrastructure, fixing our broken immigration system, and making sure that we can protect the health of the American people, not jeopardize it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a new year. We come down and begin this week, and I have made a commitment, as I think many of us do, as resolutions on what are we going to do for the new year and you always try to learn something new, and today has been a busy day with meetings and other things. I have learned a lot, but I have actually come to the floor today to learn something that was amazing to me, and it was not only that a bill that we are talking about under this rule would actually be designed to make, that was accused of making the ObamaCare Web site worse. I didn't know that was possible. And undoubtedly, it can be, but I think it actually helps when we look at what we are doing for the country and what we are doing as we move forward protecting the interests of the people.

So it is with that I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation, and in particular, H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014.

Even before ObamaCare was signed into law, pundits and politicians alike have speculated on the impact it would have on American families. Skyrocketing premiums, loss of coverage, and poor quality of care were all correctly predicted by many on this side of the aisle.

We come here today, however, because Americans aren't just faced with unaffordable health care and broken Presidential promises—the security and privacy of our personal information is at great risk due to ObamaCare.

One of the things that I think is mentioned here and should be noted, that protecting the information that is being forced to be given should be of our utmost importance and it is not something that should be just said is we should be doing other bills. Believe me, I would want to be talking about other things too, but this is something important that is protecting Americans' interests, and we need to continue to do so.

I believe that the best health care system is one that is patient centered and as far removed from the flawed policies enshrined in ObamaCare as possible. Over the upcoming months, I look forward to debating the merits of ObamaCare versus true health care reform with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But today is not that day. Today we come to the floor simply to say that American families should know about breaches of personally identifiable information in the ObamaCare exchanges.

Regardless of the letter of your political affiliation, wouldn't you like to be notified if the security of your personal information has been compromised? If we get outside the politics of Washington and ask our constituents, I firmly believe that answer would be yes. It would actually be a resounding yes.

So as I come to speak in support of this rule, and speaking also with the underlying bills and especially when I believe something such as protecting the security of our personal information is so important, I believe it is also important for us to remember as we start a new year that when we come here, people listen, people are concerned about their lives, they are concerned about what has gone on.

And over the past few months, especially when it comes to health care, you can go to teachers in Georgia right now who have had their health care changed because of the ACA. That has just been an interesting mark everywhere I go in listening to people in what is now a health care system that they used to have their own insurance is now lost into something that they are struggling with; or whether it is the identifiable nature of the issues of their information on the Web site that possibly could be compromised, to just simply saying that we need regulations for our businesses and making sure our

environmental projects are the ones that are prioritized and not just simply at the whim of a certain administration priority.

□ 1300

What we have got to do here is to continue to look forward to doing the people's business and, in doing so, in such a way that matters to everyday Americans.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again the gentleman said there is a risk of information being taken from the healthcare.gov site. There is potential risk from any site. But every day, there are tens of thousands of American identities being stolen because of this body's refusal to simply fix our broken immigration system now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority has passed so few bills into law that it is on pace to become the least-productive Congress in history. And, frankly, I think they are a little bit proud of that. The inability to govern is directly related to the closed legislative process the majority has pursued with vigor over the course of the last year.

At the beginning of the second session of the 113th Congress, the majority has practically shuttered the doors of every committee, save for the Rules Committee. It is a rare day when a bill proceeds through regular order from a committee of jurisdiction to the Rules Committee and down to the House floor. In fact, during the first session of the 113th Congress, major legislation repeatedly originated in the Rules Committee and was rushed to the House floor for an up-or-down vote.

Furthermore, during the first congressional session, the majority relied upon closed rules to shut out the minority and diminish the chance of any compromise. Under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed on the House floor. That cuts out, Mr. Speaker, more than half of the people in the United States of America who voted for Democrats.

During 2013, the majority set new records by approving 19 closed rules in a single week and an unprecedented 11 closed rules in a single day. Even those with no interest in, or knowledge of, the legislative process can understand the impact that such a closed process has on our ability to govern.

Every Member of this Chamber was sent here with a simple duty—to represent our constituents to the best of our ability. But, by closing down the legislative process, the majority is preventing 200 duly elected Members of Congress from being able to do just that. Collectively, we members of the minority represent more than 142 million Americans. Each one of us is entrusted to work on their behalf. How can we do that when the majority takes away our ability to participate in marking up legislation, amending bills, and having a full and open debate?

The Rules Committee has the unique and powerful ability to open up the legislative process and get Congress working again. In our committee, we can amend bills, improve legislation, and set the terms of debate so every Member of the House can participate in the legislative process. That is why I am so dismayed and somewhat disgusted at the proposed rule the Rules Committee has carried to the floor today.

Before us is a single resolution for three bills. Under this resolution, two of those bills are considered under closed rules, which are not amendable, not discussable, and one is considered under a structured rule. And that one came up 2 days ago. It has had no committee action whatsoever.

The bill being considered under a structured rule tries to revoke virtually all regulatory powers from the EPA, the agency that protects our health, our rivers, our air, and our land.

At the same time, one of the bills being considered under a closed rule adds layers of red tape to the Department of Health and Human Services and demands that health care navigators provide everything but their blood type and family history to Congress on an almost daily basis. It is simply designed to slow up the work of signing up Americans for the health care that they want and deserve.

It is very clear this bill is not a serious attempt to serve the American people but is a tactic to keep health care navigators from doing their work. Instead of moving forward with these gonowhere bills, we should be extending unemployment insurance to the millions of Americans struggling to find work. And without unemployment insurance, the economy is suffering every single day.

Just before we left for Christmas, the last day we were here, to end the debate on the rule of the budget, we had a vote that we could have done to extend the unemployment during the rules debate on the floor. That was under the previous question. The vote failed despite the fact that every Democrat and a Republican voted for it.

By the way, this bill was paid for. It was already taken care of by excess payments that we pay in agriculture subsidies. It was an extension for 3 months, but that was not good enough. So today, you are going to have another chance to do just that, to extend the unemployment insurance, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do it.

If my colleagues will join me in voting ''no'' on the previous question, a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits will come to the floor for an immediate vote. This is the same bipartisan bill that is moving forward in the Senate, and it deserves the same consideration here in the House.

Today, more than 1.3 million Americans and their families have lost access to unemployment insurance. Soon, it will be over 2 million and, by probably the end of March or May, 5 million. For so many, it is their only source of income and the only way they can pay their heating bills and buy food during these cold winter days.

We have to stand up for the millions of Americans struggling to get by through no fault of their own, because, you remember, in order to be eligible for unemployment insurance, you have to prove that you are looking for work. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question when it comes up so we can have an immediate vote to extend unemployment insurance and finally do something in this House and through this Rules Committee that will benefit Americans and make our constituents know that we count for something.

Mr. Speaker, The Majority has passed so few bills into law that it is on pace to become the least productive Congress in history. This inability to govern is directly related to the closed legislative process that the Majority has pursued with vigor over the course of the last year.

At the beginning of the 2nd Session of the 113th Congress, the Majority has practically shuttered the doors of every committee, save for the Rules Committee. It is a rare day when a bill proceeds through regular order—from a committee of jurisdiction to the Rules Committee and down to the House Floor. In fact, during the first session of the 113th Congress, major legislation repeatedly originated in the Rules Committee and was rushed to the House Floor for an up or down vote.

Furthermore, during the first Congressional session, the Majority relied upon closed rules to shut out the Minority and diminish the chance for compromise.

Under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed on the House Floor. During 2013, the Majority set new records by approving 19 closed rules in a single week and an unprecedented 11 closed rules in a single day!

Even those with no interest in, or knowledge of, the legislative process can understand the impact that such a closed process has on our ability to govern.

Every member of this chamber was sent here with a simple duty: to represent our constituents to the best of our ability.

Yet by closing down the legislative process, the Majority is preventing 200 duly elected Members of Congress from doing just that.

Collectively, we members of the Minority represent more than 142 million Americans. Each one of us has been entrusted to work on their behalf. How can we do that when the Majority takes away our ability to participate in marking up legislation, amending bills and having a full and open debate?

The Rules Committee has the unique and powerful ability to open up the legislative process and get Congress working again. In our committee we can amend bills, improve legislation, and set the terms of debate so that every Member of the House can participate in the legislative process.

That is why I am so dismayed at the proposed rule that the Majority in the Rules Committee has carried to the Floor today. Before us is a single resolution for three bills. Under this resolution, two bills will be considered

under closed rules and one will be considered under a structured rule.

The bill being considered under a structured rule tries to revoke virtually all regulatory powers from the EPA—the agency that protects our health, our rivers and our land.

At the same time, one of the bills being considered under a closed rule adds layers of red tape to the Department of Health and Human Services, and demands that healthcare navigators provide everything but their blood type and family history to Congress on an almost daily basis.

It is clear that this bill is not a serious attempt to serve the American people, but a tactic to keep healthcare navigators from providing millions of Americans with access to healthcare.

Instead of moving forward with these go-nowhere bills, we should be extending unemployment insurance to millions of Americans who are still struggling to find work.

Just before we left for Christmas, we had a vote on extending unemployment during a rules debate on the floor. That vote failed, despite the fact that every Democrat voted for it. As a result, more than 1.3 million Americans lost unemployment insurance on December 28th.

Today, we will give this chamber another chance to extend unemployment insurance—and I strongly urge my colleagues in doing just that.

If my colleagues will join me in voting "no" on the previous question, a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits will come to the floor for an immediate vote. This is the same bipartisan bill that is moving forward in the Senate, and it deserves the same consideration here in the House.

Right now, more than 1.3 million Americans have lost access to unemployment insurance in the last few weeks. For many, it is their only source of income and the only way they can pay their heating bills and stay warm during these cold winter days.

We must stand up for the millions of Americans who are struggling to get by in these tough economic times. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we have an immediate vote to extend unemployment insurance and finally provide for the millions of Americans in need.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 13 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is often said those who don't remember their history are doomed to repeat it.

The Rules Committee is an important function of this House. It is an important function of this body. Prior to 3 years ago, the Rules Committee was under the jurisdiction of the Democrats. They controlled the Rules Committee throughout the entirety of the 111th Congress. You may recall, that was the first 2 years of the first Obama term. In those 2 years under Speaker PELOSI, this was the first Congress in history—the first Congress in the history of the Republic—not to have a single bill considered under an open rule process.

Now, since Republicans resumed the majority at the beginning of 2011, 31 bills have come under an open rule. The track record may not be perfect, but it is inestimably better than what preceded it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that this particular rule has two closed rules on two of the three bills.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the Rules Committee and thank Members on both sides of the aisle for their hard work, but I want to associate myself with Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for recognizing that we represent millions of people, and the constant closed-rule approach for bills that have not even been heard by committee makes it difficult to represent your constituents. So I associate myself with her plea for equity and comity.

I also ask that we recognize that 1.3 million and growing, 3.6 million, 4,000 a week, of the individuals who worked and invested in this Nation have received letters, like my constituent in Houston, letters with no offer of assistance but simply that your unemployment benefit, insurance benefit, has been canceled. Cancel your life, cancel your housing, cancel your food, cancel your medicine, cancel taking care of your children, cancel your life.

And so I believe that it is extremely important that we vote today—again—and we hope that we will draw bipartisan support, to avoid the loss of some 200,000 jobs, to avoid the loss of serving 20,000 military veterans who are in fact beneficiaries of unemployment insurance, 1.3 million Americans, 2 million children impacted, to avoid the loss to the American economy. Mr. Speaker, $1.55 is generated by this insurance, millions of dollars to be lost.

And then I would say that it is important to be able to have a rule structure, more than a structured rule, more than a closed rule, because the bills that are before us today, the underlying bills, I am opposed to because my district is impacted by the Superfund.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

The three Superfund bills, no involvement of the Federal Government, taking authority away from the Federal Government, having the States override the Federal Government on Superfunds. There are neighborhoods that are still suffering.

And then with respect to this issue of privacy, I support the idea; but what I would say to my friends, and this privacy with healthcare.gov, what I would say to my friends is that we cannot continue to chip away at a bill, the Affordable Care Act, where millions of people have received health care. Let's work to ensure privacy for all of the sites of the Federal Government. Let's not pick away at the Affordable Care Act, which has been documented that it is secure, healthcare.gov.

If Republicans wish to help make all of government secure, we are ready to do that, but what I would suggest is that this bill is not going in the right direction. I ask for a "no" vote on the rule and on the underlying bills.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I tire of going through this history lesson every time we come down to the floor, but may I remind you that when the now-Affordable Care Act was passed into law, this was a bill that came over to the House from the Senate. Sure enough, the House had sent the bill over to the Senate in July of 2009, H.R. 3590. It was a bill that dealt with housing. The bill that dealt with housing was amended. The amendment read, "Strike all after the enacting clause and insert," and the health care language, which was de novo, the health care language was inserted.

Now, to be sure, the House had considered a health care reform bill, H.R. 3200. H.R. 3200 has gone to the ether of history. H.R. 3590 passed in the Senate, a 60-vote margin on Christmas Eve in 2009, and then was thrown over to the House of Representatives. Did we have a hearing on H.R. 3590 in the Committee on Energy and Commerce? No, we did not. Did they have a hearing in the appropriate subcommittee of Ways and Means on H.R. 3590, as amended? No, they did not.

The bill came to the Rules Committee. It came to the Rules Committee. I attempted to offer amendments. I was told, No, thank you. The bill was perfect the way it is, doesn't need any changes. This bill that affects every man, woman, and child in this country for the next three decades in a very unfavorable way was passed without any input from the then-minority, the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

So it is beyond comprehension that we can continue to have these arguments about closed processes. This, after all, is the granddaddy of all closed processes. And the consequence, the drafting errors, the problems embedded in the structure, could not be dealt with during the normal legislative process, which is why so much authority has been transferred to the executive branch, to the agencies, and why they are now essentially writing the laws that affect so many Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I was listening as a student of history myself to our friend from Texas. In that little last bit about affordable health care, he left out one little piece of history, which was that the Republicans of both the Senate and the House, to a person, decided it a priority to oppose the health care reform act no matter what was in it.

To now come back and say we weren't given an opportunity to amend something that we decided we were going to oppose—remember Jim DeMint's words: if we can defeat this bill, it will be President Obama's Waterloo, no matter what is in it. So we need to remember history in its full context.

And speaking of history, knowing of my distinguished friend's love of it, it was almost 35 years ago when the 96th Congress answered the cries of communities across the country facing the life-threatening effects of hazardous toxic waste. Who can forget, speaking of history, the Love Canal disaster in New York or the Valley of the Drums in Kentucky, the unexplained increase in the incidence of cancer, birth defects, and miscarriages?

In an overwhelmingly bipartisan effort then, that Congress did the right thing by creating the Superfund program, offering communities a way to remediate contaminated sites, to protect public health, and hold polluters accountable.

The success of the Superfund is clear: according to the EPA, as of April of last year, remedial actions have been completed at more than 1,145 national priority list sites, and an additional 365 have been completely cleaned up and deleted from the list. That is called success. That is called a program that is working. That is 70 percent of the sites that had been added to the priority list.

Today, human exposure is under control at 1,361 priority sites and contaminated groundwater under control at 1,069 sites.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yet, despite that success, with communities still in need, in process, the House majority wants to peel back that progress and repeal what we have done.

Can the Superfund be improved? Of course. We are committed to do that. But the answer isn't letting industry off the hook and leaving families exposed to hazardous waste and high cancer rates.

I urge defeat of this bill.

I thank my colleague for giving me the extra time.

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

I would point out this bill before us today does not—does not—change the Superfund, but it does allow States the flexibility to deal with problems in their States as they see fit.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on this 50th anniversary of the war on poverty, 1.4 million Americans have lost emergency unemployment insurance and thousands more stand to lose it each day, each week, that Congress fails to act. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider legislation that is identical to the bipartisan measure being considered in the Senate and would restore unemployment insurance to those who have lost it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a leader in the effort to restore unemployment insurance, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. POLIS, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question, as my colleague said, so that we can immediately take up the question of the extension of emergency unemployment to millions of Americans who have lost their job and who are seeking to find their next opportunity to contribute to our economy and to support their families.

I am part of the freshman class. We just began our second year in Congress. Something about the 2012 class that I think defines us is that we believe that we were sent here by the electorate of 2012 not to posture, but to get things done, to take action, to solve problems. That is why myself and the rest of the Democratic freshman class yesterday sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER asking that he immediately bring up an extension to the unemployment compensation for so many Americans.

Let's be clear about something, though. Unlike what I have heard from so many on the other side, being unemployed is not a choice; it is not a lifestyle to be sought. It is a condition that is often unanticipated, and it is one that nobody in my district that I know of who is unemployed would ever seek to try to maintain.

I can only speak for the people I represent, but I suspect this is true of my colleagues. Folks that we represent back home that are out of work would gladly, today, trade unemployment compensation for a job that puts them to work and gives them the dignity of work and the ability to meet their obligations to their family and their community. It is about survival. It is about making your rent payment. It is about being able to pay your car payment, to put food on the table for your kids. It is about being able to keep the house warm. It is not a lifestyle to be sought.

I think the notion that somehow people who are unemployed want to be there is condescending and offensive.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this previous question so that we can immediately take up the work that the American people are asking us to take up.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KILDEE. And that is to make sure that 1.3 million Americans have a chance to support their families until they can find meaningful work. Eleven million people since 2008 have been saved from poverty because of unemployment compensation. That unemployment extension was supported by the vast majority of Members of this House, signed by President Bush, with no strings attached.

What is different about 2014 than what was experienced in 2008? Nothing, except that we have the same obligation to those same Americans to make sure that they don't go broke, that they don't lose their house, that they don't lose their car, that they don't lose their family, as a result of the lack of basic decency.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

I appreciate this opportunity to comment not only upon this rule which provides, of course, for mostly closed rules—no amendments, no ability to change or modify, particularly two bills that had no hearings, went to no committees, and were reported out doing stuff that we did for 2013 almost without exception—but what I really rise to say is that I want to urge every Member to vote against the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I know the American public will hear ''previous question.'' What does that mean? The previous question, if defeated, will give us the opportunity to put on this floor what the overwhelming majority of the American people want on this floor, which I understand the gentleman from Michigan, as I just was walking in, I think was talking about. That is to deal with the most pressing issue confronting this country right now today. That is that we have 1.3 million Americans who have simply been dropped through whatever safety net we thought we had constructed.

So, Mr. Speaker, the American public understands, the previous question will give us the opportunity, if it is defeated, to put that legislation on the floor now, to extend for those 1.3 million people the help of the American people who want to do it. In every poll they say, no, we ought to have this help.

When George W. Bush was President of the United States, five times we extended unemployment insurance for long-term unemployed—five times—without paying for it.

And make no mistake about it; the vote on the previous question is whether or not you want to give long-term unemployed who have lost their insurance and are having trouble putting food on their tables, if you want to give

them help, you will vote ''no'' on the previous question. Don't hide behind a procedural issue. This is a substantive issue. This is an issue of whether we are going to give help now.

The American public that is for this ought to be looking at it. And every Member who votes ''yes'' on the previous question is voting not—not—to give help to those folks, 1.3 million of them, 20,000 veterans who can't find a job. And there is only one job available for every three people that are looking for a job.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. That is why George W. Bush extended unemployment. That is why we ought to do it. And we can do it. We have the ability to do it. Vote ''no'' on the previous question. It is a substantive vote on whether or not you want to help the long-term unemployed who have lost, as of December 28, 3 days after Christmas, the season of giving and caring, whether you want to give them the unemployment insurance that they count on to feed themselves and their families and have their heads above water.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule and urge a vote instead to bring to the floor a bill introduced by the ranking member of the ways and means committee, my friend Mr. TIERNEY.

His bill will do what Congress ought to have done before we left for the holidays: extend the emergency unemployment insurance benefits that were cut off so suddenly for 1.3 million of our fellow citizens who are looking for work.

It is shameful that Republicans continue to block an extension of this lifeline for so many who are struggling to find jobs and are facing an extremely difficult job market, where in some places there are three job seekers for each open position.

Democrats will continue to put pressure on our colleagues across the aisle to work with us in a bipartisan way to extend these emergency benefits while our jobs recovery continues.

Representative TIERNEY's bill would extend these benefits for three months to allow Congress time to work on a long-term solution.

There is no reason why 1.3 million people—a number that will grow by an average 72,000 a week for as long as Congress fails to act—should have to go without the emergency income that supports them and their families.

We need to promote job creation and get our people back to work, while at the same time ensuring that we're helping people stay out of poverty.

I call on my Republican friends to join with us in extending these emergency benefits right now and then working together to invest in the economic competitiveness that will create the jobs we need.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

In the last 12 days, nearly 1.4 million Americans have been cut off from their emergency unemployment benefits. Thousands more Americans will lose their benefits every week without congressional action.

It is unforgiveable that this Congress will adjourn tomorrow without addressing this crisis. Instead of offering a solution to extend emergency unemployment benefits, this rule does not allow us to address this critical issue of extending unemployment insurance immediately.

The longer we wait to fix this problem, the more serious it becomes for the long-term unemployed and their families. Punishing unemployed Americans and their families who have been hit hard in this tough recession through no fault of their own is just plain wrong.

My home State Senator, Senator JACK REED, has offered a proposal in the Senate. It is a critical step in the right direction to preserve this critical lifeline while we work on a long-term solution, and we should do the same thing here.

Surely my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want the opportunity to vote on extending unemployment insurance. So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, to defeat the previous question, so we can take up the issue of extending unemployment insurance for many Rhode Islanders and Americans all across this country who desperately need these benefits.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, does the gentleman have any other speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. I am prepared to close.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question.

The Senate has passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill, and the Senate is debating unemployment insurance. Meanwhile, the House hasn't dedicated a single second of legislative floor time to any immigration reform bill that would address identity theft.

Let's move forward and pass bills that matter to the American people rather than political bills that aren't going anywhere.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions for people who have been watching this debate, I'm sure one of the questions that they have, is there any difference as to how the private sector is treated if and when a data breach occurs versus a Federal agency? The simple fact of the matter is there is a difference.

□ 1330

The private sector is governed under State laws and, yes, by some Federal regulations as well.

In fact, earlier this month, in a publication called The Hill, entitled, ''Target's data breach sparks calls for action,'' there was significant discussion about, perhaps, there being more activity on the part of the Federal Trade Commission in protecting consumers who have been exposed to a data breach.

What are the protections for people harmed with a data breach by the Federal Government?

In fact, for that, there is not legislation, there is not a law that was signed by any administration, but there is an executive order of the President's, dating from May 22, 2007, a so-called OMB Circular.

The OMB Circular dealing with data breaches under the section ''Timeliness of the Notification'' reads:

> Agencies should provide notification without unreasonable delay following the discovery of a breach, consistent with the needs of law enforcement and national security and any measures necessary for your agency to determine the scope of the breach and, if applicable, to restore the reasonable integrity of the computerized data system compromise. Decisions to delay notification should be made by the agency head.

You get the impression that this is, perhaps, a rather open-ended or diffuse or poorly defined timeliness of notification for our constituents who are harmed by a data breach by a Federal agency. So that is one of the problems that we are here today to correct.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of a critical jobs bill and critical security bills to clean up our environment and to protect Americans' personal data.

I certainly want to thank Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TERRY and Chairman PITTS for their thoughtful bills.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 455 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 4 Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3824) to extend emergency unemployment benefits. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill

are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration the bill as specified in section 4 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on the previous question. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (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—191

Andrews
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
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
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
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
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
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—15

Barton
Cleaver
Cole
Gabbard
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schiff

□ 1356

Messrs. JEFFRIES, VELA, and NADLER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 186, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (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
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—186

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
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
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
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
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
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—23

Barton
Becerra
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Fattah
Gabbard
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Nunes
Rogers (KY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schiff
Turner

□ 1406

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2279.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 455 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2279.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1409

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations, or REDO, Act of 2013, which also includes my legislation, H.R. 2226, the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act, and Mr. LATTA's bill, H.R. 2318, the Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013.

Our goal with all three of these bills is to modernize some of the environmental laws that we oversee and make sure that the States are playing a significant role in implementing them. To do that, we began this Congress with a hearing on the role of the States in protecting the environment. State environmental protection officials shared their experience and expertise with us and helped us better understand the complex partnership between the States and the Federal Government as States implement Federal laws, such as the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and the EPA implements the Comprehensive

Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or CERCLA or Superfund law, and the relation to State environmental protection laws.

Today we consider three bills that are a logical outgrowth of that discussion. The Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations, or REDO, Act of 2013 would give EPA flexibility by correcting two arbitrary action deadlines that were written into the Solid Waste Disposal Act and CERCLA many years ago.

RCRA contains a mandate that EPA review and, if necessary, revise all RCRA regulations every 3 years. This deadline is unnecessary and unworkable in the face of the significant number of regulations that currently exist under RCRA.

The bill would allow the Administrator to review and, if necessary, revise regulations as she thinks appropriate. The bill would also lift an action deadline in CERCLA requiring EPA to identify, prior to 1984, classes of facilities for which to develop financial assurance regulations.

□ 1415

More than 30 years passed without action from the EPA to promulgate regulations regarding financial assurance. A lawsuit and court order finally prompted the EPA action just a few years ago.

In the meantime the States and other Federal agencies have long since acted, putting in place strong financial assurance requirements of their own. That is why the bill also provides that if EPA does get around to establishing Federal financial assurance regulations, the States requirements would not be preempted.

The bill also requires the EPA to gather information regarding the financial assurance programs of States and other Federal agencies and report to Congress regarding whether there is a need for additional regulations by the EPA.

Should the EPA determine there is a need for additional requirements, the bill ensures compliance with existing State or Federal requirements will count towards compliance with EPA's requirements.

The Federal Facility Accountability Act would bring the CERCLA waiver of sovereign immunity into conformity with the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for that matter the Clean Air Act, by requiring that all Federal Superfund sites comply with the same State laws and regulations as a private entity. This is not a new concept.

Legislation has been introduced previously by my friends across the aisle to ensure that Federal agencies comply with all Federal and State environmental laws, including CERCLA.

In fact, the Federal Facilities Compliance Act of 1991 had the same goal: to make Federal facilities subject to all the same substantive and procedural requirements, including enforcement requirements and sanctions that State and local governments and private companies meet.

The Federal Facility Accountability Act applies the same policy to Federal facilities under CERCLA that already applies to Federal facilities under the Solid Waste Disposal Act. Some argue that if this bill becomes law it will change Federal agencies' spending by forcing them to comply with State laws and that CERCLA is different because it is retroactive and applies to prior actions of the Federal Government.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act often applies to past conduct. That's why there is a provision for ''corrective measures.'' In fact, the EPA has issued multiple guidance documents that describe how Federal agencies should harmonize RCRA and CERCLA with respect to cleanups of hazardous waste.

Past conduct, future conduct—the fairness principle is the same. The basic question is whether Federal agencies should comply with State environmental protection laws just as private companies and State and local agencies must do.

My bill, the Federal and State Partnership for Environment Protection Act, does exactly what the title implies and would go a long way toward making the States partners with the EPA in cleaning up hazardous waste sites.

CERCLA is implemented by the EPA, but often States are in the best position to understand the sites in their State. This bill would allow States to play a larger role in the CERCLA process in several ways. The bill would allow States to list a site that it believes needs to be on the National Priorities List every 5 years and would provide transparency to the States if they suggest a site for listing.

The bill would also allow States to be consulted before the EPA selects a remedial action.

States are on the front lines and understand at the ground level how to prioritize environmental actions within their States.

They often come up with innovative solutions that better fit the local problem. We heard examples of that in our hearing on the Role of the States in Protecting the Environment.

CERCLA is a key example of a statute passed more than 30 years ago that we can now update and strengthen the Federal-State partnership to get sites cleaned up.

Removing barriers to job creation imposed by Federal Government is a cornerstone in our governing philosophy. CORY GARDNER, BOB LATTA and I produced bills to ensure that the Federal Government reduces unnecessary red tape, the barriers to job creation, while still keeping our environment healthy. These important bills aim to improve the Federal and State relationship when dealing with hazardous waste.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
Washington, DC, January 8, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, I am writing with respect to H.R. 2279, the ''Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013.''

As you know, H.R. 2279 contains provisions within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 2279, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert a jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2279, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 2279.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
Washington, DC, January 8, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2279, the ''Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013.'' As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 2279, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, for which you will have my support.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2279 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

At a time when too many of our citizens are still out of work, our Nation's infrastructure is in need of repair, the Tax Code needs revision, and when the safety net that provides basic necessities for our citizens has a tragic number of holes to close, we are spending our time on yet another bill that is headed straight for the legislative dust bin.

It was the high-profile contamination at Love Canal in my home State of New York back in 1978 that motivated Congress to address the serious public

health threat that existed at many sites across this country. Toxic contamination of air, of water, and of land from the improper handling of disposal of hazardous materials.

Many of us represent districts that have formerly contaminated sites or sites that still remain to be cleaned up.

Superfund is not a perfect law, but it has, in combination with other environmental laws, returned many abandoned, contaminated sites to productive use.

When contaminated, blighted land is transformed, the entire community benefits. A long-abandoned former industrial site along the riverfront in my district was restored to a popular park. The residents of Amsterdam now enjoy a beautiful waterfront area.

H.R. 2279 does nothing to improve public health or create jobs or protect the environment or avoid needless public expenses. In fact, it does the opposite.

Title I of this bill further delays actions that should have been taken years ago. Congress included broad authorities for the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that businesses that handle hazardous substances were financially able to deal with contamination that might result from their activities. This provision remains essential to protecting taxpayer interests, and it ensures these businesses are acting responsibly.

EPA's goals within the Superfund program should not stop at cleaning up the legacy sites that we have. It should also prevent new sites from being contaminated. It should prevent more people from being exposed to toxic substances, and it should prevent the property damage, loss of revenue, and stigma that communities experience when they are marred by these sites.

H.R. 2279 blocks the Environmental Protection Agency from implementing financial responsibility standards that their inspector general's office and the Government Accountability Office have advised are prudent actions that will avoid unnecessary public expenditures to clean up contaminated sites.

The GAO's last report on this topic indicated that in the 10-year period they examined, Federal agencies spent $2.6 billion to reclaim abandoned hardrock mine sites on Federal, State, private, and tribal lands.

So how does H.R. 2279 address this potential $100 million per year liability? By blocking EPA from taking recommended steps to avoid these potential cleanup costs. We cannot afford to continue this destructive policy.

Under the guise of ''fiscal responsibility,'' the majority voted to expand the list of requirements for applicants to the food stamp program to include drug testing and work requirements in addition to the detailed examination of an applicant's financial assets already required—all this to avoid providing a subsidy of about $1.50 per meal.

Apparently, it is too much to ask that a business, which could expose communities to toxic contamination, leave taxpayers with cleanup costs in the tens of millions of dollars, and result in lost local revenue and loss of property values, provide the government with assurance that it can afford to properly manage or clean up contamination that it created. The inconsistency in these policy choices is, indeed, incredible.

Blocking EPA from instituting basic requirements to protect public health, community vitality, local economic interests, and taxpayer interests provides a massive subsidy to a polluter at great public expense.

Titles II and III of this bill are somewhat of a mystery. I have no idea what problems with the Superfund program they propose to fix, but we have heard from the administration about serious problems this bill would, indeed, create.

The proponents of this legislation claim that title II will provide States more funding, give States a greater role in cleanups, and improve cooperation between States and the Federal Government on site cleanups, but States already have a significant role. Under current law, States can assert greater control over cleanups through a variety of mechanisms if they wish to do so.

The provisions altering the relationship between Federal and State government have a number of serious problems. For example, title III creates situations in which Federal employees could find themselves in a legal mess if caught between conflicting State and Federal direction of a cleanup site. This is an issue that was raised when this bill was considered by the committee. It was not resolved in committee, and it was not resolved before coming here to the House floor.

This is not the first bill this House has considered that demonstrated a disregard for Federal workers. This House has repeatedly turned to Federal workers to shoulder an unfair amount of the burden of deficit reduction.

Our erratic appropriation process has made their jobs more difficult, even as we have reduced their benefits and frozen their salaries.

We shut down the government, creating tremendous uncertainty for their families and barring people from their workplace. Now we are poised to pass a bill that might result in Federal workers being put in jail for doing their job.

Mr. Chair, I have touched on a few of the problems with this legislation. This is a poorly crafted bill that offers nothing for the public. It will not speed cleanups. It will not save money. It will not improve public health. This is bad policy and poorly crafted legislation. With that, I urge my colleagues to reject it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2279 and specifically a section of the bill I sponsored referred to as the Federal Facility Accountability Act. This commonsense legislation updates CERCLA to ensure that Federal facilities are held to the same level of accountability as private facilities when it comes to cleaning up the release of hazardous substances. This legislation is supported by a number of State entities that have had numerous problems with Federal facilities skirting their CERCLA cleanup responsibilities.

As the Department of Environmental Conservation Contaminated Sites program in Alaska pointed out during one of our subcommittee hearings, a recurring problem is when Federal entities use sovereign immunity as a bar to limit or even refute State involvement and oversight of agency cleanups. In these instances, the Federal agency is acting as the responsible party and the regulator in which they get to determine which laws to apply, how safe the remedy needs to be, and they also pay the bill. Further, there is inconsistency in how some Federal agencies apply their CERCLA authority.

The Federal Facilities Accountability Act addresses these concerns and existing ambiguities by ensuring current and formerly owned Federal facilities will have to comply with the same State requirements as a private entity doing cleanup under CERCLA and specifically identifies the types of State procedural and substantive requirements that are applicable to the Federal Government.

Some of the most pressing environmental problems exist at current and former Federal facilities, and States have come a long way in developing strong regulatory programs to protect public health, safety, and the environment. It makes sense for Federal agencies to comply with these State environmental laws and to clean up contamination at Federal facilities to the same standards as everyone else.

With strong independent State enforcement authority, the environmental performance of Federal agencies will undoubtedly improve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2279.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the former chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a staunch defender in public policy and outspoken word for the environment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO) for yielding and for his kind words.

Today the House is considering legislation to reduce the number of cleanups of dangerous contaminated sites that can occur each year. It is reducing the number of cleanups. At the same time, it is raising the cost to the taxpayers and letting polluters escape responsibility.

This bill is a perfect illustration of what is wrong with the House of Representatives. It is a partisan bill, developed through an insufficient committee process that erodes landmark public health protections for the benefit of big polluters.

When I first learned that the committee was considering this legislation to address the cleanup of contaminated sites on Federal land, I was hopeful that this was an issue that could be pursued on a bipartisan basis. We should always be looking for ways to improve our laws, to be more careful and effective in the use of taxpayer dollars, and to better protect public health and the environment. But the Energy and Commerce Committee leadership refused to work with the stakeholders to develop a workable and credible proposal.

□ 1430

The Department of Justice and Department of Defense both offered to come help us craft new and effective policies, but the chairman of the subcommittee refused to even meet with them.

Even worse, after the hearing on the bill, where a bill was out there, we had a hearing on it, the House Republicans added provisions that would let private companies avoid accountability for the pollution they cause. That means we are voting on legislation today to create new hurdles for holding polluters accountable, and we have no legislative record to explain it.

The outcome of enacting this bill should be obvious. If polluters don't pay to clean up their pollution, then it just becomes one more burden on the taxpayer. And none of us should want that.

This is the continuation of a disturbing trend. Over the last 3 years under Republican control, the House has voted over 400 times to weaken environmental laws. Last year, the House voted 51 times to benefit the oil and gas industry. From gutting laws that fight climate change to repealing rules that cut toxic air pollution, the House Republican leadership appears to have no qualms about targeting any public health and environmental protection.

The House Republicans seem to have forgotten we represent all of the American people. We represent the parents who want to know that their children are not being exposed to cancer-causing pollution. We represent taxpayers who don't want to spend millions to clean up a polluted industrial site simply because a big corporation decided to walk away. And, yes, we even represent the Federal employees who shouldn't have to face the threat of State sanctions just for doing their job and following the law as they would under this bill.

The administration strongly opposes this bill because it could delay cleanup of contaminated sites with the most urgent human health and safety risks. All of the Democrats on the Energy and Commerce Committee voted against these bills that have been combined and are being presented to us today. We all oppose it because it will increase litigation and let polluters off the hook. This bill would be vetoed if it ever made its way to the President's desk. Most likely it will never see the light of day in the other House.

This bill might play well with some special interest groups, but it should never become law; and I urge all Members to oppose this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have to respond, I think, briefly. I appreciate the ranking member's passion in addressing these issues, but we need to clear up what some of the facts actually are.

CBO has scored these bills and has come back and said that there are no significant cost increases associated with these. Furthermore, in regards to meeting with the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense, that meeting did occur, and the concerns that they raised were mainly around criminal liabilities for Federal employees, and that was addressed in the final legislation. So I'm not sure why we are still debating those issues.

At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership in managing this legislation today. I also thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois, for his fine work on this legislation.

I am rising today in support of H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act, a package of bills, as we have discussed, which includes the Federal Facility Accountability Act by Mr. LATTA from Ohio and the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act by Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

This legislation represents steps to roll back unnecessary and overburdensome regulations that are duplicative and unnecessary. The bills are aimed to protect the State-Federal partnership when it comes to cleaning up hazardous waste sites as quickly and as efficiently as possible. Solid waste must be disposed of in a responsible, efficient, and environmentally friendly manner; but there is no need for overly burdensome regulations that put a strain on businesses.

While our economy continues to sputter along, commonsense revisions of rules and regulations are a vital and critical component of helping our State and local economies grow.

My bill, the REDO Act, does two things. It allows the EPA the authority to revise and review the Resource Conservation Recovery Act, or RCRA, regulations as appropriate instead of every 3 years as required under current law. Even the EPA in written testimony to the Energy and Commerce Committee said that this regulation—the regulation that we are changing—can pose a significant resource burden on the EPA, given the complexity and volume of EPA's RCRA regulations.

Again, the EPA has problems with the rule. We are simply trying to change the rule to give them the power to meet the rule, and that is why it is all the more surprising that the President would issue a veto threat over a regulation that his own agency has written testimony saying they can't comply with it and have problems with it.

This bill also provides that when the EPA promulgates a financial responsibility requirement, existing State or Federal requirements are not preempted and EPA's requirement will fill whatever gap may be left by the requirements set forth by States and other Federal agencies. If EPA does revise requirements, they must submit a report to Congress explaining their justification for doing so.

It is a commonsense bill, commonsense jobs legislation; and I urge this Chamber's support.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you for yielding so I can correct the record.

Bipartisan staff on our committee met with the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense to hear a long list of objections they had to the bill that was before the markup in committee. When we went into the markup in committee, I personally asked in the public session if Chairman SHIMKUS, the chairman of the subcommittee, would meet personally with the Department of Justice and Department of Defense because they had great concerns about the bill. He said at that markup that he would.

We checked with the Department of Defense, we checked with the Department of Justice, and there has been no such meeting. There has been some change, but they have not really addressed all the issues that I think Members should have been taking into consideration. There was really not an attempt, if the gentleman would permit, to work this out on a bipartisan basis, to hear what other people had to say about it. This bill was driven through and was being written whether we had a hearing, written after the hearings where they had a markup, written after the markup without getting all the facts; and it is a flawed bill as a result of it.

Thank you for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I'm proud at this point to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Section 106 of this bill requires that the owners and operators of facilities holding certain quantities of materials that are included on the Department of Homeland Security's Chemicals of Interest list report those materials to

their State emergency response commissions. And while it is absolutely imperative that State and local authorities are properly informed about potential hazards in their communities, we have to be sure to communicate this information in the most secure, responsible, and effective way.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Committee's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, this provision concerns me for two particular reasons. First, the President has already specifically asked several Federal agencies—this is the Department of Homeland Security; the Environmental Protection Agency; and ATF, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms—to assess the feasibility of sharing this kind of information with the emergency response commissions while they are actually engaged in this activity.

Section 106 effectively mandates that they share this information immediately—before the President has had a chance to make his determination. And with sensitive information about the amount, variety and location of potentially dangerous materials at issue, this directive raises serious security concerns.

Second, the DHS Chemicals of Interest list is specific to the Chemical Facilities Anti-Terrorism Standards program. CFATS has in place a required practice of sharing information in a way that ensures facility security. I have serious reservations about whether this sensitive information could become compromised or subject to broad dissemination if section 106 were to become law. Chemical security is the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security, which is specifically equipped to protect it.

Because these concerns have yet to be addressed, I request that the committee revisit section 106 during conference with the Senate.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague, my friend from Pennsylvania, for calling attention to this concern that you raised.

In our open, deliberative process which we had in the markup, this was added as an amendment to the bill by my friends on the other side. This was prior to the President's rollout of his working group, prior to the President's stated concern about the sensitive nature of this information; and so it is one of the few times I would agree with the President that this information is very, very sensitive. So it might have been inappropriate at that time to accept this portion of the bill.

In our view, protecting this information, especially keeping it away from terrorists, is of utmost concern; and I want to assure you that this will be our guiding principle as we consider whether to include section 106 or any version of it in the final draft of the legislation.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee and also the longest-serving Member of the House, my good friend from the State of Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who was at the table in 1980 to oversee the Superfund and knows more about the Superfund than perhaps anyone in the House.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend from New York. I commend him for his outstanding service, and I appreciate his yielding this time to me.

Well, we have a bad bill on the floor. Frankly, I am embarrassed; and if I was one of the Republican managers of this bill, I would have a red face. Quite honestly, it does nothing except expose Federal employees to liability for actually enforcing the law.

No oversight was conducted to bring about the consideration of this legislation. No opportunity was made for the agencies to come forward and fully set out their concerns about how this bill is a bad piece of legislation.

As the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I handled the Superfund amendments in the reauthorization acts earlier. In that effort, it was a fully bipartisan undertaking, and we worked very closely with the Reagan administration, which was present and involved in all the conference meetings. The Senate at that time was under Republican control. President Reagan signed the act on October 17, 1986, after overwhelming votes of 386–27 in the House and 88–8 in the Senate.

At the one hearing that we had on this bill, I did not hear any support from the majority's witnesses. Most of them seemed to be somewhat embarrassed about the legislation and were unable to tell us anything that the legislation would accomplish in the public good or towards speeding up or improving the enforcement of Superfund.

It was interesting to note that there was really no identification of what the legislation would do to cure the problems that we confront with regard to Superfund. The Superfund program has been a fine example of success after having had a rocky start, and we have seen substantial completion of construction activities at over 70 percent of the national priority sites. Thousands of other shorter-term actions have also been completed.

Before charging headlong into solving problems that are not backed up with a factual record and with no showing whatsoever of a need for the legislation, I recommend that this body first gather the evidence that it needs from EPA, from States, from local governments, from industry and communities to better understand what, if any, problems need to be addressed. Until then, I fail to understand the purpose of this legislation other than a device to provide work for members of staff, to obfuscate the enforcement of Superfund and to, quite frankly, ignore the real problems which exist.

Superfund is cursed with the fact that it has major difficulty in being properly funded because the funding for it has long since expired, and now the ability of the Nation to fund the cleanup is not available to us. This bill would do nothing to address any of the problems that are there to be seen. It is a bad bill. It should be rejected.

□ 1445

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), our chairman.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, well, it is great to be here on the floor with my friends as we talk about moving pieces of legislation. It is unfortunate that we are no longer a debating society; we are just a statement society, whether we are going back to what is true and right in language of the bill or what is not.

Let me talk to folks about how we got to this position.

Upon becoming subcommittee chairman in the last Congress, I talked to members of my committee and staff and I said, There is no perfect piece of legislation. There is no perfect piece of law. What are some things that we can fix to make this process go better?

And it wasn't just our ideas; we went to the States. The States have a huge responsibility. And I think if people watched the body of information of what is coming out of our committee, we have given a lot of deference to the States because they are the ones who live closest to these locations. So we bring in the Council of the States, the Environmental Council of the States and all the stakeholders and we say, What is it about the Federal law that drives you crazy and if we fixed it would make your life better? Hence, these three pieces of legislation that have been rolled into one bill to make it to the floor.

The Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act, it allows the EPA to review regulations on solid waste disposal only when necessary. You know what the law says; regardless if the law works or not, you have to review it every 3 years. And you know what happens when that law is in there; regardless if it works, regardless if there are no complaints, you have to review it. So that is ripe for litigation. You don't do it within the time line, whether you need to or not, let's sue and settle. Let's do something.

So all we are saying is, if the law works, if the regulations are good, if there are no complaints, don't have an automatic time line of having to review it in 3 years. The States said, Yes, we would like that because we are spending more time.

Part of the problem with the Superfund is huge amounts of money go to

litigation. Surprise, surprise. We want to get money away from litigation to remediation. That is all we are trying to do.

The bill also requires EPA, prior to developing new financial responsibility requirements—and that is the key. What is a financial responsibility requirement? What do you have to have available if you are going to do this site and in case something goes wrong and you need cleanup? What are the financial requirements? What is the bonding you need? All we are saying is don't change the rules. And if you are going to change the rules for financial bonding while the process and the site is being operated, wouldn't it be good to talk to the States and let people know that the Federal Government is going to change the rules in the operation of a new site? The States said, Good idea. You ought to look at that.

One other part of the bill is the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013, which requires the EPA to consult with States when undergoing a removal action. So usually what happens at a Superfund site, the Federal Government gets involved. They are going to help do the majority of the cleanup. But guess who has the long-term observation and administration costs of the site? The States do. All we are saying is, if we are going to start to remediate in a State, let's have the State sit down and work with the EPA so the State knows its long-term costs. Pretty simple.

And the last one, which I always find pretty amazing that my friends on the other side are arguing about, protecting the Federal Government to pollute. All we are saying is, when the Federal Government has polluted a site, the Federal Government ought to clean it up. We make everyone else do it. We hold everyone else responsible. But no, if the Federal Government has polluted, we give them immunity. Sovereign immunity. They don't have to do anything. So this law says that it is about time the Federal Government comply with the same laws that States do and other individuals do.

This is a position my colleagues have had for many, many years. And of all the portions of this bill that I thought that they would be all for is moving this position that the Federal Government should comply with the same laws as everyone else does. And for my colleagues on the other side to protect governmental polluters I just find is unbelievable.

So the process was good. We had hearings. We had markups. We had amendments agreed to. I am proud of my colleagues in bringing these bills to the floor. I am glad of the participation by the States, and I look forward to the moving of the bill.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, before I yield, I would like to make a few comments.

I keep hearing from the bill's supporters that the States need and want this legislation. I am a little confused by those statements. My staff called the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, and they do not support the legislation. We also called the Environmental Council of the States, which represents the State environmental commissioners, and they have not endorsed the instant legislation before the House. So I am somewhat confused by the statements being made here.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who has fought for many environmental causes through the committee on behalf of his home State of New Jersey and, for that matter, for this Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from New York, the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2279. This is an unnecessary and ill-advised piece of legislation that would significantly weaken our country's hazardous waste laws and further shift the burden of cleaning up these sites from the entities responsible for the contamination to the taxpayer instead.

Mr. Chairman, polluters are already not paying their fair share to help clean up America's worst toxic sites, and this bill only makes things worse. Since 1995 when the Superfund taxes expired, taxpayers have shouldered an unreasonable responsibility to pay for these cleanups. I have a bill, the Superfund Polluter Pays Act, which would reauthorize the original Superfund fees and make polluters, not taxpayers, pay the costs of cleaning up Superfund sites. Congress needs to reinstate the ''polluter pays'' taxes so the industries most responsible for polluting our land and water are held responsible for cleaning up our toxic legacy, a legacy which severely affects my home State of New Jersey.

But again we face the prospect of the Republican majority dismantling our Nation's critical environmental laws. The bill before us today is really a combination of three bills, all of which will hinder hazardous cleanup across the country. And I am especially troubled by provisions in the bill that enable sites to veto sites from being added to the Superfund National Priorities List, as well as the provision that weakens the requirement for companies who deal with hazardous materials to carry insurance to cover contamination threats. Absent this insurance requirement, it will be easier for a company to go bankrupt and shirk its responsibility to clean up contamination that it has caused.

Mr. Chairman, cleaning up Superfund sites creates jobs by converting the contaminated areas into productive land ready for redevelopment and employing engineers, construction workers, and others engaged in the cleanup. I have seen this in my home State. New Jersey has more Superfund sites than any other State, and my county of Middlesex actually has more sites than any other county. But we have cleaned up a lot of these sites and created jobs. They are now used for recreation, for manufacturing, for shopping centers, so many other things.

We don't want to weaken the Superfund law. That would be a huge mistake. So I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, just a couple of quick points of clarification.

My friend and colleague Mr. TONKO and I agree on many things, and we have a history of having worked together to hold the EPA to commonsense rules, and I appreciate that, but I need to clarify just a couple of quick things that my colleague mentioned.

From the Environmental Council of the States, I have before me a letter that I would like to enter into the RECORD stating that the Environmental Council of the States is writing to support many of the concepts included in this legislation, on all three pieces of this legislation.

And the other organization, the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, they don't take positions on legislation; so no matter what the piece of legislation would be, if you call them, they are not going to take a position on it one way or another. That does not mean that they do not support this, but they simply don't take positions.

I wanted to make those clarifications for the RECORD.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ECOS, THE ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL OF THE STATES,
Washington, DC, June 18, 2013.

Re ''CERCLA Bills'' H.R.s 2226, 2318, 2279

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: The Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) is writing to support many of the concepts included in H.R. 2226 The Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013, H.R. 2318 The Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013 H.R. 2279, and The Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013.

As stated in our testimony at your hearing on May 17, ECOS supports the expansion of ''consultation with states'' as described in the bills. ECOS especially acknowledges that the bills directly address concerns expressed by the States in our ECOS Resolution on federal facilities operations under RCRA and CERCLA (attached; see especially the bolded items).

ECOS is a non-partisan, non-profit organization of the state environmental agencies and their leaders, who are our members.

We ask that you include this letter in the record on this matter. If there is anything else that ECOS can do to assist you in this matter, please do not hesitate to ask.

Regards,

R. STEVEN BROWN,
Executive Director.

Attachment.

ON ENVIRONMENTAL FEDERALISM

Whereas, the states are co-regulators with the federal government in a federal system; and

Whereas, the meaningful and substantial involvement of the state environmental agencies as partners with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is critical to both the development and implementation of environmental programs; and

Whereas, the U.S. Congress has provided by statute for delegation, authorization, or primacy (hereinafter referred to collectively as ''delegation'') of certain federal program responsibilities to states which, among other things, enables states to establish state programs that go beyond the minimum federal program requirements; and

Whereas, States that have received delegation have demonstrated to the U.S. EPA that they have the independent authority to adopt and they have adopted laws, regulations, and policies at least as stringent as federal laws, regulations, and policies; and

Whereas, states have further demonstrated their commitment to environmental protection by taking responsibility for 96% of the primary environmental programs which can be delegated to states; and

Whereas, because of this delegation, the state environmental agencies have a unique position as co-regulators and co-funders of these programs; and

Whereas, the delegation of new federal environmental rules (issued as final and completed actions and published by the U.S. EPA) to the states to implement continues at a steady pace of about 28 per year since spring 2007, for a total of approximately 143 new final rules and completed actions to implement through fall 2011; and

Whereas, federal financial support to implement environmental programs delegated to the states has declined since 2005; and

Whereas, cuts in federal and state support adversely affects the states' ability to implement federal programs in a timely manner and to adequately protect human health and the environment; and

Whereas, states currently perform the vast majority of environmental protection tasks in America, including 96% of the enforcement and compliance actions; and collection of more than 94% of the environmental quality data currently held by the U.S. EPA; and

Whereas, these accomplishments represent a success by the U.S. EPA and the states working together in ways the U.S. Congress originally envisioned to move environmental responsibility to the states, not an indictment of the U.S. EPA's performance; and

Whereas, the U.S. EPA provides great value in achieving protection of human health and the environment by fulfilling numerous important functions, including; establishing minimum national standards; ensuring state-to state consistency in the implementation of those national standards; supporting research and providing information; and providing standardized pollution control activities across jurisdictions; and

Whereas, with respect to program operation, when a program has been delegated to a state and the state is meeting the minimum delegated program requirements, the role of the U.S. EPA is oversight and funding support rather than state-level implementation of programs; and

Whereas, under some federal programs the U.S. EPA grants to states the flexibility to adjust one-size-fits-all programs to local conditions and to try new procedures and techniques to accomplish agreed-upon environmental program requirements, thereby assuring an effective and efficient expenditure of the taxpayers' money. Now, therefore, be it resolved that the environmental Council of the States: Affirms its continuing support for the protection of human health and the environment by providing for clean air, clean water, and proper handling of waste materials;

Affirms that states are co-regulators, co-funders and partners with appropriate federal agencies, including the U.S. EPA, and with each other in a federal environmental protection system;

Affirms the need for adequate funding for both state environmental programs and the U.S. EPA, given the vitally important role of both levels of government;

Affirms that expansion of environmental authority to the states is to be supported, while preemption of state authority, including preemption that limits the state's ability to establish environmental programs more stringent than federal programs, is to be opposed;

Supports the authorization or delegation of programs to the states and believes that when a program has been authorized or delegated, the appropriate federal focus should be on program reviews, and, further, believes that the federal government should intervene in such state programs where required by court order or where a state fails to enforce federal rules particularly involving spillovers of harm from one state to another;

Supports early, meaningful, and substantial state involvement in the development and implementation of environmental statutes, policies, rules, programs, reviews, joint priority setting, budget proposals, budget processes, and strategic planning, and calls upon the U.S. Congress and appropriate federal agencies to provide expanded opportunities for such involvement;

Specifically calls on U.S. EPA to consult in a meaningful, timely, and concurrent manner with the states' environmental agencies in the priority setting, planning, and budgeting of offices of the U.S. EPA as these offices conduct these efforts;

Further specifically calls on U.S. EPA to consult in a meaningful and timely manner with the states' environmental agencies regarding the U.S. EPA interpretation of federal regulations, and to ensure that the U.S. EPA has fully articulated its interpretation of federal regulations prior to the U.S. EPA intervention in state programs;

Believes that such integrated consultation will increase mutual understanding, improve state-federal relations, remove barriers, reduce costs, and more quickly improve the nation's environmental quality;

Noting the extensive contributions states have made to a clean environment, affirms its belief that where the federal government requires that environmental actions be taken, the federal government ought to fund those actions, and not at the expense of other state programs;

Affirms that the federal government should be subject to the same environmental rules and requirements, including the susceptibility to enforcement that it imposes on states and other parties;

Affirms its support for the concept of flexibility and that the function of the federal environmental agency is, working with the states, largely to set goals for environmental accomplishment and that, to the maximum extent possible, the means of achieving those goals should be left primarily to the states; especially as relates to the use of different methods to implement core programs, such as risk-based inspections or multi-media environmental programs, and particularly in the development of new programs which will impact both states and the U.S. EPA; and

Directs ECOS staff to provide a copy of this resolution to the U.S. EPA Administrator.

CLARIFICATION OF CERCLA SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY WAIVER FOR FEDERAL FACILITIES

Whereas, current and former federal facilities have some of the most pressing environmental problems, such as hazardous substances, unexploded ordnance, radioactive materials, and abandoned mines; and

Whereas, problems associated with some of these federal facilities pose substantial threats to public health, safety, and the environment; and

Whereas, ECOS believes the States' regulatory role at federal facilities should be recognized and that federal agency environmental cleanup activities are subject to and should receive the same regulatory oversight as private entities; and

Whereas, for many contamination actions the federal agencies assert Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) lead agency authority under Executive Order 12580; and

Whereas, state experience for many contamination actions has shown that assertions of sovereign immunity and CERCLA lead agency authority have led to inappropriate and/or inconsistent interpretation of state law and have not supported cleanup to the same standards as private parties; and

Whereas, assertions of sovereign immunity and CERCLA lead agency authority hamper consistent state regulatory oversight and responsibility to its citizens; and

Whereas, a clarification of Executive Order 12580 and/or federal legislation would aid states in implementing regulations which have been duly enacted by the states; and

Whereas, this resolution fully supports Policy NR–03i (specifically Section 3.5 on ''Natural Resources'') executed by the National Governors' Association. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the environmental Council of the States (ECOS):

Requests the Administration revise Executive Order 12580 to clarify that federal facilities are subject to appropriate state regulations and are not unduly shielded by sovereign immunity and lead agency authority;

Encourages the U.S. Congress act to support the States by the implementation of specific legislation which will without equivocation acknowledge state authority and regulatory responsibility for oversight of removal and cleanup actions at current and formerly owned or operated federal facilities; and

Authorizes the transmittal of this resolution to the Administration, appropriate congressional committees, federal agencies, and other interested organizations and individuals.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, while the Environmental Council of the States may have supported some concepts of the bill, they have not moved to endorse the bill. I will stand by my statement.

Next I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a staunch defender of the environment and a good friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and leadership here on the floor.

When I first heard that we were going to be dealing with Superfund reforms and modifications, I was originally encouraged. I have been working with these issues on the Federal level, and before that, for almost 20 years, as a local official dealing with the problems of pollution in Superfund sites. I know that there are many challenges to the

process and that it is chronically and dramatically underfunded. It is complex and cumbersome. Many of the participants are not fully equipped to be able to manage it. We have learned a little bit in the almost 30 years since the legislation was passed, but I am sad to say I was very disappointed because, rather than dealing in a thoughtful, bipartisan way to try and refine the process, we are actually taking a step backward.

This bill would water down the requirements and provide fewer dollars, blurring lines of responsibility. This is not going to help. The Superfund tax expired in 1995. Since then, we have been shifting the burden away from the petrochemical industry that created these problems in the main, shifting it to the general fund taxpayer, a scarce and dwindling supply.

This isn't going to move away from litigation; it is going to make it more likely, if it were enacted, by confusing people. Changing the rules that people have operated under is not going to be helpful; it is going to slow it down further.

I am deeply concerned that the Department of Defense has not fully met its obligation as the largest generator of Superfund sites in the United States. I have been on this floor repeatedly attempting to work through the budget process and the authorization process for us to step up and do right by people.

I have got a harbor that was the staging area for three wars, and a significant amount of the pollution there that we are dealing with is as a result of that Defense Department operation. But what we are doing here would, according to the Department of Defense, disrupt the national priority scheme in which the most contaminated Federal sites are cleaned up first. It would increase litigation, delay cleanup, and waste already limited resources.

Now, by pretending that somehow the State government is going to take the lead and compel Federal agencies to do things that may in fact be contrary to Federal law is not going to speed this process further. It is not going to make it easier. It is going to continue what is the problem. People today dig in their heels.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TONKO. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We haven't actually moved forward to try to work carefully, to thoughtfully, in a bipartisan session, refine it. We are going ahead and trying to superimpose on top of it things that will undercut that effort.

Now, I am critical of what the Federal Government has done in some areas, but as a practical matter, local governments, by failure to zone, plan, regulate, and exercise oversight, have often been responsible for many of these problems. And they have, in the main, not stepped up and been aggressive with the strictest of standards. This would superimpose what are potentially less rigorous or, in fact, no local standards, be able to cost shift to the Federal Government without any interest in providing the resources for the Federal Government to do so.

I would hope that our friends, if they are sincere, would spend time with people who are in the trenches and look for ways in a bipartisan, thoughtful way to refine the Superfund program so that, in the spirit of what originally created the legislation, we can do something that will do better by our constituents, better by the environment, and better by the taxpayer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) who has organized the Environmental Justice Advocates of his home State of Minnesota, and is also the chair of the Progressive Caucus in the House.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, the polluter pays. The polluter pays, and that is a simple idea with very broad appeal. The company responsible for causing the pollution should have to pay for the cleanup. It makes sense. This bill would relieve many companies of that responsibility when it comes to the most polluted sites in the country. Instead, taxpayers will pick up the tab. It is another bailout.

Currently, if a company is part of an industry with a record of pollution, it needs to post a bond or buy insurance. This requirement helps to prevent a company from polluting until it goes out of business, leaving the taxpayer with the bill for the cleanup.

H.R. 2279 allows the company to skirt its financial responsibility, in essence, to internalize all the money they make while polluting but to externalize all of the costs after they are done and leaving everyone else to shoulder the burden. That is not free market enterprise; that is crony capitalism.

The bill would also reduce funding for highly contaminated sites. It should be increasing funding for the sites so their cleanup does not drag on for decades. Less funding is not the answer. Because funding is already so short for these Superfund sites, we have to prioritize the worst sites for cleanup, and the result is the National Priorities List. This bill would disrupt that priority system.

Mr. Chairman, instead of letting polluters off the hook, we should use the money to put people to work by cleaning up the long list of toxic sites all over the country that are exposing people to toxic waste, pushing down property values, and inhibiting economic growth.

As I close, I just want to say that this bill, like so many bills offered by the majority, rests upon a falsehood, and that is that health and safety regulations hurt the economy. They don't. It is not true. It is a false statement, and there is no evidence for them to prove that it is true. And yet they want us to believe, as these companies deregulate and get tax cuts and all these other benefits, that they are going to use the extra money they get in order to create jobs, which they never do.

Reject this bill. It is a bad idea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 2279 is a deeply flawed bill that will increase costs, increase litigation, slow down the pace of cleanups, and, indeed, put the public at risk. It will do nothing to make cleanups at contaminated sites more efficient or more effective.

The proponent's intended goals for this legislation are not reflected in the bill's language. We can, and we should, do much better for people living in communities that are dealing with toxic legacies from past failures to deal with hazardous substances properly.

If we want to prevent new Superfund sites from being created and to clean up contaminated sites in their communities and convert them from liabilities to productive assets, we must reject H.R. 2279. I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to go back and revisit just briefly some of the cost implications or the allegations of cost implications of today's legislation that we are considering.

CBO carefully analyzed all three of the bills that we are considering as part of H.R. 2279 today, and here is what they said:

> CBO estimates that, in some cases, implementing this legislation could affect the pace of discretionary spending if priorities for cleanup activities change. However, CBO expects that total costs to fulfill Federal responsibilities under CERCLA would be little changed under this legislation.

That was directly from the CBO score for H.R. 2226.

> Based on information from EPA, CBO expects that removing the current requirement to review certain recommendations every 3 years would reduce administrative costs. However, some of those savings in administrative expenses would be offset by spending on the new requirement to report to the Congress any financial responsibility requirements. CBO estimates that, on balance, implementing this legislation would not have a significant net impact on spending that is subject to appropriation over the 2014–2018 period. Enacting H.R. 2279 would not affect direct spending or revenues.

That was directly from the CBO score for H.R. 2279.

CBO estimates that enacting this legislation could increase the pace of discretionary spending to the extent that Federal agencies accelerate spending

related to cleanup activities or pay additional fines and penalties imposed by the States. However, CBO expects that aggregate, long-term costs to fulfill Federal responsibilities under CERCLA would be little changed under the legislation.

In addition, H.R. 2318 could increase direct spending to the extent that fines and penalties were paid from the Treasury's Judgment Fund. However, CBO expects that any incremental spending from that fund would probably be insignificant. CBO estimates that any additional direct spending over the 2014–2023 period would be insignificant.

CBO goes on to say:

Enacting this legislation would not fundamentally change the Federal Government's responsibility to comply with CERCLA. According to the latest financial report of the United States, the Federal Government's current environmental remediation and waste disposal liabilities exceed $300 billion (under all environmental laws). Under current law, Federal agencies, in particular the Departments of Defense and Energy, currently spend billions of dollars each year conducting cleanup activities under CERCLA, including reimbursements to State agencies for related services they provide. Based on information from Federal agencies and industry representatives, CBO expects that enacting this legislation could induce Federal agencies to accelerate their compliance activities at some facilities—possibly changing the timing of funding requests for certain projects. As a result, H.R. 2318 might lead to greater compliance costs for Federal facilities for the years immediately following enactment, but the total long-term cost of compliance would not change substantially.

I just wanted to make that point for the record.

Finally, I want to urge my colleagues not to be misled by my colleague's argument that this bill somehow prevents the EPA from enacting financial assurance requirements. It simply does not. More than 30 years passed before EPA complied with the requirements of CERCLA and started the process of developing financial assurance requirements. All this bill does is require the EPA to acknowledge the body of law developed by the States and other Federal agencies in the more than 30 years since the EPA has failed to act.

This legislation does not limit EPA from establishing Federal CERCLA financial responsibility requirements or from setting a minimum level of financial assurance that is required. H.R. 2279 merely ensures that existing State and Federal requirements can be used to meet those requirements where appropriate and ensures that existing State protections that may already exceed a new Federal minimum requirement will not be automatically voided.

The purpose of the provision in the bill requiring the EPA to report to Congress before new CERCLA financial responsibility requirements are enacted is to make sure that there is a legitimate need for new requirements. It does not prevent the EPA from promulgating new requirements if they are necessary.

My colleague argues that the bill is based on a false premise that States are implementing adequate financial assurance requirements. The bill does not prejudge State financial assurance requirements. What the bill does is require the EPA to analyze the existing financial assurance requirements, and it directs the EPA to "fill the gap" left by financial assurance regulations developed by the States or other Federal agencies. But make no mistake, if there is a regulatory gap and the EPA believes that gap needs to be filled, the EPA is free to enact regulations.

The purpose of financial assurance under 108(b) of CERCLA was to prevent the creation of new Superfund sites. The bill provides a mechanism for gathering information to decide whether the existing State and Federal financial assurance requirements are adequate to protect the Federal Government from incurring response costs under CERCLA.

The bill directs the EPA to gather information and report back to us before it promulgates any additional requirements. It does not otherwise preclude the EPA from enacting rules that the EPA determines are necessary. In fact, we understand that the EPA has already been gathering this information from the States and other Federal agencies like the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

The bill simply sets out a process for us to learn what State and other agency requirements are out there and whether there is a need for more regulation before the EPA creates yet another layer of regulation. Contrary to what my colleagues are saying, the bill does not cut off any rulemaking by the EPA.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 113–30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2279

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

TITLE I—REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013".

SEC. 102. REVIEW OF REGULATIONS UNDER THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT.

Section 2002(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6912(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall review, and revise, as the Administrator determines appropriate, regulations promulgated under this Act.".

SEC. 103. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLASSES OF FACILITIES UNDER CERCLA.

Section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "Not later than three years after the date of enactment of the Act, the President shall" and inserting "The President shall, as appropriate,"; and

(B) by striking "first" after "for which requirements will be"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "Financial responsibility may be established" and inserting "Owners and operators may establish financial responsibility";

(B) by striking "any one, or any combination, of the following:" and inserting "forms of security, including"; and

(C) by striking "or qualification" and inserting "and qualification".

SEC. 104. REPORT TO CONGRESS REGARDING FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608(b)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(6) The President may not promulgate any financial responsibility requirement under this subsection without first submitting to Congress a report—

"(A) describing each facility or class of facilities to be covered by such requirement;

"(B) describing the development of such requirement, why the facility or class of facilities proposed to be covered by such requirement present the highest level of risk of injury, and why the facility or class of facilities is not already covered by adequate financial responsibility requirements;

"(C) describing the financial responsibility requirements promulgated by States or other Federal agencies for the facility or class of facilities to be covered by the financial responsibility requirement proposed under this subsection and explaining why the requirement proposed under this subsection is necessary;

"(D) describing the exposure to the Fund for response costs resulting from the facility or class of facilities proposed to be covered; and

"(E) describing the capacity of the financial and credit markets to provide instruments of financial responsibility necessary to meet such requirement.

The President shall update any report submitted under this paragraph to reflect any revision of the facilities or classes of facilities to be covered by a financial responsibility requirement that is the subject of such report.".

SEC. 105. PREEMPTION OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 114(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9614(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) No owner or operator of a vessel or facility who establishes and maintains evidence of financial responsibility associated with the production, transportation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous substances pursuant to financial responsibility requirements under any State law or regulation, or any other Federal law or regulation, shall be required to establish or maintain evidence of financial responsibility under this title, unless the President determines, after notice and opportunity for public comment, that in the event of a release of a hazardous substance that is not a federally permitted release or authorized by a State permit, such other Federal or State financial responsibility requirements are insufficient to cover likely response costs under section 104. If the President determines that such other Federal or State

financial responsibility requirements are insufficient to cover likely response costs under section 104 in the event of such a release, the President shall accept evidence of compliance with such other Federal or State financial responsibility requirements in lieu of compliance with any portion of the financial responsibility requirements promulgated under this title to which they correspond.''.

SEC. 106. EXPLOSIVE RISKS PLANNING NOTIFICATION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the owner or operator of each facility at which substances listed in appendix A to part 27 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, as flammables or explosives are present above the screening threshold listed therein shall notify the State emergency response commission for the State in which such facility is located that such substances are present at such facility and of the amount of such substances that are present at such facility.

TITLE II—FEDERAL AND STATE PARTNERSHIP FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013''.

SEC. 202. CONSULTATION WITH STATES.

(a) REMOVAL.—Section 104(a)(2) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''Any removal action undertaken by the President under this subsection (or by any other person referred to in section 122) should'' and inserting ''In undertaking a removal action under this subsection, the President (or any other person undertaking a removal action pursuant to section 122) shall consult with the affected State or States. Such removal action should''.

(b) REMEDIAL ACTION.—Section 104(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''before determining any appropriate remedial action'' and inserting ''during the process of selecting, and in selecting, any appropriate remedial action''.

(c) SELECTION OF REMEDIAL ACTION.—Section 104(c)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)(4)) is amended by striking ''shall select remedial actions'' and inserting ''shall, in consultation with the affected State or States, select remedial actions''.

(d) CONSULTATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS.—Section 120(f) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''shall afford to'' and inserting ''shall consult with'';

(2) by inserting ''and shall provide such State and local officials'' before ''the opportunity to participate in''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''If State or local officials make a determination not to participate in the planning and selection of the remedial action, such determination shall be documented in the administrative record regarding the selection of the response action.''.

SEC. 203. STATE CREDIT FOR OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 104(c)(5) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(c)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting ''removal at such facility, or for'' before ''remedial action''; and

(B) by striking ''non-Federal funds.'' and inserting ''non-Federal funds, including oversight costs and in-kind expenditures. For purposes of this paragraph, in-kind expenditures shall include expenditures for, or contributions of, real property, equipment, goods, and services, valued at a fair market value, that are provided for the removal or remedial action at the facility, and amounts derived from materials recycled, recovered, or reclaimed from the facility, valued at a fair market value, that are used to fund or offset all or a portion of the cost of the removal or remedial action.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''removal or'' after ''under this paragraph shall include expenses for''.

SEC. 204. STATE CONCURRENCE WITH LISTING ON THE NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST.

(a) BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION.—Section 105(a)(8)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''Not later than 90 days after any revision of the national list, with respect to a priority not included on the revised national list, upon request of the State that submitted the priority for consideration under this subparagraph, the President shall provide to such State, in writing, the basis for not including such priority on such revised national list. The President may not add a facility to the national list over the written objection of the State, unless (i) the State, as an owner or operator or a significant contributor of hazardous substances to the facility, is a potentially responsible party, (ii) the President determines that the contamination has migrated across a State boundary, resulting in the need for response actions in multiple States, or (iii) the criteria under the national contingency plan for issuance of a health advisory have been met.'' after ''the President shall consider any priorities established by the States.''; and

(2) by striking ''To the extent practicable, the highest priority facilities shall be designated individually and shall be referred to as'' and all that follows through the semicolon at the end, and inserting ''Not more frequently than once every 5 years, a State may designate a facility that meets the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, which shall be included on the national list;''.

(b) STATE INVOLVEMENT.—Section 121(f)(1)(C) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(f)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''deleting sites from'' and inserting ''adding sites to, and deleting sites from,''.

SEC. 205. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT LAW.

Section 121(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(d)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking ''State environmental or facility siting law'' and inserting ''State environmental, facility siting, or environmental covenant law, or under a State law or regulation requiring the use of engineering controls or land use controls,''.

TITLE III—FEDERAL FACILITY ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013''.

SEC. 302. FEDERAL FACILITIES.

(a) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 120(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(a)) is amended in the heading by striking ''OF ACT''.

(b) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO FEDERAL FACILITIES.—Section 120(a)(2) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''preliminary assessments'' and inserting ''response actions'';

(2) by inserting ''or'' after ''National Contingency Plan,'';

(3) by striking '', or applicable to remedial actions at such facilities''; and

(4) by inserting ''or have been'' before ''owned or operated''.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—Section 120(a)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(a)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the United States shall be subject to, and comply with, at facilities that are or have been owned or operated by any such department, agency, or instrumentality, State substantive and procedural requirements regarding response relating to hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants, including State hazardous waste requirements, in the same manner and to the same extent as any nongovernmental entity.

''(B) COMPLIANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The United States hereby expressly waives any immunity otherwise applicable to the United States with respect to any State substantive or procedural requirement referred to in subparagraph (A).

''(ii) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Neither the United States, nor any agent, employee, nor officer thereof, shall be immune or exempt from any process or sanction of any State or Federal Court with respect to the enforcement of any injunctive relief under subparagraph (C)(ii).

''(iii) CIVIL PENALTIES.—No agent, employee, or officer of the United States shall be personally liable for any civil penalty under any State substantive or procedural requirement referred to in subparagraph (A), or this Act, with respect to any act or omission within the scope of the official duties of the agent, employee, or officer.

''(C) SUBSTANTIVE AND PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—The State substantive and procedural requirements referred to in subparagraph (A) include—

''(i) administrative orders;

''(ii) injunctive relief;

''(iii) civil and administrative penalties and fines, regardless of whether such penalties or fines are punitive or coercive in nature or are imposed for isolated, intermittent, or continuing violations;

''(iv) reasonable service charges or oversight costs; and

''(v) laws or regulations requiring the imposition and maintenance of engineering or land use controls.

''(D) REASONABLE SERVICE CHARGES OR OVERSIGHT COSTS.—The reasonable service charges or oversight costs referred to in subparagraph (C) include fees or charges assessed in connection with—

''(i) the processing, issuance, renewal, or modification of permits;

''(ii) the review of plans, reports, studies, and other documents;

''(iii) attorney's fees;

''(iv) inspection and monitoring of facilities or vessels; and

''(v) any other nondiscriminatory charges that are assessed in connection with a State requirement regarding response relating to hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants.''.

SEC. 303. AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE, ISSUE REGULATIONS.

Section 115 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9615) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''If the President delegates or assigns any duties or powers under this section to a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States other than the Administrator, the Administrator may review, as the Administrator determines necessary or upon request of any State, actions taken, or regulations promulgated, pursuant to such delegation or assignment, for purposes of ensuring consistency with the guidelines, rules, regulations, or criteria established by the Administrator under this title.''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those

printed in part A of House Report 113–322. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–322.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, strike lines 13 and 14 and insert the following: ''U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)) is amended by inserting ''Not later than 90 days after''.

Page 9, line 7, strike ''; and'' and insert a period.

Page 9, strike lines 8 through 15.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

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

My amendment would strike language that expands eligibility for the National Priorities List in section 204, which is overseen by the Environmental Protection Agency.

My amendment also reinstates language that directs listings of the ''highest priority facilities'' for cleanup and guarantees that State-recommended sites receive priority.

□ 1515

In 2003, an agreement was finalized to provide much-needed cleanup to the North Indian Bend Wash site in my district. The site, formerly used for industrial production and manufacturing, now spans several housing developments in which thousands of Arizona families, students and seniors reside.

Since then, Federal, State, and local stakeholders have worked together to put a 25-year plan in place to address soil and water contamination at this site, but those plans have not gone uninterrupted. In January of 2008, more than 3.5 million gallons of contaminated water were mistakenly delivered from this site to homes in Paradise Valley, and in July of that same year, irrigation water used from this site triggered a study at an elementary school in my district to determine if the school grounds had been contaminated.

The North Indian Bend Wash site is one of many sites across the country listed under the National Priorities List, which provides much-needed funding to assist States with cleanup efforts.

In keeping with the mission of the National Priorities List, which is to protect public health, my amendment protects funding for important cleanup projects, like the North Indian Bend Wash, that are taking place in hundreds of communities across the country.

The underlying bill would expand eligibility for the National Priorities List, stretching its mission beyond its current financial means without providing additional funding to accommodate this expansion. My amendment prevents this unfunded expansion.

In times of financial shortfall, we should ensure that we efficiently and responsibly use taxpayers dollars to prioritize projects by need and maximize our impact on improving public health. While I agree that providing more robust State input is essential to crafting better environmental policy, H.R. 2279 would actually repeal language that requires the administration to prioritize the most urgent and impactful State projects for cleanup.

I also believe that striking the ''highest priority facilities'' language, as called for in the underlying bill, may have the unintended consequence of diminishing the statutory role that States would have in determining the EPA's cleanup priorities. The underlying bill strikes the only clause in the current law that explicitly protects states' rights with NPL. Without this language, it is possible that the underlying bill could result in the EPA's placing certain projects that States have requested at the bottom of its funding priorities on the NPL while still following the law. My amendment reinstates this language, directing the EPA to make tough choices that necessarily respect the interests of our States.

We all share the desire to work towards commonsense, reasonable solutions, using tax dollars wisely, facilitating job growth and improving public health. This amendment provides a meaningful fix to the underlying bill by preventing an unfunded expansion of the NPL and directing the administration to make tough choices that respect the rights of States. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes the provision that would allow States to list a site on the National Priorities List once every 5 years.

States have a great deal of experience and expertise in cleaning up sites contaminated by hazardous wastes, and States are often in a better position to understand the realities of site cleanup in their States and to understand the local or regional issues affecting the cleanup, but there are times when it would be better addressed by the EPA under CERCLA, and there would be a significant delay in the listing process. As a result, the bill also allows a State to designate a site that meets the criteria for listing to the National Priorities List once every 5 years.

CERCLA currently permits States to list a site on the National Priorities List only once. States have taken to calling this their ''silver bullet.'' Using the silver bullet fast-tracks the listing of a site on the NPL and allows States to avoid the often lengthy listing process. Some States have already used their silver bullet, while others hold onto it and wait for a site that it believes would be better addressed by the EPA under CERCLA.

My colleague indicated in a Dear Colleague letter she circulated earlier today that the bill could result in the EPA's placing silver bullet projects at the bottom of the priorities list while still remaining in statutory compliance. While I appreciate my colleague's concern, this statement is both misleading and incorrect. The reality is that the EPA can place a silver bullet site—or any other site for that matter—at the bottom of its priority list at any time. This bill does not change the EPA's ability to prioritize sites for cleanup.

CERCLA is very process heavy, and States are often reluctant to wade into the drawn-out CERCLA process. They would rather clean up the sites themselves and avoid the stigma associated with having a Superfund site in their States. However, there are times when the only way to get a site cleaned up is to get it on the Superfund list. It is not an easy conclusion for States to come to, and States are not clamoring to list on the National Priorities List. So any argument that this bill would somehow result in an onslaught of new listings by the States would simply not play out.

One of the arguments against allowing States to list a site on the NPL is that it will somehow change the EPA's prioritization of how to spend its cleanup dollars. Just because a site is listed on the NPL does not mean that it will automatically receive funding or will somehow jump to the front of the line to receive cleanup dollars. Nothing in this bill changes the fact that the EPA sets the priority for sites to be cleaned up, and the EPA decides how to spend its cleanup dollars.

Furthermore, if a site is listed and is being cleaned up using Federal dollars, States are financially invested in making sure the cleanup is done right. States must contribute 10 percent of the overall remedial cost and all of the long-term operation and maintenance costs. With that, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY), my colleague.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment requiring the EPA to stay focused on the National Priorities List.

There are nine Superfund sites where I am from in the Hudson Valley of New York. Toxic sites once declared uninhabitable are now engines of economic development, and I want to credit the good folks at the EPA, including my friend Judith Enck, who leads Region 2, but one Hudson Valley community with poison in its water has waited over 10 years for a solution.

The EPA began cleanup at the site in Hopewell Junction in 2003 and officially added Hopewell to the Superfund National Priorities List in 2005. Hopewell Junction isn't some abandoned wasteland, and it isn't an empty brownfield. It is a community full of children and families who need our help and who need our help now. Hopewell could be a neighborhood anywhere, a neighborhood in which families shouldn't have to choose between clean water and their children's health, between selling their houses or staying in a place where they grew up and loved but is now contaminated. My neighbors, like Debra Hall, have put blood, sweat and tears into this effort for 10 years to try to clean up Hopewell—10 years telling anyone who would listen that Hopewell must be a priority because they can't wait.

It is outrageous, and they deserve better from their government. I support this amendment to keep our priorities straight, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I share the desire of my Republican colleagues to increase the input provided by and the role of States in listing facilities on the National Priorities List, but by adding more sites to an already overwhelmed program, we may diminish the effectiveness of this important program.

I am also concerned that the underlying bill, by striking the current statutory language that directs the EPA to give State-recommended sites priority, could have the unintended consequence of decreasing the role of States in this process. For these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, ironically, the EPA often pushes States to identify more sites that the EPA can put on the list so that the EPA can argue for more cleanup funding. The EPA incentivizes States to identify sites that meet the listing criteria by giving the States that identify sites more funds to do initial site assessments.

So the long and short of it is that the EPA wants more sites on the NPL, and the EPA wants the States to assist with identifying NPL sites, but the EPA does not want to relinquish control over the actual selection of the appropriate sites. We are trying to help fix that. Again, I urge a ''no'' vote from my colleagues on the Sinema amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

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

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113–322.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—AVOIDING INCREASED LITIGATION AND DELAYS IN CLEANUPS

SEC. 401. AVOIDING INCREASED LITIGATION AND DELAYS IN CLEANUPS.

This Act shall not take effect if any provision thereof would increase the potential for litigation, reduce the amount of funds available for the cleanup of contaminated sites, or delay the implementation of any such cleanup.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, my amendment adds a savings clause to H.R. 2279 to avoid unintended consequences and detrimental impacts on current and future site cleanup efforts.

We certainly know that the actual provisions of the bill trump the intended goals of the legislation. If, as the supporters of this bill claim, it will not increase litigation, it will not increase costs or delay ongoing or future site cleanups, my amendment would have no effect. However, if the administration's analysis is correct—and I believe it is—my amendment will keep current site cleanups on track and ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent efficiently—spent on cleaning up contaminated sites and not spent in courtrooms.

If the committee had taken additional time to do the necessary oversight that would enable us to identify the best options for improving the Superfund program, my amendment would not be necessary, but the many problems with this bill that Democratic members of the committee have raised and that are echoed in the administration's analysis make my amendment truly necessary.

As the administration's statement of policy points out, H.R. 2279 severely reduces the Federal Government's role in the cleanup of Federal sites. The Federal Government's ability to set a ''worst first'' prioritization agenda for site cleanups is eliminated. The Federal Government pays the vast majority of the costs for site cleanups on Federal lands and sites on the National Priorities List. The Federal Government certainly should consult with the State on sites within its borders, but especially in cases where Federal land, Federal tax dollars, Federal employees, and Federal operations are concerned, the Federal Government should have the last word.

My amendment provides a prudent insurance policy to ensure that we do not use limited Superfund resources to litigate rather than to mitigate. My amendment ensures that we move forward. It ensures that we clean up these sites and convert them from revenue liabilities to revenue enhancements. It ensures that we reduce public health risks from contamination. With that, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am sure my colleague's amendment is well-intentioned, and in fact, I agree with him. I do not want to see an increase in litigation or a slowdown in the cleanup process or a decrease in funds available to clean up Superfund sites, but this amendment is not necessary because H.R. 2279 will not do any of those things.

CERCLA has been implemented for over 30 years, and the EPA has developed many practices and policies during that time. Some of the policies work and are consistently implemented, but many of the policies or practices are ineffective or are not consistently applied across the EPA regions. The EPA has done a good job of getting contaminated sites cleaned up under CERCLA, but that doesn't mean that we can't do better.

States are often in a better position to understand the local and regional issues affecting the cleanup, and States are well positioned to assist the EPA with all aspects of a response action. By ensuring that the States have a meaningful role in the Federal-State partnership under CERCLA and by making sure that Federal entities are on a level playing field with private entities engaged in CERCLA cleanups, we can do better and get more sites cleaned up faster.

My colleague's amendment implies that the purpose of this bill is to thwart cleanup efforts. On the contrary, the purpose of this legislation is to make sure sites get cleaned up in a

timely fashion by enhancing the existing role of the States, which are in the best position to assess the conditions at the site. The bill adjusts a top-down culture of CERCLA cleanups, but the bill does not alter the EPA's lead role in implementing CERCLA. States are already involved in the CERCLA process. Ensuring that States have a meaningful and substantial role will not slow down the cleanup process.

My colleague's amendment also implies that H.R. 2279 will reduce the number of funds available for cleanup. This is simply not the case. Congress decides on the amount of money to be appropriated to the EPA or to other Federal agencies for cleanups, and that is not changed by this legislation. It is up to the Federal agencies to prioritize how they spend the appropriated cleanup funds, and nothing in this bill changes the way money appropriated for cleanups is spent.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, our colleague and my friend from Ohio indicates that this bill will not increase litigation or increase costs or delay ongoing or future site cleanups, and so my amendment would not affect the measure before the House. So it really is a statement in support of the amendment. There is no just reason offered to not support the amendment.

With that, again, I would encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, once again, I want to say how much I respect my colleague, Mr. TONKO. We continue to work together, have worked together, and have had some successes in holding the EPA accountable to the law. I appreciate working with him.

But this amendment, although well-intentioned, is drafted in such a way that makes it impossibly vague. It is indeterminable whether a provision of the bill would increase the potential for litigation, and I continue to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Tonko amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113–322 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. SINEMA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 228, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

AYES—189

Andrews
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
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
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
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—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
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
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (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—15

Barton
Cleaver
Crowley
Gabbard
Garamendi
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Smith (WA)

□ 1559

Messrs. BOUSTANY, BROOKS of Alabama, WHITFIELD, HULTGREN, HUDSON, FLEISCHMANN, GOHMERT, LoBIONDO, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Messrs. TERRY and GALLEGO changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LEE of California and Mr. SIRES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 9, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 227, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

AYES—190

Andrews
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
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
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
SchultzWaters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
[H09JA4-

NOES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
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)

NOT VOTING—15

Barton
Cleaver
Crowley
Gabbard
Garamendi
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Smith (WA)

□ 1605

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, 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. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, and, pursuant to House Resolution 455, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. PETERS of California. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PETERS of California, moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2279 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—PRESERVING THE POLLUTER PAYS PRINCIPLE AND LIMITING EXPOSURE TO TOXIC CHEMICALS

SEC. 401. PRESERVING THE POLLUTER PAYS PRINCIPLE AND LIMITING EXPOSURE TO TOXIC CHEMICALS.

This Act shall not take effect if any provision thereof would result in—

(1) fewer contaminated sites being cleaned up each year, or the responsibility for cleaning up a contaminated site being shifted from the polluter to the taxpayer; or

(2) greater long-term exposure for vulnerable populations, including populations in pre-schools, elementary and secondary schools, hospitals, and nursing homes within 5 miles of contaminated sites, to arsenic, mercury, cadmium, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), perchlorate, or other toxic substances that pollute drinking water or cause adverse human health effects, such as respiratory disease, cancer, or reproductive disorders.

Mr. PETERS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

My amendment simply states that the bill won't take effect if it results in fewer cleaned-up sites, if it shifts responsibility from polluters to the American taxpayers, and if there is greater exposure to carcinogens for schools, hospitals, and nursing homes within 5 miles of a contaminated site.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, we have heard as an article of faith that we have to choose between a prosperous economy and a clean environment, the idea that we can't have both. That is a false choice.

People in San Diego and people around the country know that we deserve nothing less than both. We need to provide both economic opportunity and clean air and water for our future generations.

In my first career, for 15 years, I practiced environmental law in the public and private sectors. Many of my clients were businesses or local governments that struggled to understand and follow what they felt were overly complex and time-consuming regulatory requirements, and from this experience, I have no doubt that overly burdensome red tape hurts our economy.

So I hope that in any case where we can streamline and simplify environmental regulations, while still protecting and enhancing the health of our rivers, lakes, oceans, and air, that everyone in this Congress would be onboard.

I hope that we all agree that real substantive protections are important to ensuring that our drinking water, ocean water, and the land we live and farm on are safe for our children, the elderly, and our families. These resources are economic assets that we have inherited, that we have a responsibility to preserve, and that we must be active stewards in protecting.

At the heart of the Superfund program is the commonsense idea that those who caused pollution would pay to clean it up. The underlying bill turns away from this basic principle and, instead, puts hardworking taxpayers who didn't cause the pollution on the hook for the expensive cleanups. That is not right, and it is not a good incentive for preventing future contamination.

The bill creates an unfunded mandate by allowing States to move polluted sites off of their regulatory plates to the Federal Superfund list, shifting responsibility from corporations and States to the Federal taxpayer, and just as the Congress has slashed the Superfund budget 40 percent over the last 5 years. If we add more sites to the already burdened Federal list, we will certainly delay cleanups at the expense of human health and the environment.

Second, the bill, for the first time ever, would subject our Federal employees to unfair penalties and perhaps even imprisonment if, in the good faith execution of their duties, they find that they can't comply with a State order because it directly conflicts with Federal law. Putting Federal workers who are tasked with cleaning up these heavily polluted sites in this position is beyond bad management, it is cruelly unfair, and it effectively scares employees from doing the very job we pay them, as taxpayers, to do.

Finally, the Department of Defense has serious concerns with the bill, as it would make it difficult to clean up many of the nearly 10,000 Superfund sites on military bases. According to the military, the bill would waste money on unnecessary litigation instead of actual site cleanup.

Just north of my district in San Diego, a part of Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton is a Superfund site. Nine areas of soil and groundwater have been contaminated by pesticides, metals, herbicides, and more. These waters sources flow into the neighboring Pacific Ocean, and every day that we delay the cleanup and restoration of this site, our servicemembers, civilians working on the site, and numerous endangered species in the region face adverse risks. We cannot let this continue.

In these lean fiscal times, we must make the most of limited Federal resources and taxpayer dollars. This legislation would bring with it unnecessary litigation, more spending that doesn't go to fixing the problems, exactly the kind of waste we are trying to eliminate from the Federal budget.

My motion to recommit ensures that we are both careful stewards of the taxpayer dime and the environment. We must support laws that protect human health and the environment and continue to enforce the idea that polluters—not hardworking taxpayers—pay for what they pollute.

I call on my colleagues not to fall for the false choice between growing the economy and protecting the environment. We can and we must do both. Vote ''yes'' on this motion, and stand with me to protect the taxpayer, protect children's health, and ensure that those who cause pollution pay to clean it up.

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

□ 1615

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, our goal with this legislation is clear and straightforward. We want to modernize outdated environmental laws. The part of the bill that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) wrote makes modest, but important, improvements in environmental law. It allows the EPA to review and revise its solid waste disposal regulations as necessary.

In a hearing that we had, we asked a mayor from New Jersey, Would you rather clean up the trash or revise regulations? The mayor made it clear he would rather focus on getting the real work done instead of getting bogged down in governmental red tape.

The part of the bill written by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) says that Federal facilities should behave like anyone else in the State and meet the same natural resource protection requirements. Now, go figure: requiring the Federal Government to live under the same laws that the American people, the States and private-sector businesses have to live under. This is not a new concept. It is already the case under the Clean Air Act and RCRA. Let's just narrow the gap for the Superfund.

Finally, the portion that I wrote ensures that States have a place at the discussion table throughout the process that the EPA set for developing remediation plans.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the motion to recommit and a ''yes'' on final passage. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 225, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

AYES—188

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

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
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
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
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
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
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
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
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—19

Barton
Cleaver
Crowley
Gabbard
Garamendi
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sinema
Smith (WA)
Stockman
Terry

□ 1623

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 188, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—225

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
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 (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—188

Andrews
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
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
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey	Walz	Waxman
Vela	Wasserman Schultz	Welch
Velázquez	Waters	Wilson (FL)
Visclosky		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt	Gingrey (GA)	Ruppersberger
Barton	Guthrie	Rush
Cleaver	Heck (NV)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Conyers	Jones	Smith (WA)
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	Stockman
Gabbard	McClintock	
Garamendi	Ruiz	

□ 1631

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 10 on Final Passage of H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VINCENTE ''BEN'' GARRIDO BLAZ

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me here as I deliver this eulogy for a former Member of Congress.

I rise to pay tribute to the late Vicente ''Ben'' Garrido Blaz, Guam's former Congressman and a retired brigadier general in the United States Marine Corps. Ben passed away last night at the age of 85.

Ben was a longtime friend whose lifetime of service to Guam and our Nation has been an inspiration to generations. As a survivor of the Japanese occupation of Guam during World War II, Ben had a strong sense of patriotism and duty to our country. He was commissioned as an officer of the Marine Corps in 1951 and went on to become the first Chamorro to achieve the rank of brigadier general. In 1984, Ben was elected to serve in this House of Representatives, where he represented the people of Guam for four terms.

Throughout my time in Congress, Ben has been a strong source of support and guidance. I am grateful for his counsel and friendship, and I will miss him dearly.

I join the people of Guam mourning the loss of Congressman Ben Blaz. Our thoughts and prayers are with his sons, Mike and Tom, and their families.

I now ask for the House to observe a moment of silence in remembrance of Congressman Blaz.

I thank my colleagues who have joined me here, Mr. Speaker.

OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to attempts in the omnibus budget bill to restore any U.S. funding to UNESCO, a corrupt entity that is an extension of an anti-America, anti-Israel U.N. agenda.

UNESCO is attempting to pull a bait and switch on the American public. It says that it will use our constituents' money on World Heritage sites in our districts, but what it really wants is to use the funds that it lost when it admitted Palestine to its club.

UNESCO knew what would happen to it if it admitted Palestine, but the agency counted on this administration to give it the money anyway. Not only is money fungible, Mr. Speaker, but studies indicate that there is no guarantee that this designation of World Heritage site is beneficial to the local economy.

Taxpayer money for UNESCO is included in next week's omnibus budget bill. UNESCO must not receive a dime unless it reverses its decision on Palestine. I urge my colleagues to see through this guise and to continue to support American principles and U.S. law.

KELLOGG LOCKOUT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion recently about extending benefits to the unemployed, and it is critical we do that.

I would like to talk about 226 people who are in my district who have jobs but still can't come to work to perform those jobs and get paid. They worked at the Kellogg plant in Memphis, making cereal like Corn Flakes and Frosted Flakes, but they have been locked out by Kellogg since October 22 due to a national contract dispute.

The company, with sales of $14 billion at last estimate, hopes to bring in so-called ''casual'' employees who would be paid less and work fewer hours and get fewer benefits than the steady middle class jobs that the company offers now.

I am proud Kellogg is in my district, and I have toured their plant. When I am flying out of Memphis, I drive up and down Airways Boulevard. I go past the Kellogg plant, and I see those employees out each day, day and night, even in 10-degree weather earlier this week. Like the post office, they are out in rain, snow, or sleet. I see them on holidays, weekends, you name it, fighting for their rights, standing up for themselves.

It is time to end this lockout. Put those people back to work. Let's produce our cereal with good Memphis employees.

SEX TRAFFICKING AT THE SUPER BOWL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States is gearing up for the next Super Bowl. Unfortunately, so are human sex traffickers. Super Bowl Sunday is not just the sporting event of the year; it has also become America's traveling human trafficking magnet. Exploiters roam the streets looking for prey.

Last year, while the two teams battled it out on the field, a young trafficked girl prayed for her life while sold for sex. These are women and children who have been taken as sex slaves, becoming sought-after entertainment on Super Bowl weekend.

New Jersey's efforts toward eliminating this dastardly deed are to be commended. Hopefully, they are successful in curbing modern-day slavery at the Super Bowl. But this crime ought not to be, not at a major sporting event, not in our neighborhood.

That is why CAROLYN MALONEY and I have introduced H.R. 3530, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which will go after the traffickers and the consumers of this slavery. We need to protect victims and prosecute the slave trafficking deviants.

And that's just the way it is.

EXTEND EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our priority in Congress should be to find solutions, to boost our economy and get people back to work. While we are still working to get our economy back on track, Americans need to be able to feed their families and support themselves. It is about fairness.

That is why I urge my colleagues today to extend the emergency unemployment insurance. For every dollar spent on unemployment insurance, we generate $1.55 in new economic activity in its first year, which is why we create more jobs and will get Americans back to work.

In Florida alone, 70,000 people have lost this essential lifeline during the holiday season. And if we don't act, this number could double in the next 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply a question of fairness. It is the right thing to do for our families and for our economy.

BROWSE ACT

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about ObamaCare this afternoon and the fact that the President came out to the American people and said that healthcare.gov was going to work

like Amazon and Kayak, Web sites where consumers are able to go shop for products, and if they find a product that they like, then and only then do they have to put in their personal information—their date of birth, their credit card, their full name and address.

Healthcare.gov doesn't work that way. Before Americans can shop for products on healthcare.gov, they have to put all of their information—their address, their date of birth, their Social Security number—into a Web site that isn't secure.

I am introducing the BROWSE Act to make sure that Americans have an opportunity to search the Web site, look at products, and only if they find a product that they like, only then do they have to put in their personal information. Healthcare.gov should work like the rest of the Internet and the marketplace.

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of President Johnson's announcement of the war on poverty.

I recently had the opportunity to visit the Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library and Museum in Austin, Texas, and I was astonished by just how much he and the Congress were able to accomplish during his time in office. Since 1967, poverty has declined by more than a third. Still, 49.7 million Americans live in poverty, including 13.4 million children, but the war on poverty and the programs really worked. Here are some of them:

Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Head Start, school lunch, child nutrition, migrant assistance, Job Corps, legal assistance, small business and rural loans, and Indian reservation programs.

All of those were put into effect and really worked.

Dana Milbank had an article today in The Washington Post where he said, And what is the response to the 50th anniversary? It is the Republicans declaring war on the war on poverty, as they have for the last 50 years.

It is time for us to work together and continue to end poverty.

□ 1645

HONORING SERGEANT JACOB HESS

(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 a very heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of Sergeant Jacob Hess.

Jacob is a 22-year-old American hero—the embodiment of the greatness that gave birth to the country he so deeply loved. Raised in a military family, after graduating from North Central High School in Spokane, Washington, he joined the United States Marine Corps to serve and defend this country.

Jacob lost his life just a few days ago, New Year's Day, while supporting Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. He lost his life in the name of American freedom. He lost his life to protect all of ours.

He leaves behind a community that admired him, a country that pays him homage, and a family that has been forever changed by him. He was a son, a brother, and a husband. He says goodbye to the family that got the call they hoped they never would.

May God bless Sergeant Jacob Hess; his mother, Keirsten Lyons; his father, Mike Hess; his brother, Cameron; and his wife, Bridget. May God bless his family and all the brave men and women who have answered America's call to freedom.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, it is the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty. Although in many ways it has been a success, economic opportunity is still too often a stacked deck. Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal stated that J.P. Morgan, the giant Wall Street bank, last year paid out nearly $22 billion due to misdeeds and misrepresentations.

The stock market sets new records every day. Wall Street has recovered. When will Main Street?

While this is happening, 41 percent of the unemployed people in my district have been out of work for more than 26 weeks. They have run out of unemployment because Congress failed to act. The income difference between the wealthy and workers is greater than any time since the 1920s.

Mr. Speaker, when will a nation that proclaims itself a bastion of freedom, both economic and personal, free the poor from the shackles of poverty?

CONGRATULATING THE TOP THREE AWARD WINNERS FOR THE 2013 PENN STATE UNIVERSITY CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PUBLIC SPEAKING CONTEST

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the top three award winners for the 2013 Penn State University Civic Engagement Public Speaking Contest.

Students for the competition are nominated by their classmates in recognition of their speaking performances throughout the semester. In total, 1,500 students vie in the competition. Their speeches are what Aristotle, who wrote about rhetoric, would classify as ''deliberative,'' meaning their work is intended to spark public dialogue on matters of social or cultural importance.

The contest is judged by representatives from Pearson, The New York Times, Penn State, and the State College community.

For this year's competition, Amanda Hofstaedter of Chalfont, Pennsylvania, won first prize for her piece titled, ''Mandatory GMO Labeling: A Win-Win for Companies and Consumers.''

Sarah Bastian of State College, Pennsylvania, took second place for her work titled, ''Driving Down Demand: An Answer for Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking.''

And finally, Prithvi Nilkant of Mars, Pennsylvania, took third place for her work entitled, ''Creating a Safer Society for All.''

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate these winners, along with all the competing students, for not only their hard work, but also for their creativity and for their passion for public engagement.

NEXT STEP IN WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, when President Johnson declared war on poverty, this, the richest Nation in the world, had a poverty rate of 19 percent. By 1973, 9 years later, that rate had been brought down to 11 percent. We were definitely winning the war on poverty.

Unfortunately, too many politicians found success running down the achievements of the war on poverty. Scapegoating ''welfare queens'' furthered a narrative that the war on poverty was not worth fighting. But nothing could be further from the truth.

For example, Medicare and Medicaid, two poverty programs, made a difference, a tremendous difference, in the health security of older Americans. These two antipoverty programs have reduced the poverty rate of our senior citizens from over 30 percent to less than 10 percent.

The Congressional Black Caucus' 10–20–30 initiative targets communities of need with effective infrastructure investments. This proven approach was pioneered in the Recovery Act of 2009. Expanding this effective poverty fighter should be our next step in the long march of the war on poverty.

CONGRATULATING GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't let the first week in Congress go by without taking a moment to congratulate Grandfalls-Royalty.

Grandfalls-Royalty is one of the smallest public schools in Texas, with a student head count of about 27 kids. They had 16 of those guys in uniform not so long ago to play in the State championship six-man football game. I am proud to say that Grandfalls-Royalty defeated Milford 73–28.

Grandfalls-Royalty made their first debut in a State playoff game. It was held in the home of the Dallas Cowboys, the $1.2 billion home of the Dallas Cowboys. Frankly, it was also called. For the 13th time this season, it was called by the 45-point mercy rule. That meant the game ended with still 6 minutes and 28 seconds to play in the fourth quarter. Quite an accomplishment for a small school, one in west Texas that I am very, very proud of.

Congratulations to Grandfalls-Royalty.

UNCERTAINTY WITH IRAN

(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, the United States finds itself in a period of great uncertainty in the face of a new short-term deal with Iran.

The fact that Iran has finally come to the negotiating table is only proof that sanctions are working. The strength of our sanctions has severely devalued Iran's currency, crippled its economy, and forced it to finally consider curbing its nuclear program.

While we are hopeful for a broader deal, it is imperative that the United States and the international community remain vigilant. A nuclear Iran is the most pressing national security threat not only for the United States, but also for our allies in the Middle East, especially Israel.

As talks move forward, our security and the security of our allies in the region must remain our number one priority.

EMPLOYER MANDATE UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, back last summer when the President unilaterally announced that he was going to not enforce the employer mandate under the Affordable Care Act, I was quite surprised because the next day there was a news article in The New York Times about it. Democratic Senator TOM HARKIN was quoted in the article. He was one of the architects of the Affordable Care Act. He said, speaking of the President: This was the law. How can he do that? How can the President simply unilaterally choose to ignore the law?

Our Founders, Mr. Speaker, designed a system of government based upon a separation of powers. The legislative branch enacts the laws and the executive branch, the President, enforces those laws. They did that to protect our very, very fragile freedom. We cannot allow those separations to be eroded. One man who can both make the laws and enforce the laws is more a monarch than a President.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution requires, in part, that the President take care to faithfully execute the Nation's laws. In 1792, when George Washington was faced with enforcing an unpopular whiskey tax, he wrote in a letter that:

> It is my duty to see that these laws are executed. To permit them to be trampled upon with impunity would be repugnant to that duty.

President Obama, on the other hand, has, throughout his administration, picked and chosen which laws or parts thereof he wishes to enforce. House Resolution 442 would require the House of Representatives to institute a lawsuit against the President to comply with this article II, section 3 of the Constitution. It lists four specific examples where the President has either failed to enforce the laws or has gone beyond the laws as written:

One is the 1-year delay in the employer mandate under ObamaCare, which I mentioned earlier;

Another is the 1-year extension of the substandard insurance policies, which by my definition is any insurance policy anybody would really want to buy;

One is the waiving of the work requirements under the welfare laws; and

One is the granting of deferred removal action to illegal aliens.

Again, one man empowered to both enact the laws and enforce the laws is more a monarch than a President. This is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democrat issue. It is not a Tea Party action. This is not for messaging. H.R. 442 merely recognizes that no American, including the President, is above the law.

What would we say if the next President came in and said, I don't like the Affordable Care Act and, therefore, I am not going to enforce the individual mandate, which would gut the law? What would we say if President Obama or any other President said, I think the top income tax rate is too high and, therefore, I am not going to enforce it, or I am not going to enforce the lowest income tax rate? What is the difference between those situations and what President Obama is doing right now not enforcing the employer mandate under ObamaCare? After all, the Supreme Court has ruled that the penalties under ObamaCare are a tax.

What would we say if a President said, I am not going to enforce this tax against my friends but I will against my enemies, or I am not going to enforce it against my contributors but I will against everybody else? What is the difference between that situation and what the President has done granting 1,300 unilateral exemptions to different groups under the Affordable Care Act?

If the President is allowed to make the law or to ignore those laws passed by Congress, Congress can just go home; there is no need for the legislative branch. In fact, when Congress, following the President's lead, when the House of Representatives passed a bill that would delay the employer mandate for a year, which the President had already announced he was going to do unilaterally, the President threatened to veto it.

□ 1700

At this time, I yield to Representative MARTHA ROBY from Alabama.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much to my colleague from South Carolina. I just want to tell you that, as I travel throughout Alabama's Second District, the question I get over and over and over again is: What can we do about this executive overreach?

So I rise, Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of the people of Alabama's Second Congressional District to lend my support to Mr. RICE's S.T.O.P. Resolution in order to stop this overreaching Presidency. I appreciate so much the diligent and thorough work of my colleague's on this resolution, and I am proud to sign on as a cosponsor.

In advancing this resolution, we are seeking to finally stop constitutional overreaches by the executive branch and restore the separation of powers by bringing legal action against the Obama administration to compel the judiciary to rein it in. This resolution directs a civil action on behalf of the House of Representatives in Federal court in the District of Columbia, challenging four unilateral Obama administration actions, as have already been explained, that blatantly flout constitutional restraints on the executive branch. I am going to mention them again:

Specifically, these include the lifting of the Affordable Care Act's mandated requirements on the type of insurance providers can offer; the 1-year delay of the health care law's employer mandate; the adoption of a policy against deporting certain illegal immigrants, which is counter to U.S. immigration and naturalization laws; and the decision to waive the ''welfare to work'' laws.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration is certainly not the first administration to overstep its constitutional authority as, I would say, most Presidents in recent history have pushed the limits of executive power, but the actions taken in the last few years have been especially blatant and egregious. President Obama and his administration have recklessly stretched the scope of the executive branch, aggressively imposing by administrative rule or regulation what they can't achieve legislatively. When I am at home and am talking with my constituents about this, we talk particularly about the promulgation of rules. It is just a backdoor attempt to get done what the President can't get done here in the Congress.

Amazingly, in some cases, the administration has moved to delay, tweak or to otherwise alter the very health care law he pushed to enact, all while dismissing legislative proposals that would have had the same effect but would have had the benefit of being legal because they would have gone through the Halls of Congress. If allowed to stand unchecked, such actions present a dangerous threat to our constitutional separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, I wish this weren't necessary. I wish President Obama and his administration had the self-restraint to act within their constitutional bounds, but this administration's pattern of aggressively overstepping its authorities to implement policy and win political battles leaves us no choice to act. Our constitutional restraints on government are not always convenient for political or policy goals, but they are necessary for preserving the checks and balances that ensure this government still derives its authority from the people and not the other way around.

We know that working through the courts can take time, but the judicial branch has shown a greater willingness as of late to rein in these overreaches from the Obama administration. Two recent decisions that are worth noting have already struck down the Obama administration's attempts to flout the law and act outside of the constitutionally prescribed role of the executive branch.

One was the lower court's ruling overturning the President's attempt to appoint NLRB members without Senate approval, and the other was a rare mandamus order from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals that rejected the administration's attempt to simply not enforce laws related to Yucca Mountain and nuclear waste.

Mr. Speaker, this S.T.O.P. Resolution allows the House of Representatives to seek the intervention of the judicial branch to rein in these executive abuses and reconstitute the separation of power. I hope it also sends a message to the Obama administration that this body, as one half of a coequal branch of the United States Government, is not going to stand by and watch the erosion of this country's constitutional framework.

Again, a sincere thank you to my colleague from South Carolina for taking the lead on this, for showing leadership. I am proud to be able to state to the people of Alabama's Second District, when asked ''What are you doing about this?,'' that this S.T.O.P. Resolution is a step in the right direction. So thank you very much.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mrs. ROBY.

I yield to my friend and colleague from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague TOM RICE for introducing this important resolution. I am proud to stand in support of this, and I thank him for giving me a few minutes to discuss what is a very, very important issue today.

My friend knows that I was a writer. Before I came to Congress, I wrote a number of books. I spent a lot of time writing about and studying this great Nation—about the history of this Nation, about the history of the world—and I think I know a little bit about some of these things. I think one of the most remarkable but underappreciated characteristics of General George Washington, who was, I think, a hero for many of us, was his deference to the Continental Congress during the American Revolution. Although in many cases he knew what needed to be done, he always recognized that he derived his authority—he derived all of his power—not from himself but from the Congress, and he understood that the Congress was the organization and the body that held the power and the keys to a successful government.

It is a lesson, as we have been discussing here tonight, that, unfortunately, this President does not seem to appreciate or to even understand.

Our Founding Fathers made it very clear in the Constitution that the responsibility of the President was to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—not selectively chosen, not preferred or some of them ignored, but faithfully executed. It is his constitutional responsibility, but time and time again, we have seen this President as he ignores this constitutionally mandated responsibility. He prefers to pick and to choose which laws he will enforce.

I would like to quote eminent Judge Michael McConnell, who recently wrote:

> The Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, which advises the President on legal and constitutional issues, has repeatedly opined that the President may decline to enforce laws he believes are unconstitutional, but these opinions have always insisted that the President has no authority to refuse to enforce a statute which he simply opposes for policy reasons.

This has become a very troubling trend for this President. As my friend has already pointed out, among other examples, he has already declined to enforce immigration laws against a large number of illegal immigrants. He has chosen not to enforce work requirements that Congress mandated as part of the 1990 welfare reform programs, programs which had broad bipartisan support and which everyone recognizes were very successful. He has chosen to change the congressional requirements that States must meet under No Child Left Behind, and in none of these cases did he say he believed the laws were unconstitutional. He simply disagreed with the policies and so refused to enforce those laws. Now, we may or may not agree with the President on the merits of these policies, but as an institution, Congress should be extraordinarily concerned that the President is usurping our role as legislators, and it is setting a very dangerous precedent.

The President, for example, went to great lengths to convince the Supreme Court and other Americans that the Affordable Care Act was, indeed, constitutional. He won that battle, which means he should have to enforce this law that he argued was constitutional or, if not, come to Congress and ask for changes to the law, but over the last few months, we have seen numerous delays and exemptions to ObamaCare without any input at all from Congress. Now, once again, regardless of your views on the merits of ObamaCare, the President's actions should make everyone who respects the separation of power and the role of the executive very uncomfortable.

Can you imagine if Governor Romney had been elected President and if, on his first day in office, he had said, ''I am going to delay the employer mandate''? Do you think any of my colleagues from across the aisle would have supported him in that? Imagine if he had said, again as was illustrated before, ''I think that the capital gains tax is too high. To get our economy going, I am just not going to enforce the capital gains tax for a year.'' I mean, if he had done that, heads would have exploded all over Washington, DC.

Why would that have happened? He doesn't have the authority. The Constitution forbids it. We have a President, not a king. I don't want this President to act that way. I don't want a Republican President to act that way. Our Founding Fathers would be horrified if they were alive today and were watching what is happening with our Constitution and the growing power of the Presidency. This is dangerous, and it is demeaning to our democracy, and it simply must stop. I hope the President will remember his constitutionally mandated responsibility to enforce all laws, not just those laws that he chooses to enforce because he agrees with them.

Mr. RICE, thank you, sir, for drawing attention to this very important issue. Thank you for giving me a few moments to share this with you here on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. STEWART.

I yield to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from South Carolina. I appreciate his making this time available.

Mr. Speaker, truth be told, this is a leadership hour, so it tends to be Republicans down on the floor when it is a Republican leadership hour, and it tends to be Democrats down on the floor when it is a Democrat leadership hour, but as my friend Mr. STEWART said so well: this is not a Republican problem. This is not a President Barack Obama problem. This is a ''we, the people'' problem.

The concern is not that it is President Barack Obama who is saying the Affordable Care Act doesn't have to be enforced. The concern is that any President could say that any law doesn't have to be enforced. Thomas Jefferson said you are not likely to lose your freedoms through rebellion; you are likely to lose them little by little by little by little. That is why we all have to stand up together.

Mr. RICE is a freshman from South Carolina. I have only been here for two terms myself. I think about some of the giants of this institution, not just of the House but of the Senate as well. I think about one of my favorite Democratic Senators, Robert Byrd from West Virginia—a champion of article I of the Constitution. He was a Democrat second; he was an American first, defending the Constitution against Presidents, Republican and Democrat, who would take the people's power from Capitol Hill and take it down to the executive branch.

So I want to ask you now—and it may sound frivolous—if we had President Mitt Romney in the White House today and if Mitt Romney were deciding the Affordable Care Act did not need to be enforced, would you still be here on the floor, asking that Congress go to court to reclaim congressional powers? I ask my friend.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. As you said, Representative WOODALL, I am an American first and a Republican second, and if the President usurps the Constitution, I will call him to task.

Mr. WOODALL. I confess to you that I went on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—as all of my colleagues know, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee is responsible for doing all of the oversight over the executive branch—because I was certain Mitt Romney was going to win. I said, for far too long, power has been leaving the people's hands on Capitol Hill, gravitating down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House, and we in a Republican House will be able to do oversight over a Republican President and show the American people it is not about Republicans and Democrats; it is about article I and article II and about following the process, following the law, following the Constitution. It matters. It doesn't matter when times are good. It matters when things get dicey, when you begin to lose those freedoms little by little.

□ 1715

I want to ask my friend from South Carolina, because we went through this with recess appointments, whether or not there was the ability for the President to appoint folks of his choosing to various positions around the city. And what I read that D.C. court opinion to say is what President Obama has done is absolutely outrageous. It cannot possibly stand.

But what Congress allowed President Bush to do and President Clinton to do and President Bush before him to do and President Reagan before him to do, that was also unconstitutional; and Congress has to step up for the powers of the Constitution entrusted in us.

Is this your understanding?

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Representative WOODALL, that is exactly what this resolution is intended to do. It is intended for Congress to take action to enforce the Constitution.

Representative WOODALL, do you hear from your constituents back home when you speak to them that the President is breaking the law, and why don't you do something about that?

I do all the time. I think that is a result of the erosion of Congress' power—exactly what you are talking about.

Mr. WOODALL. We should absolutely have arguments on this floor about how much money should be spent on this program versus that program, whether or not we should authorize a new issue or do away with an old issue. Those are those things that divide us.

But we should be united, Republican, Democrat, House and Senate, over these constitutional issues of where does the people's power reside. Because if leaders like you, in the absence of Senator Byrd from West Virginia, in the absence of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, in the absence of some of those greats who formerly preserved the people's power, I don't know how it gets preserved.

I am certain that you face slings and arrows from folks thinking this is some sort of partisan stunt: you just don't like this President; you just have sour grapes over the last election.

I have gotten to know you well over your very short time in Congress. It is so valuable to me that you put your responsibilities as an American first—far above your responsibilities as a Republican—and that despite those slings and arrows, the Constitution comes first. It may not seem like we need the Constitution to protect us each and every day; but when we wake up and realize it is not there, it is going to be too late.

I hope this is something that spreads in a bipartisan way and in a bicameral way. We have preserved this Republic, this greatest form of government the world has ever known, only because folks have stood up when others did not see that necessity.

We need this. There is the necessity today, and I am grateful to you for your leadership.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, my friend.

I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. I thank my good friend from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), for bringing this resolution forward and for his leadership. This is a very important issue not only today, but as Mr. WOODALL pointed out here, also for the future of our Nation—a constitutional Republic, as you so eloquently put it.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution specifically requires that the President:

> Take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

This does not allow the President to enforce the laws he likes and ignore the laws he doesn't. This clause compels the President to ensure that all agencies within his executive branch are carrying out the laws created by Congress, the people's arm of government.

The current administration undermines this body on a near daily basis; and if it is allowed to continue to do so, as you pointed out, the balance of power will no longer exist. In fact, it is rapidly slipping away to one side of the balance scales. It is our duty as representatives of the American people to speak out about this. And if not us, who? And if not now, when?

The delay of the employer mandate, the extension of the substandard insurance policies, and the grant of the deferred removal action to certain illegal immigrants are just but a few examples of the executive attempting to legislate without Congress.

Luckily, the Framers instituted a system of checks and balances. This Congress has no choice but to turn to the courts. I offer my strong support for Congressman RICE's STOP resolution, H.R. 442, which will enable the House to bring a civil action against the executive branch and allow future legislators to hold the executive branch accountable.

I think this is the crux of this and this is the important part of this. Because it is for all future Presidents. Again, we have to stand up and start defending our Constitution.

This administration, like others before it, has no problem creating mandates for the American people, but cannot seem to follow the most important mandate of our Nation: the Constitution.

If you look at this, this simple little book, it is not an epic in volume. You can see it. It is very thin. But yet it is an epic in ideology of what free men and free women can do, and they are held accountable with their government by this little red book.

The importance of this issue cannot be overstated. We must address this now so that all future Presidents will know that they must abide by the Constitution. No President, past or present, Democrat or Republican, should ever be exempt from the duties laid out by our Founding Fathers.

That is why I support Congressman RICE's STOP resolution, H.R. 442, and I

urge all my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support this resolution for America and for our Constitution.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. YOHO.

I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

When we left in December to go back to our districts for the Christmas weekend, I got home and thought, Okay, the President is going to do something with ObamaCare as we get close to Christmas. You just know anytime you come up on a holiday, some news gets put out. July 3, leading into the 4th of July, was the employer mandate delay. The grandfather stunt was pulled leading into Thanksgiving.

And sure enough, December 19, the Obama administration grants a ''hardship exemption'' from the individual mandate tax penalty to those who have seen their plans canceled due to ObamaCare.

I don't think any of those plans should have been canceled. I offered a bill here, and the House passed something similar, to essentially grandfather in those plans. The Federal Government shouldn't be forcing people out of plans they like. Certainly, things needed to be done there.

But understand how unfair this is. If you had insurance and your policy is canceled, and then the ObamaCare replacements are not affordable for you, they are saying, Okay, you are fine. No penalty for you. But if you are somebody who couldn't have afforded insurance the prior year, and now you are told you are forced to go on these ObamaCare exchanges, you still have to pay the tax, even though you may have been worse off than some of those other folks.

Or if you are somebody that had employer coverage last year, and now maybe going out on your own and you need to buy individual insurance, if you end up in the exchanges and you don't find those affordable to you, you don't get the same relief.

When you are talking about arbitrary delays like this, it is inherently unfair.

Now, give the administration some credit. Unlike some of the other delays, there is actually a provision in ObamaCare that says people can qualify for a hardship exemption from the individual mandate. The problem is that in this instance it is ObamaCare itself that constitutes the hardship.

So because ObamaCare is implemented, these people are suffering a hardship. Therefore they are exempt from the statute. To me, I think that is an abuse of what the statute is supposed to do. Certainly, it begs the question, Could you simply delay or grant a suspension of all of these provisions of ObamaCare?

It is interesting because I was reading in the Weekly Standard publication, one of the reporters was asking members of the Senate what are their limits, what is the principled justification for his conduct.

And so the reporter asked one Senator:

> How do you determine if the President couldn't do something that it does exceed his authority? Are there any parts of the law that the President does not have the authority to delay or suspend?

The Senator's response—a Democratic Senator:

> I don't know. I'm not the scholar on that.

Well, the reporter went to another Democratic Senator and said:

> Are there are any delays the President wouldn't have the authority to make? Could the President potentially suspend the entire law if he wanted to?

His answer:

> I can't answer a hypothetical.

The reporter asked again:

> So you can't say if there are any parts of the law he couldn't delay unilaterally?

The Senator said:

> I can't answer a hypothetical.

Finally, another Senator told the reporter he doesn't know of any legal impediment preventing the executive branch from delaying the employer or individual mandates.

When asked:

> Couldn't a future President just simply come in and suspend the entire law?

That Senator said:

> I don't want to speculate what a future President might do.

And so I think those answers, when Senators and the President's own party cannot offer any principled justification for the President's conduct that would exclude the potential of a President simply delaying all provisions of the law, you know that you are not in the realm of faithful execution of the law.

I think it is a challenge. We have talked about it in this Chamber in hours like this. We have had hearings in the Judiciary Committee with experts—even liberal constitutional law experts—saying that this conduct goes beyond what the Founding Fathers intended and what the Constitution envisioned.

I would like to see somebody offer a principled justification for the President picking and choosing which parts of the law should be enforced and should not be enforced, should be delayed, should be suspended, or should be ignored.

It is interesting, because when you go back and look at the Founding Fathers when they created the Constitution, when they created the Congress, when they created the executive, at the convention James Wilson from Pennsylvania was the one who moved to create a President consisting of a single person. And that caused silence in the convention hall because they had just rebelled against Britain. And although you needed some type of executive power, there were some who were a little bit taken aback that you would even have a single President, even in a constitutional system. Some of the people said at the time that you can't really have a strong President and have a republic.

So this was a huge issue for the Founding Fathers. Clearly, it would not have been acceptable to stand up at the Constitutional Convention and say, Yes, the President is going to have the authority and duty to enforce the laws; but if there are laws he doesn't like, he will be able to delay provisions or ignore provisions as he sees fit, as long as it is consistent with his overall purpose or political agenda. That would not have been acceptable to anybody at the time.

Can you imagine if when John Adams succeeded George Washington, he just started delaying provisions related to the bank of the United States or the Jay Treaty? Imagine when Jefferson came in. He ran against the Alien and Sedition Act. Some of those were just allowed to expire, but they went in and repealed a core portion of the Alien and Sedition Act. They didn't just ignore it. The provisions that expired, expired; and then they repealed the provisions that were still in effect.

That is the way it is supposed to be done. They would never have allowed John Adams or Jefferson to come in and just willy-nilly enforce what they wanted to and not enforce what they didn't want to.

And so part of the frustration of this is Congress is supposed to stand up for its authority. I think the House people here realize that what the President is doing is not proper constitutional government, but the U.S. Senate is just totally out to lunch on this. They are not interested in safeguarding their institutional prerogatives, because they are putting their political interests ahead of the legislative body's authority. That really runs contrary to how the Founders envisioned the separation of powers and checks and balances working.

In Federalist 51 Madison said:

> Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.

What he meant by that is that, yes, you have separate powers. You have an executive, a legislative, and a judicial power. But just because you separate them doesn't mean that individual liberties can be secure.

So you have got to give each branch the ability to check the other branches. And they were sure they knew people would have different partisan allegiances and all that, but they were pretty sure that each branch would have the wherewithal and would want to defend its own prerogatives.

And so in this instance, I think what you don't have is a Senate that is willing to join with the House, use the power of the purse, use the appointment power, advise and consent, all the powers that we have, use those until the President starts conforming with the law.

□ 1730

But we are not there yet. And so this idea of trying to bring this in front of courts, we shouldn't have to do that. We should be able to defend our own turf. But it is frustrating because we don't have a lot of other options at this point.

So I think that my colleague from South Carolina, you know, I give him credit for thinking of what can we actually do that could potentially be successful. And so I am hoping that this move will be successful.

But I think, going forward—and this has been a problem before this President. He is not the only one who has pulled stunts like this, although I think he has gone beyond what any previous President has done.

Ultimately, people in this body and in the other Chamber have got to get serious about defending our constitutional responsibility. That means holding Presidents accountable who are not in accordance with article II, section 3, the ''Take Care'' clause. But it also means not delegating so much legislative authority to these bureaucracies when they end up essentially legislating, and those rules are imposed on the public without Congress saying anything at all about it.

So, ultimately, the courts cannot save us if we aren't willing to save ourselves and protect the authority that the Constitution grants us and that we are supposed to exercise on behalf of the people that we represent.

We are, especially in this House, we are the people's House. The President gets elected, too, but we are the closest to the people, and I think we have got to do a better job of this going forward.

So I would just tell my friend from South Carolina, Thank you for doing this. I know you have signed on. I have a resolution just to say that the House doesn't approve of this conduct, because I fear if we don't do anything, then we are basically setting a precedent where this is going to be unquestioned going forward.

So I think as much as we can do, even if we are not successful, at least we are showing people that we think this is a contested practice, and we are not willing to allow this to become something that is accepted for future Presidents, Republican or Democrat.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I thank my friend from Florida.

Separation of powers is fundamental to our form of government. The Congress enacts laws. The President enforces the laws. One individual who can both make the law and enforce it is more a monarch than a President.

Without the separation of powers, our form of government crumbles. As earlier speakers said, the erosion of the separation of powers didn't start with President Obama, but it has certainly accelerated. At home I am asked all the time, The President is breaking the law; why don't you do something about it? This resolution is an attempt to do exactly that.

Nobody would argue that the President has no discretion in enforcing the law. Clearly, he does. But in these four instances, he has clearly overstepped that discretion.

I fall back to say, what would we say if the President has the power to waive these things, the employer mandate, the penalty under the employer mandate, that is a waiver of a tax? What would we say if the next President waived the capital gains tax, or waived the maximum bracket under the income tax, or waived the income tax for his friends?

Clearly, that is beyond the discretion of the President. Clearly, President Obama has gone beyond his discretion, and Congress needs to enforce the Constitution.

We have 44 cosponsors to our bill so far, but we need the help of the American people. We need you to talk to your Representatives. If you need more information about our resolution or what you can do, please go to my Web site at www.rice.house.gov.

Thank you for your concern. Thank you for viewing. Let's protect our democracy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

THE CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. During our Special Order hour, we want to talk specifically about the need for unemployment insurance but, more broadly, about what we need to do to make sure that everyone in this country has access to opportunity.

Just yesterday, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty. President Johnson said, during his State of the Union in 1964:

> Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope, some because of their poverty, and some because of their color, and all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity.
>
> This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America. It will not be a short or easy struggle. No single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won. The richest nation on Earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it.

Those are the words of President Johnson 50 years ago when we started the war on poverty in this country. We created Medicare and Medicaid, the food stamp program and programs like Head Start. And we have great results from those programs.

In fact, according to a new study, these initial programs, coupled with expansion of pro-work and pro-family programs, like the earned income tax credit, have helped reduce poverty by nearly 40 percent since the 1960s. The poverty line fell from 26 percent in 1967 to 16 percent in 2012, when the safety net is taken into account.

Now, while there has been a lot of progress, we still have far too many people in this country who are still living in poverty or on the brink of living in poverty. Fifteen percent of Americans today are living below the poverty line, and that is just $11,490 for an individual. 46.5 million people in our country are living in poverty, and one in three Americans teeters on the brink of living in poverty. That includes 16 million children in this country. That is more than 700,000 people in my home State of Wisconsin.

According to the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in Rock County, in my district, a county that I share with Congressman PAUL RYAN, 22 percent of the children in that county are living in poverty.

We still have vast inequality, income inequality. We have unlivable wages. And we still have Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, who want to chip away at that very economic security. It almost seems like today it is not a war on poverty, but sometimes it seems like there is a war on the war on poverty, that we are actually stepping backwards from the very improvements we made over the years from 1960.

In fact, what we noticed that just happened was the not extending of the benefits, emergency unemployment benefits back in December, on December 28. It has affected 1.3 million Americans. Not only do we have issues like that, but we also have an attack on food stamps, where this very body has voted to cut $39 billion from the SNAP program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—$39 billion—affecting millions and millions of Americans.

We have seen attempts to not allow us to raise the minimum wage, a minimum wage that is entirely behind where it should be. If you took into consideration where it should be, just for inflation from 1968, that minimum wage in 2013 dollars would be at $10.60—not $7.25, at $10.60. We are way behind keeping up with inflation.

Income inequality is at an all-time high. We are finding that incomes for the top 1 percent have grown more than 31 percent since 2009, and the bottom 99 percent of people, their income has moved less than 1 percent. So we are in a challenging time.

We know that there was an economic downfall across the globe, and especially hard hit, we feel it in this country. And while we are having dual activities happen, jobs are creeping back up, we are having progress, but still, 7 percent of people are unemployed.

And while we have got those jobs creeping up, we still also notice that

people are being left behind with this economy, and that is exactly why we have tried to do things like extending the unemployment insurance benefits for people.

But unfortunately, in this body, in this very body, Mr. Speaker, austerity has ruled the day. Austerity has taken place, instead of prosperity. Instead of doing measures that would lift people out of poverty and help people get a job and help people be able to support their families, we are trying to take government down and down and down, like they did in Europe, and they have had disastrous results from doing that.

That is not a path out of our current economic condition. We need to be investing in our people so that they have those opportunities. They can grab a ring at that ladder and get a good job and be able to get by. So there are so many things we need to do.

Unfortunately, these attacks aren't just in this body, in the Congress. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, these attacks are even happening in the States.

In my home State of Wisconsin, our Governor, Scott Walker, was recently on a CNN program. And when he was asked about extending unemployment benefits, his response was, the reason why the White House is so actively pursuing this, unemployment insurance, is they want to desperately talk about anything but ObamaCare.

Can you believe the Governor of a State who is 37th in job creation, who promised when he was elected to create 250,000 jobs, and he has done a portion of that, is somehow trying to say that helping people to get out of poverty, helping people to be able to support their family with groceries and to be able to pay their rent or mortgage, at a time of still having record people who are out of work, while we are trying to start getting jobs to come back, at 7 percent, at that time, Mr. Speaker, that Governor can still only talk about ObamaCare, as all too often this body has done.

We need to act now. The time to act on this, for this body, is now. 1.3 million people are currently out of work and trying to get those benefits they need so desperately during that period that have been cut off. And every week, across the country, 72,000 new Americans will lose their benefits if we don't do something—72,000 thousand people across the country.

Mr. Speaker, in our Speaker of the House's district alone, you look at the largest cities in that district in Ohio: Springfield, Ohio, 60,000 people, that would be like having your entire city of Springfield go unemployed in a single week; in the city of Hamilton, 62,000 people, 1 week, all out of work; Middleton, 48,000 people, you can take that and the surrounding communities, all in 1 week, out of work if we don't do something.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this body do something. 1.3 million Americans have lost these benefits at the end of December, including 20,000 military veterans who aren't getting the benefits they need. These are hardworking people who are still trying to find jobs in this economy, but there are just not enough jobs yet available. And in many fields it is even tougher.

Right now, 24,000 Wisconsinites have lost these important, vital lifelines, and the number just keeps going up every single week by 72,000 people. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans adjourned Congress on December 12, more than 2 weeks before these benefits were set to expire. We could have done something, we could have stayed and worked, and instead we didn't. Now, because of that, we have 1.3 million and counting people who don't have access to these vital benefits.

Now, let's just think about this. Under President Bush, five times we extended these benefits without any strings attached like this Congress is trying to do to this President, five times, and the unemployment was less than the 7 percent we are at right now. It is hypocritical for us not to do what we all did together five times under President Bush while people are still looking for work.

The bottom line is you still need this money, not just to pay for groceries and to pay for rent or your mortgage, but you need things to be able to get a job. If you don't have the ability to pay for gas in your car, how are you going to be able to find a job? You need to be able to have that car to go to interviews to find a job.

□ 1745

You need to be able to pay for your phone so you can receive a phone call for these jobs. These are all reasons why we need to make sure those benefits are available for all too many people in this country.

There is also what happens to the economy when you don't have these benefits in place. Just in the first week since Congress cut off long-term unemployment, our local economies across America lost $400 million of potential economic activity, and that is going to grow every single week. So it is a double-whammy: not only the people who are desperately looking for work, trying to find that job, not able to find that job, but we are also going to have even more people be unemployed because of the overall impact that has on the economy.

It has been said that 200,000 jobs would be lost in 2014, and we are going to decrease the gross domestic product simply by not doing these benefits. The bottom line is, there are so many reasons why we need to do this. Later, I am going to talk more about my State of Wisconsin and why it is important.

I am joined by one of my colleagues here today who is actually the cochair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Representative RAÚL GRIJALVA. Representative GRIJALVA has served in Congress for six terms. He is a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and he also serves on the Committee on Natural Resources, where he is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation.

He is a tremendous Member of Congress. He has been a mentor to many of us who are freshmen, who recently have joined, and is a very strong member of our Progressive Caucus, speaking on behalf of each and every American who needs opportunity. It is my pleasure to yield now to the gentleman from Arizona, Representative GRIJALVA.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Congressman, let me at the outset thank you for the opportunity to provide some clarity to the discussion and the lack of debate, many times, in this House about what is really important to the American people. That clarity is important to this whole Congress. It is important specifically to our Democrats and in particular to the Progressive Caucus, of which you are a member, and I want to thank you for that and for your efforts.

The Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation program expired on the 28th because of a lack of action on the part of the majority—the majority being the Republicans—cutting off an average weekly benefit of $300, as has been stated, to 1.3 million job seekers. Without that extension, another 72,000 Americans on average are estimated to lose their unemployment insurance every week during the first half of this new year.

All economists agree that providing extended unemployment benefits is one of the most effective job creation strategies available during a high period of joblessness. In this period of economic uncertainty, every $1 of unemployment compensation creates 52 cents in additional economic activity beyond that dollar. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that extending benefits for another year will save 200,000 jobs.

The failure by the Republicans to extend Federal unemployment insurance at the end of last week is already taking more than $400 million out of the pockets of American job seekers nationwide and State economies.

Unemployment insurance is viewed as a very effective stimulus because Americans without jobs tend to spend their unemployment insurance right away and on the very basic needs that they and their families need.

Democrats have called on Congress to extend the Federal emergency unemployment insurance program through 2014. Congress must act soon to restore those necessary benefits to the unemployed workers and to their families.

This economy still has 1 million fewer jobs than before the Great Recession began; 37 percent of the unemployed have been out of work for more than 6 months; almost 1.9 million more would lose their unemployment benefits in the first half of 2014, as their State benefits run out.

In my State of Arizona, the failure by the GOP, the Republicans, to reinstate and extend the unemployment compensation benefits directly affected 17,100 unemployed workers in Arizona. An additional 22,500 unemployed workers will lose their benefits in the first 6 months of 2014 if this Congress does not act.

Arizona has an average of an 8.3 percent unemployment rate throughout the State. There has been a 20 percent reduction in unemployment benefits to these workers since 2011. So we stand a chance, in Arizona, to save up to 2,000 jobs and reinstate for 17,000 people their unemployment benefits if this Congress were to act now.

We are here today, with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) managing this hour, to talk about the necessity and the urgency of the extension of unemployment benefits that has to be a priority for this Congress.

For those willing workers and their families, it is an essential, essential act by this Congress. These workers should not be pawns in political gamesmanship or in gotcha strategies by the Republicans to try to, in effect, embarrass the President. That does not need to be part of this equation. As Mr. POCAN pointed out, this has been dealt with in a bipartisan manner. This renewal, regardless of who has been in the White House, has been a response to the needs of the American people and their workers. I also believe that people receiving unemployment should not be subjected to punitive, mean-spirited requirements in order to receive that support.

We need action. We don't need posturing. We don't need empty preaching from the majority on extending unemployment benefits. That needs to be done and done immediately.

As we talk about unemployment benefits and their extension, I also want to mention that we have to realize that there is not a subtle or overly covert agenda at work here by the majority. We see the nonaction on unemployment, a vital and necessary response that, in the past, has been met with bipartisan support. We now see cuts amounting to $20 billion in nutrition and basic sustenance support for people in need, the SNAP program in the farm bill. That cumulative effect of $20 billion will affect many, many families, children, and adults throughout this country.

There is also a growing wage and income inequality and disparity in this country. That has been as a consequence of policies in which we reward those that are doing well—and God bless them, and they should do well, and we should be proud of them—we reward them with tax breaks, with loopholes, and with the ability to increase their income and their purchasing power while at the same time shifting the burden of responsibility for basic services in this country to hard-working, middle class people in this country. That income inequality is possibly one of the most dangerous economic realities that is happening to this Nation, and that, too, is an agenda that is going on and continues to go on in the policies and the initiatives that are being promoted by the majority party in this House.

There is a huge need in this country for a livable minimum wage that pays people for the actual work that they do. We can't ignore the sequester cuts and how they have directly affected child care and the ability for parents, and particularly women, to be able to work and have some security that their children are being taken care of. The cuts in that area, in Head Start, in particular, are going to be devastating; early childhood education, the cuts in that area, and the freedom that it would provide parents to be able to feel secure about being at work while their children are learning and being taken care of.

The cuts in job training and the ability for people to seek new careers and change the orientation of where they are working, that has been cut. Public education, an investment strategy that, in hard economic times, has been critical to our country, again, is being cut. Access and affordability of higher education, again, being cut.

There has been no jobs bill. It was interesting to hear the Speaker of the House say the other day that it is the Democrats' fault that there is no jobs agenda that has been presented. There has been a jobs agenda presented over and over again by a variety of colleagues in this House, in the Senate, and by the administration. The inaction and them turning their face to that reality has been a consequence of the leadership in this House that has refused to deal with that.

Unemployment benefits are part of a greater crisis, a crisis of economic fairness in this country, a crisis that demands that this Congress look beyond its own rhetoric and look at the reality.

In my district, every time in our office people come in seeking help from us, and, invariably, the biggest request is, How can I find a job? How can I get trained for a new career? How can I get myself in a situation where I can go back to work and feel secure in taking care of and supporting my family? For single heads of households, it is the same issue.

I would suggest that if we really want to deal with the economics and not just provide rhetoric about jobs that we look at the first necessary step: extend these unemployment benefits, provide some security and some sustainability to millions of workers in this country, and then move on to the real agenda, which is to provide some fairness to these workers and some opportunities to these workers.

Again, Congressman POCAN, I appreciate the time and yield back.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Congressman GRIJALVA, for so articulately outlining the austerity policy of the House Republican leadership and their stunning lack of ability to get anything done to help the 1.3 million people who are out of work and the 72,000 Americans each and every week that are going to lose their benefits if this House doesn't act.

It is now my pleasure to introduce a stalwart progressive in the U.S. Congress, the ranking member of the House Committee on Financial Services, as well as a member of the House Steering and Policy Committee. She is a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and was past chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. It is my honor to now yield to Representative MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. I would certainly like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative MARK POCAN, for yielding to me, and I congratulate him for organizing this Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order on unemployment insurance.

Fifty years ago this weekend, in his the State of the Union address, President Lyndon B. Johnson declared a war on poverty. He introduced Federal legislation, even proposed State initiatives that would over time improve health, education, nutrition, and access to housing, employment, and economic opportunity.

Although America has changed a great deal since that day, poverty and economic inequality are still at the forefront of our Nation's problems. They are only exacerbated by the Great Recession. The gap between the rich and poor in America has become a chasm. Today, 20 percent of the income in our country goes to the top 1 percent of Americans, and the top 1 percent holds about 40 percent of the country's wealth. This inequality is mirrored in our communities, our housing and rental markets, and our financial system, where a lack of access to banking services often causes working families to have debts that spiral out of control.

Mr. Speaker, inequality in this country has reached a point that for many, the American Dream of upward mobility and unlimited economic opportunity has been greatly diminished.

The 2008 financial crisis cost our economy $12 trillion, as millions lost their homes and jobs. This destruction of wealth disproportionately hurt our Nation's most vulnerable and only widened the gap between the rich and the poor. Even the gains from growth during the recent recovery have overwhelmingly benefited the wealthiest people in society.

Almost 95 percent of the income gains since the recovery began have been captured by the top 1 percent. Meanwhile, the minimum wage has not been increased since 2009. Mr. Speaker, this is totally unacceptable. Chronic unemployment and poverty still plague many of our communities. American families are still struggling to make ends meet. Four million Americans have been out of work for 27 weeks or

more, and the economy still has 1 million fewer jobs than before the Great Recession began.

□ 1800

Those there are other factors at play. Much of this inequality is a result of some of the government policies that we make, and government policy can help reverse these alarming trends.

But instead, our friends on the opposite side of the aisle are digging us deeper and deeper into this crisis. They passed the farm bill that cuts SNAP nutrition program for low-income families by $40 billion, and then the Republicans let unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployment expire 3 days after Christmas.

Already, 1.3 million unemployed Americans have lost their Federal unemployment insurance. That includes 20,000 military veterans. Each day this program sits expired, thousands of additional struggling Americans are adversely affected.

As State benefits are exhausted in the first 6 months of 2014, an additional 1.9 million Americans will lose their unemployment insurance. In fact, every week another 72,000 job-seekers will lose their benefits during the first half of this year.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment insurance is critical to struggling families. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, unemployment insurance kept 2.5 million people above the poverty line in 2012, including 600,000 children.

Unemployment insurance is good for the economy. According to Moody's Analytics, every dollar of unemployment insurance generates $1.55 in new economic activity in the first year. The bipartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that 200,000 jobs could be lost in our economy if unemployment insurance is not extended.

We must act and act immediately to extend unemployment insurance. So I call on my Republican colleagues to bring the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, that is H.R. 3824, to the House floor and pass it now.

With one in five American children living in poverty, it is clear that the war on poverty has gone on for far too long. Let's take action now to have all Americans share in our Nation's growth and prosperity. Let's bring an unemployment extension bill to the floor, and let's bring it now. Let's bring a substantive jobs bill to the floor now, and let's bring a minimum wage increase to the floor now. American families have suffered enough. It is time to restore the American Dream.

As I wrap up, let me just say this on behalf of the American people. I hear these arguments every day from the opposite side of the aisle saying if you can continue to extend these unemployment benefits, you are simply going to undermine the will for people to go to work. What you are going to do is make them comfortable on these unemployment benefits, and they won't go look for a job.

Well, I want to tell you I have not talked to everyone whose on unemployment or who needs extended benefits; but I can tell you this, American folks want jobs, they want to work, they want to earn a decent living, they want to earn wages to take care of their families and their children. Their aspirations and their goals are the same as yours and mine. They want what America has promised.

I would say to those who would continue this argument, don't disrespect the American people that way. Don't undermine the American people that way. Do what you know is right, what makes good sense, and let us help out those who are the most vulnerable, who need us now at this time so that they can continue to look for jobs, so that they continue to aspire to have the American Dream, and I thank you very much.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative WATERS. Your efforts over the years have been so appreciated by so many, and I hope the House Republican leadership will listen to your pleas and bring this to a vote.

It is now my honor to introduce one of my fellow freshmen who has rapidly been recognized not only for his hard work and effort, but for his skills, and his work on behalf so many across this country. I would like to yield some time to my colleague Representative JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the Badger State, for his continued leadership, and each and every week when we are in session coming to the floor of the House of Representatives and articulating the progressive message for all to hear and for the good of the country. I appreciate you yielding some time during this Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order.

This month we marked the 50th anniversary of the declaration of the war on poverty. We know that on January 8, 1964, President Lyndon Baines Johnson came to this very Chamber, spoke to a joint session of Congress, and laid out a series of initiatives designed to combat chronic poverty in this country.

As a result of this effort, there were many legislative battles that were won: in the march toward the creation of a Great Society, Medicare, Medicaid, Head Start, school breakfast program, the Food Stamp Act, minimum wage enhancement, Job Corps, college work study. These were programs all part of that Great Society era enacted between 1964 and 1966; and taken together with other war on poverty initiatives, they managed to rescue millions and millions of Americans from their impoverished condition and set them on a pathway toward the middle class.

Over the years, we have attempted to continue that war on poverty with great success such that the situation in America now is better than it was in 1964; yet we know that the war continues. Instead, it seems like as opposed to waging a war on poverty here in this Chamber, many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to embark on a war against the poor, a war against middle class families and senior citizens, those who are striving to realize the full potential of the American Dream. And that's why we are also so troubled by the failure to extend long-term unemployment benefits.

Now, I arrived in this Chamber feeling as if I was prepared for the experience, given the professional and educational legislative experiences that I had had in advance of January 3, 2013. And it has been my honor and my privilege to work with such a tremendous class of freshmen.

I have been troubled over the last year by the fact that I appeared deficient in one area, and that is in my failure to have any meaningful experience in the art of hostage negotiation. But from the very beginning that I set forth in this Chamber, it seemed as if those skills were necessary in this climate.

In January of 2013, we had to wait more than 75 days before this House would pass a Superstorm Sandy relief package, unprecedented in the history of this Congress' response to a natural disaster because there were some who put forth a ransom note, demanding offsets, even though never had that happened in the history of the Republic.

Then several months later, in the run-up to October 1, you had an Affordable Care Act law passed by this Congress in 2010, signed by the President, declared constitutional by the Supreme Court in an opinion parenthetically written by Chief Justice John Roberts, and then reaffirmed with the overwhelming electoral college election of the President in 2012. Notwithstanding any of that, you had folks demanding an exchange for keeping the government open: that we either delay, destroy, or defund the Affordable Care Act. Again, a ransom note exercise.

Here we are, 1 year removed from my inaugural experience around the Superstorm Sandy debacle back again facing an almost unprecedented situation where the majority has said, in exchange for us renewing long-term unemployment benefits for Americans that reasonable people should conclude are in need, not only do we want a pay-for, almost unprecedented, the last 17 times that this has been extended, but we have got a whole list of ransom demands that we want enacted in order for us to rescue these Americans who are in distress.

I am just hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we can get together subsequent to the United States Senate which has signaled and indicated its willingness to move forward, see to it that it shouldn't be the case that in exchange for taking a positive step forward in this institution, we always have to take two steps backward.

The positive step would simply be to renew the provision of unemployment benefits for the long term, individuals who have been working hard to find a job, and then coming together to figure out collectively how we can all move forward in the best interest of this country and our economy. I am hopeful that that will take place in the next day or week, certainly within the month, and we will continue to press forward in that regard.

With that, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his continued leadership.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative JEFFRIES, and thank you for articulating, I guess, what I have been feeling also for the last year, my lack of hostage-taking skills. I certainly learned some in the last 12 months serving in this body.

It is now my pleasure to yield some time to my colleague from California, Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, who is the first Mexican American woman to be elected to Congress. She cofounded the bipartisan Congressional Study Committee on Public Health. She became the first woman to chair the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and serves as the chairwoman of their health care task force.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend Congressman POCAN for his leadership and his hard work on this very, very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of 1.4 million Americans who lost their emergency unemployment insurance during the holiday season and the millions of Americans who stand to lose their benefits in 2014 if Congress fails to extend unemployment insurance.

It is an insult to the American worker to oppose the extension of these benefits on the premise that emergency unemployment insurance provides a disincentive to work and that it makes unemployed Americans content to live off of the taxpayer-supported benefits.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that Americans have a strong work ethic and are the best and most productive in the world. And the reality is that in spite of their efforts to find employment. There are still 1.3 million fewer jobs today than there were when many of these Americans lost their jobs due to our country's economic downturn. It is unconscionable to punish those who lost their job through no fault of their own and continue to actively seek work.

With nearly three job-seekers for every available position, American workers are unemployed not because they are not motivated to work, but because there are simply not enough jobs for everyone who needs one. This problem is magnified in my home State of California where there are 400,000 fewer jobs available today than there were 6 years ago.

Unemployment benefits average $300 per week and replace less than 50 percent of prior earnings. Yet these benefits can make the difference between homelessness and hunger. They are often the only means of keeping a roof over one's head and putting food on the family table. For example, in 2012, unemployment benefits kept an estimated 2.5 million Americans, including 600,000 children, out of poverty.

It is also worth noting that unemployment benefits do more than provide a critical lifeline for out-of-work Americans. It is estimated that each dollar of unemployment insurance generates $1.50 in new economic activity. This means our economy is losing $400 million every week Congress refuses to extend these benefits.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office also estimates that the economy will lose 200,000 jobs if emergency unemployment insurance is not extended.

Unemployment insurance is a moral imperative that will also keep our economic recovery moving in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, we are a country of hardworking Americans. We must not turn our backs on those who need this critical Federal assistance as they struggle to find work.

□ 1815

I strongly urge Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR to schedule floor action on extending emergency unemployment insurance benefits without delay.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much.

It is so important to note that 37 percent of the people who receive these benefits have been searching for a job over 6 months, the very people who are going to be affected, 72,000 a week if this House doesn't act.

I now yield to another colleague, someone who has been a stalwart member of the Progressive Caucus, is the senior whip for the Democratic Caucus, and she is currently a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security Committee and a strong advocate for people who are trying to lift themselves out of poverty and find opportunity in America.

It is my pleasure to yield to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind leadership, because it is kind leadership, and I am very privileged to be very proudly a member of the Progressive Caucus, serving as the vice chair liaison on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus to the Progressive Caucus and a member of the Executive Committee and have watched this caucus take on hard issues. First, of course, issues that dealt with the idea of minimum wage and the underpayment, if you will, of Federal contractors paying Federal employees who are contracted to them.

We have understood the distinction of the 99ers versus the 1 percent and waged a strong battle to make sure that the 99 percent were heard. So today, I want to join the gentleman and say that time is running out. Just this week, as I indicated earlier today and the day before, those whose benefits were cut off on the 28th are receiving those notices or are receiving empty mailboxes just in time for the end of the month and the beginning of the monthly bills. Whether it is one's mortgage or rent, whether it is the utilities that one has to pay, whether it is care of one's elderly parent or children, I can assure you that the 1.3 million, 4,000 per week, 12,000 in Harris County, 66,000 in the State of Texas, are now confronting some very difficult times.

Now, I think it should be known that when we say the term ''progressive,'' it is also a term that celebrates the greatness of America, its diversity, its opportunity and prosperity. I have not heard one of our members of the caucus in any way challenge prosperity, victory, or success. In fact, I am going to share with my colleagues what the Houston Chronicle put on the front page: ''Sales of million-dollar homes snowball here.''

That gives a false image of America, congratulating those citizens and families who are able because of the greatness of this Nation, because of the hard work of themselves and so many who contribute to the economy, because of the hard work of those who are now chronically unemployed or unemployed who contributed to society and want to contribute to society, they are able to be prosperous. It is good news for the real estate industry and my friends who are in that industry and good news for small businesses, but that clouds the issue and it allows people to falsely represent that all is well.

The chronically unemployed number in the United States is higher than it has ever been. It is 2.6 percent, juxtaposed against a 7 percent unemployment rate. It varies across America.

So I want to join the gentleman with a very loud, clarion voice, hopefully a voice of clarity, that you can have prosperity. We are a capitalistic society. There is good news in Houston. But at the same time, when I held an outreach press conference on December 31, fearing the worst, that there was a full house of people looking for work, people telling their stories of how long they looked for work, and the sadness of not being able to find work, and the faith community joining in and the social network community indicating they don't know how long they are going to last with this added number of individuals. Food banks, emergency food stamps and others, they didn't know how long they were going to last.

It is imperative that we have, within these hours, movement by the other body, which we congratulate for making the first step. But I would like to say this should be an emergency, an emergency vote for a 3-month extension and then the opportunity to go forward on a more deliberative analysis of how we can fund the rest of the time.

So I would hope—we voted today. Democrats voted to extend the unemployment. I hope that the Progressive Caucus' voice will be heard. I thank the gentleman because I want the 1.3 million and growing number to be able to have the same dignity as those who can celebrate the purchase of a million-dollar home, which we don't in any way challenge, but we realize that there are people who simply want to be able to make that rental payment or mortgage payment. They can do it. Although they are making ends meet, they can do it if we recognize the importance of giving them that transitional bridge. Pass the unemployment insurance benefit now.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative JACKSON LEE. I think you clearly explained the dilemma we have.

While the economy is slowly bouncing back—and this President has brought us from a 9.8 percent unemployment rate he inherited down to 7 percent—and jobs are slowly being created, we still are noticing that there are still people being left behind. We have to recognize that as well.

I believe Secretary Robert Reich wrote a piece that appeared today that explained that so well. Unfortunately, due to income inequality, the gap of the percentage of people who are poor, are working but still are not earning enough, we need to talk about that as well.

I now yield to another one of my colleagues, one of my freshman colleagues who in fact has been elected by our Democratic class as the freshman class president. He serves on the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform where he is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs, and is also on the Committee on Natural Resources. It is my honor to yield to Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank my valued and trusted colleague from Wisconsin for granting me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a Congressman from Pennsylvania, in fact, a Congressman from Scranton, Pennsylvania, the birthplace of Secretary Robert Reich, I might add, someone we are very proud of. And I am very proud myself to be a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I rise here to speak in support of a reasonable extension for UI benefits with no strings attached.

I say ''no strings attached'' because every time we have extended long-term UI benefits, we have done so with no strings attached, no political wrangling, no arm wrestling. ''No strings attached'' means no conditions whatsoever. It is the right thing to do because you have to do it in a situation like this. In fact, five times during the George W. Bush administration, this Nation extended UI benefits on an emergency basis with no strings attached, and I see no reason why we have to depart from this American precedent today.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, the importance of fiscal responsibility. It is not like there is only one party that understands fiscal responsibility. We get that on this side of the aisle, and we get that in the Congressional Progressive Caucus as well. But the question is of timing. We want to balance the budget. We want to pay down the national debt. We get why those things are important, and we know that UI benefits can't last forever.

But the fact of the matter is it is an emergency now. As our dear friend, the gentlelady from Texas just styled it, it is an emergency now. The reason it is an emergency is the vast number of American citizens who are long-term unemployed. Mr. Speaker, 1.3 million on December 28 got cut off. In my own district in northeastern Pennsylvania, over 6,000 families got cut off on December 28, 3 days after Christmas.

The fact of the matter is this is not American tradition. Since 1959, we have never ended long-term UI benefits at a time when so many Americans are long-term unemployed. The gentlelady from Houston just mentioned it is 2.6 percent long-term unemployed in this country right now. Every other time we have cut off long-term UI benefits, it has been at a time when the people who are long-term unemployed are way less of a percentage. I think the previous highest percentage was 1.3 percent, in other words, half the percentage that we have now. Now is not the right time to cut off people from long-term UI benefits.

Mr. Speaker, these are real people we are talking about. Before my voice entirely gives out, I want to read to you a letter I got from a lady named Carol Blankenhorn from Schuylkill Haven in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, which I proudly represent. Carol writes:

> I am writing because I am a single unemployed mother that does not get any child support and have been supporting myself and my son up until my territory at my job was dissolved. I have been very diligent in my job search, but to no avail. I believed that at least I had 26 weeks of standard benefits, but the emergency extension is so crucial to me and others because of the poor economy and the lack of jobs. I have now received a notice of exhaustion for benefits in 3 weeks, and I am devastated. I am not one of those people that are sitting back collecting. I couldn't live with myself. But now as I sit and look at my son 1 week before Christmas, I am beside myself and have no idea how I am to survive. I am urging you to please extend and renew emergency Federal extended unemployment benefits. In closing, I would ask you to please respond to me of your views and intentions on this very important issue.

That was Carol Blankenhorn, a real person from Schuylkill Haven, Pennsylvania. These are real people we are talking about. Leaving aside the damage to the economy of stopping UI benefits at this point, leaving aside all of the economic realities that favor extending UI benefits, remember above all, we are talking about real people and real families; and that alone, in the dead of winter, is a great argument not to cut people off UI benefits at a time when it is next to impossible to find another job.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative CARTWRIGHT, for not only your long-time advocacy on behalf of so many people, but for sharing the personal stories, because I think that is what matters the most.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. POCAN. I have all sorts of stories that I would read but I don't have time to from construction workers who are out of work and need these benefits, from machinists who are out of work, a surgical nurse in Baraboo, Wisconsin. There are so many people who need these benefits, and the very stories that Representative CARTWRIGHT shared, I just have pages of these stories of people across the country who need these benefits to continue to get by while they are looking for work. They are not lazy. They are not sitting back. They want to work. And in this economy, they are doing everything they can to try to, but the economy is not ready for some of these people and we have to do everything we can.

I do want to read one story. I had an opportunity this afternoon to meet with a constituent from Reedsburg, Wisconsin. She was recently the winner of Half in Ten's Our American Story: 50th Anniversary of the War on Poverty Storytelling Contest. Her name is Amy Treptow. She was here with her daughter, Anna. She has benefited from programs that we have put together for people who are lower income. I will read her words:

> I have always worked hard and played by the rules, but I was still living on the brink of poverty. My story is the story of millions in today's economy in which there aren't enough jobs and/or adequate training for the ones that are available. The basic need for more good jobs and training programs seems to be overlooked in today's conversation about poverty.
>
> I am a veteran and a divorced mother with two children. I went to school to become an elementary schoolteacher but wasn't able to find full-time employment, so I enrolled in a skills enhancement program at my local community action agency in Wisconsin. The program assists low-income adults that are working a minimum of 20 hours per week to gain job skills in order to be able to have a job that pays a living wage with health benefits.

□ 1830

> I was working as a contract teacher making $15,184 a year, which is far below the poverty line for a family of three. Once I enrolled in the program, I started to take coursework to get certified as a reading specialist. The program helped me with the tuition and other school expenses and provided me with case management services. I was also living in section 8 housing and received housing counseling, as well as participating in the agency's Family Self-Sufficiency Program. I am now a full-time employee with benefits as a reading specialist instructor

helping low-income children, along with two other jobs, and I now own my own home.

And she goes on.

By providing these safety nets, the very safety nets that we celebrated yesterday on the 50-year anniversary of the war on poverty, we have helped someone like Amy and her family lift themselves out of poverty, but we have to do that right now in helping others.

I would like to, at this point, yield some time to my colleague from Illinois, someone who has been a mentor to me my entire career in the legislature, and so glad to serve with her now in Congress, a very staunch Progressive, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY from the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. If that referred to me, I apologize.

Thank you very much for organizing this hour for the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about human issues that really don't lend themselves to any kind of political label. We are talking about people. And I think this is what has hurt me so much is the meanness, the meanness.

I just celebrated my 15th year here in the House of Representatives, and I have to tell you that we have disagreed across the aisle on a lot of different things, but the demonization of people who are struggling just to live a decent life. We are talking about people when we talk about the unemployed who aren't looking for the huge fancy job. They want to make enough to be able to raise their children comfortably, to be able to eat, put a roof over their head, just modest things that add up to a decent life.

Aside from all the arguments on why it is really dumb economically to not extend those unemployment benefits, that it will actually cost us jobs, 250,000—I don't know what the estimate is—if we don't put money in people's pockets that they can go out and spend, why would things that used to have a bipartisan consensus not prevail today?

In 1959, 1962, 1973, 1977, 1985, 1994, and 2003, we extended unemployment insurance benefits until the level of long-term unemployment—those are people unemployed over 6 months—fell below 1.5 percent. Today that is 2.6 percent of Americans. That is over 1 million Americans.

What are we doing? Who are we? That is what I asked myself around the holidays. We had a lot of cold weather and snow—typical Chicago in some ways—and people are celebrating and still going out and shopping and Christmas lights and Christmas trees. I was picturing—I know some of those families for whom this was so bleak and so unnecessary—that we could have, in 5 minutes before we left here, just extended those unemployment insurance benefits.

And you've got that sign there that says: Each week that we fail to act, 72,000 more people—that is a pretty hefty small town of people—will lose their benefits, people who only are qualified for those benefits if they are seeking work, three people searching for every job that is available in this country.

You talked to people who have experienced this ultimate sense of insecurity: What is going to happen to me and my family? What I hear at the end of that story when I talk to people is: I don't know what I am going to do. I don't know what I am going to do.

For many people, the fear of homelessness is just right outside their door right now. I don't get it.

We celebrated the—and I mean celebrated—the 50th anniversary of the announcement of the war on poverty and all the things that we did and that were supported for many years.

Thank you.

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

HEALTH EXCHANGE SECURITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WAGNER. 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 materials on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, a bill that forces the Federal Government to notify individuals if their personal information has been stolen or unlawfully accessed through an ObamaCare exchange.

Since the disastrous rollout of ObamaCare on October 1, we have heard story after story, Mr. Speaker, of security threats and privacy concerns with the troubled ObamaCare insurance exchanges, from the chief information officer at CMS claiming that ''there is also no confidence that personable identifiable information will be protected,'' to an administrator at CMS saying that the ObamaCare Web site ''exposed a level of uncertainty that can be deemed as high risk,'' to a computer security expert calling the ObamaCare Web site ''a hacker's dream.''

It is clear that the ObamaCare exchanges were never ready to be launched, and it is unconscionable that this administration would expose millions of Americans' personal information to cyber threats and identity theft.

To make matters worse, there are laws already implemented that require private companies to notify innocent victims of these security breaches. But President Obama didn't think it was necessary to live by the same rules as the private sector and decided to push his failed agenda despite senior government officials warning him that his Web site was not safe for the American people.

Every day, Mr. Speaker, I hear from far too many hardworking families in Missouri's Second District who have seen their premiums skyrocket, wages decreased, insurance coverage canceled of late, and hours cut back at work. These families are already suffering from the harsh realities of ObamaCare. To make matters worse, they have no idea whether their personal information has been stolen or not.

Just recently, Mary Ann Schaeffer wrote to me from Kirkwood, Missouri, about how worried she is that her most intimate information could be stolen from the ObamaCare exchanges. And I quote from Mary Ann Schaeffer of Kirkwood, Missouri: ''I am concerned about the security of my sensitive medical records in a big government database.'' Mary Ann is just one of the many people I hear from in the St. Louis region that are worried about the devastating consequences of ObamaCare.

The only way to truly protect the American people from ObamaCare is by replacing it with free market-based solutions that expand access without destroying our economy, putting the Federal Government between you and your doctor, and lowering the quality of our care. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, should, at the very least, be required to report any security breaches on the ObamaCare Web site to those innocent victims who, through no fault of their own, trusted a government that deceived them.

Since President Obama decided to delay the implementation of ObamaCare for unions and businesses for an entire year, don't you think the least he could do is tell hardworking Americans if their personal information has been stolen or breached?

Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is: ObamaCare is wrong for the American people, it is wrong for hardworking Missourians, and it is wrong for the people of Missouri's Second Congressional District, and it needs to be replaced immediately before any more of its harmful provisions are implemented.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' a resounding ''yes,'' on this commonsense measure.

I would now, Mr. Speaker, yield to my good friend, the gentlelady from Tennessee, Representative DIANE BLACK, who has not only spent countless hours championing the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, but who has tirelessly worked to improve our Nation's health care as a small business woman and a nurse in Tennessee and now as a Member of Congress.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady from Missouri, my friend and my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, which would provide basic protections on the healthcare.gov Web site to help Americans protect themselves from fraud and abuse. Unfortunately, we live in a time where cyber threats are rampant, and we must do what we can to make sure that Americans are protected from these threats.

John Fund at National Review recently wrote this:

> Christmas shoppers were stunned to learn that computer hackers had made off with the names and other personal information of some 40 million Target customers.
>
> But at least Target informed its customers of the security breach, as it is required by law. Healthcare.gov faces no such requirement—it need never notify customers that their personal information has been hacked or possibly compromised.

What makes this even worse is that the Department of Health and Human Services was asked to include notification provisions in the final rules for ObamaCare and they declined. Because of this decision on the part of HHS, millions of Americans' names, addresses, phone numbers, dates of birth, email addresses, and even Social Security numbers are at risk; and if they are breached by the government, they would never have to tell them.

Consider that as Americans who seek health care insurance sign onto the Federal exchange, they are inserting their personal information into a Web site that has never had a full end-to-end security test. In fact, CMS's Chief Information Security Officer, Theresa Fryer, stated in a draft memo that the Federal exchange ''does not reasonably meet security requirements'' and that ''there is no confidence that personal identifiable information will be protected.''

Even worse, experts at the credit agency Experian recently warned that the ''health care industry by far will be the most susceptible to publicly disclosed and widely scrutinized data breaches in 2014.''

So Experian says that it is the health care that stands the greatest risk. This prediction was based in part on reports of security risks posed by the healthcare.gov Web site since the health care law's infrastructure was put together too quickly and haphazardly.

Mr. Speaker, this Web site was never ready to go on October 1. The very least we can do is to require that the Federal Government notify someone if their personal information has been hacked. That way, at the very least, they have a chance to fend off identity theft and cyber attacks and hopefully avoid another nightmare scenario like the one we saw that happened to Target shoppers.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill and for our colleagues in the Senate to swiftly send it to the President's desk.

□ 1845

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee, Representative DIANE BLACK, for her supreme leadership in this area. This is her bill. This is her piece of legislation. It has been something she has worked on tirelessly for years and has seen its exposure in both the private sector and now, unfortunately, at the Federal Government level. So I thank her for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend, Representative RICHARD HUDSON. I thank him very much. He is a freshman Member and a dear friend and colleague, a leader in our freshman class. I thank him, not only for his work on the Homeland Security and Agriculture Committees, but also for the work that he has done in dealing with health care on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. RICHARD HUDSON.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that my colleague from Missouri has been a true leader in Congress.

It is a real honor to serve with you, and I thank you for your leadership, particularly on this important issue.

ObamaCare is an absolute disaster. We have seen disastrous impacts back home in North Carolina with the loss of jobs. I talk to folks every day when I go home. I go home every weekend. I travel the district. I talk to businesses, and folks tell me that they have never sat on more capital. The reason they are doing that is that they don't know what the costs of health care are going to be. So we have got businesses out there that could be expanding, that could be hiring people, but because of this health care law—because of the uncertainty created by it, because of the rising costs—we have got businesspeople who are not hiring. That is why we are not seeing job growth like we ought to see. That is why this is the flattest, longest recession we have seen in our country's history.

This awful health care law is also destroying the greatest health care system in the world. We are seeing premiums increase. I get letters and emails every day from my constituents who tell me their premiums have gone up. I talked to a woman the other day who is working three jobs. Her husband is working part-time because he can't find full-time work, but she is working three jobs just so she can pay for health care. That was before the premium increase.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen so many folks who have had their plans canceled. It has been said that the lie of the century is that, if you like your health care, you can keep it. People are seeing their health care plans canceled, and it is going to get worse because, when businesses have to start looking at whether they can afford to keep folks on their health care or not—whether the math adds up for them, whether they can afford to do that given all the new, excessive mandates—we are going to see more people lose their insurance. It is an absolute disaster.

I am committed to doing everything I can to repeal this law and replace it because, at the end of the day, this is about people, and in this country—the greatest country in the history of the world—we can do better than this. We can offer health care that is the world's best quality health care at a price that people can afford, and we can put people in charge of their health care decisions, not bureaucrats in Washington like this awful law does, so I am committed to repealing this law.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support the bill that is coming to the floor tomorrow, a bill that deals with one of the disastrous aspects of this law that I haven't mentioned yet, and that is the risk to millions of Americans that their personal information can be divulged—can be stolen—because of the lack of security on the ObamaCare Web site. This is a horrendous problem. Million of Americans are at risk, and there is no accountability. So what we are asking for is to put that accountability in place, that if people's personal information is lost, those folks have to be notified.

The Federal Government thinks that businesses should live by that standard. The Federal Government says that States that have set up their exchanges should live by that standard. I say that the Federal Government ought to live by the same standard. If that personal information is compromised, then the individual should be notified, and the government should take responsibility and rectify the situation.

This is simple, commonsense legislation that I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I hope our colleagues in the other body, and I hope our President will support. We owe it to the American people to do the right thing—to make sure their information is secure. If something happens, God forbid, we must do the right thing and notify those individuals. We rectify the situation. We take responsibility for it.

So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is the right thing to do by the American people. I urge them to vote ''yes'' tomorrow.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative RICHARD HUDSON, for his leadership in this area and for giving voice to not just the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act but to the jobs issue. Certainly, what ObamaCare has done is create nothing but a part-time workforce. This is about access to care. It is about cost. It is about millions of Americans who have lost their coverage. It is about the deception of the American people. It is about a government bureaucracy—a Federal bureaucracy—telling the American people what is in their best interest.

You, the American people—your constituents, Congressman HUDSON—know

what is in their best interests when it comes to their health care and their most intimate details, whether it has to do with their personal medical records and information or whether it has to do with their costs, their coverage, their premiums, their copays. There is so much that must be repealed and replaced in this law. At the very least, what the Federal Government can do is to protect the integrity of their most private and personal information.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

It is now my great privilege to yield to my good friend, Representative JAMES LANKFORD from Oklahoma. He is our leader and our chairman on the Republican Policy Committee, and he is a friend and a colleague at the leadership table. I thank him most especially for the work that he does on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, which is, Mr. Speaker, monitoring the implementation of healthcare.gov and of the Affordable Care Act.

I am now pleased to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your oversight of this evening. The gentlelady and I do not agree at all on football, she being from Missouri and my being an Oklahoma State fan, but we do agree on this. This is a critical area, and it gets to the basic element of what we do as a Nation and what a government is supposed to do.

A government is designed to protect and to serve the people. The people don't serve the government. The government serves the people. The government is set to allow people to be able to live their lives as they choose. Then along comes the Affordable Care Act, where the government looks down at the people, literally, and says, ''I am going to make better decisions for you. Instead of your choosing your doctor, instead of your choosing your hospital, instead of your choosing your insurance, I am going to pick a group of insurance policies and hospitals and doctors I like as the government, and you get to pick from my list.'' It removes those choices from individuals to then set up a Web site and say, ''You are required to go on this Web site and enter your information on this Web site.''

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how you handle shopping online, but when I shop online, I am careful of what Web sites I go to. I want to make sure there are security protocols and there is some backing to that so I am not entering information onto some site where I don't know how the security is handled. But this one is different. On this one, the power of the Federal Government is coming down on an individual to say, ''I don't care what you think about the security of this site. Enter your information there, and not only enter your information there, enter your children's information there.''

Chief Information Security Officer Teresa Fryer, she is the one who was set to be able to sign off on the security protocols for the Web site when it was to be launched, but in September, she refused to sign off and to put her name onto the exchanges and the data hub and say that it was ready to go and that the security was there. In fact, her statement was that there was a high risk of security and that there had been no end-to-end testing of this site, and she refused to sign off on the security. This is the chief information security officer who was assigned to oversee that for the government. Instead, it was pushed up to Marilyn Tavenner, the Director of CMS, to have to make the signoff because the person under her refused to do it.

Should Americans be concerned in entering their information? Absolutely, they should be concerned in entering their information because there is still no certification that this is fully tested, fully approved and that there are not serious vulnerabilities.

In the first week that the site was launched, the Federal Government brought in what is called a ''white hacker,'' someone who is going to come in and test the system, try to hack into the system. Were they successful? Absolutely, they were successful. They found multiple vulnerabilities in the site, itself, and then reported it back to CMS. There are a lot of security vulnerabilities there.

Is this an issue? Yes, but as ironic as all that is, a government that is set up to serve the people is actually trying to protect itself and not report when there is a problem.

You see, when Target had 40 million credit cards stolen in a very rare incident for a retailer like that—my family's being one of those—we were all notified. We were told, ''You are at risk. Here is what has occurred, so go change your credit card. Go protect your identity,'' because Target has the responsibility to protect us and to be able to let us know you have got a risk.

The Federal Government right now is saying, ''If someone breaks into our system, we have the responsibility to protect the Federal Government and not to let anyone know,'' instead of protecting the individual. That is government on its head. Government is designed to serve and protect the people, not to have them say, ''I can't tell you that information because it will look bad for the Federal Government.'' No.

This bill does a basic thing. It says the people are more important than the program that the government has set up—the people are—and that if their information has been stolen, if there has been a compromise to that information, they should be informed of that so that they can take the steps that are necessary to make sure they and their children who they have entered on their site have their information protected in the days ahead.

This is the right thing to do. This is not some blanket partisan issue. We would want this in every aspect of every Web site that the Federal Government has, whether that be IRS information, whether that be ObamaCare information, whether that be information on an EPA computer. If it is compromised, that citizen should know so steps can be taken to be able to protect himself. It is a reasonable protection for the American people. That is why I think this is a reasonable thing to be able to do. Quite frankly, we believe that the Affordable Care Act will be completely repealed and that the American people will have the ability to choose for themselves again rather than have the Federal Government say we are going to make choices for you. Until that day comes, it is a reasonable thing to at least begin with this.

With that, I thank the gentlelady from Missouri. Again, I can't root for your football team, but I can stand with you on this issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is a good friend and leader.

We won't debate the outcome of the Cotton Bowl here in the well of the floor today—that will stand on its own merit—but I do appreciate his leadership on this very important health care issue. I appreciate his leadership on the Republican Policy Committee for our party and the work that he does tirelessly to communicate those in a way that is about serving the people, which is, at the end of the day, why we are here.

Government should be here to serve the people, and we have not put the proper protections in place. What is good enough for the private sector and the States ought to be more than good enough for the Federal Government. Certainly, the American people are worthy of these kinds of protections.

While I will say over and over again that ObamaCare is wrong for the American people—that it is wrong for hardworking Missourians and that it is certainly wrong for the people of the Second District—and that it needs to be replaced immediately before any more harmful provisions are implemented, at the very least, what the government can do is require that we report any security breaches on the ObamaCare Web site to these innocent victims who, through no fault of their own, trusted a government that has once again potentially deceived them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues again to vote ''yes'' on this commonsense measure. Tomorrow, let's all stand for the American people and in service to them rather than as a government that is not telling them what is best for them but is truly serving their interests and serving their needs. Please, stand and vote ''yes'' on the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act.

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

FINDING COMMON GROUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the Speaker for his courtesies and the leader for her courtesies for the opportunity to share on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer to say to my colleagues who spoke earlier that we all recognize that the Affordable Care Act has generated opportunities for 9 million Americans, and it is growing. Let's find common ground. We have a law that is legal and affirmed by the United States Supreme Court, but it is affirmed by what is most important: hungry Americans needing good health care to save their lives and the lives of their families.

□ 1900

Frankly, I believe that there needs to be security for all of the Web sites of Federal agencies, rather than have bills that appear to be attacking the Affordable Care Act again, after 46 attempts to repeal it. Let's find a way that we can work together to secure extensively the entire Web sites carefully that are utilized by the Federal Government.

But I have the opportunity and I want to cover, Mr. Speaker, an array of issues that I think are important as we begin this new year. I do want to wish everyone a happy new year. But as I do so, since I come from Houston, and have been a member of the House Science Committee for 12 years before moving to Homeland Security, I want to congratulate NASA and the White House.

First, NASA, for the miraculous and unbelievable space walk just about a week or so ago by two outstanding astronauts. Space walks are not often done. They are much more difficult—in fact, extremely difficult—than one might imagine, as you watched what seemed to be a beautiful effort of activity in space.

I want to congratulate them. That is science. That is genius. That is what these astronauts trained for. They are our neighbors. I was with them over the holiday. I want them to know on the floor of the House that this was outstanding work.

I want to congratulate the White House because, as many of us have advocated over the years, my colleague who is no longer in the House, Congressman Nick Lampson, and myself signed many letters to extend the life of the space station. I am very pleased that it is now to extend the space station for 4 years. I am optimistic when that 4 years is nearing, there will be another assessment that there is more life in the international space station—opportunity for major research, including, when I was on the Science Committee, cancer research in particular, heart disease, stroke, aging. Our former Senator, John Glenn, took a second ride into space as a member of the United States Senate to test space travel on those who are aging.

Congratulations to NASA and the international space station. It speaks to the genius of America. It speaks to the aspirations and hopes of children around the world. It focuses on the emphasis in the United States on science, technology, engineering, and math, or STEM. Teachers continue to emphasize to our children the importance of those disciplines, and it gives us great hope.

And that is a lot of what I will talk about tonight: hope. For when we think of hope, we must have a broad definition that it includes all Americans. In fact, I believe from the very moment of the dumping of the tea in the Boston Harbor, the Founding Fathers of this Nation, in spite of all of the possible inequities like the holding of slaves, had hope. They left their places of persecution because they had hope.

And we have grown through the ages, from the 1600s, 1700s, 1800s, 1900s, the 20th century, and the 21st century. It has all been around hope. We were hopeful the turn of the century, even as World War I was flaring. We were hopeful even as the 1928–1929 collapse was happening. We were hopeful even with the horrific, heinous acts of World War II, with the interment and the Holocaust. But people were hoping that we would save people and get out of the dastardliness of that.

We were hopeful in the fifties. We as African Americans were hopeful as we marched in the 1950s and 1960s. We were hopeful with the Thurgood Marshall argument before the United States Supreme Court on Brown v. Board of Education. We were hopeful.

Now we come to a situation of wealth inequality. We must assure those who fall in that gap of where they are not where they should be, through no fault of their own, but because of this increasing gap.

For example, the wages of those in the top 1 percent—those making $352,900-plus—their income grew 281 percent from 1979 to 2007. For the bottom 20 percent, their income grew 16 percent, those making less than $20,000. For those making $34,000, it grew 23 percent. For those making $34,000 to $50,000, 25 percent.

There is wealth inequality in this Nation.

Some would argue some of that is inherited wealth, some of that is capital gains, some of that is stock revenue. It is wealth inequality.

I am moved by the words of Justice Brandeis:

> We can either have democracy in this country, or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can't have both.

That is not snatching wealth from someone who has worked hard. It is to even up the opportunity for that gap—281 percent growth for the 1 percent, and numbers like 23 and 25 and 38 percent for the working middle class. We need to do better.

And so I think we need to start by stop quarreling about the unemployment benefits extension. We did it under President Bush, with no offsets, and, as well, for about 5 years with President Bush even acknowledging that when people work and invest in this Nation and they fall on bad times, give them a transitional bridge.

Some would say our unemployment is going down. My friends, on the chronically unemployed, it is the highest it has ever been, at 2.6 percent. Now that is growing to 1.3 million in 2013. It will go up to 3.64 million.

So I am not asking for the whole piece. I had a bill that said 1 year. Let's extend it for 3 months on an emergency basis and then begin to discuss how we can fund it.

There are 68,000 jobless workers that are in Texas, and we expect that as it grows in 2014 to 1.9 million and more—as I said 3.6 million and growing—it will be 106,900 Texans.

I have spoken to some of those Texans, and I have heard the stories of a welder who liked his job, was laid off, through no fault of his own, and needs this transitional funding so that he can be presentable for a job. Or a person in technology, administrative assistant, or somebody who worked in home health.

I believe that we have a legitimate basis for the creation of 200,000 jobs—a real dent in the economy and an acknowledgment that the unemployment rate in the United States in 2012 was 8.1 percent. States range from 3.1 percent, to Texas, which is 6.8 percent. Missouri is 6.9 percent. We have 5 percent and 5.7 percent. We have 7 percent in Alaska. Delaware is 7.1 percent. It goes all over the gamut. The individuals are not able to find work because for every job, there are three persons looking.

It generates into inequality of wealth. There is nothing that will refute this except for a transitional hand-up for those unemployed. And, yes, job creation.

My good friends, the Republicans, say they passed a bill on job creation last year. Yes, they did. And we have a bill on job creation, the Jobs bill. That seems to me a compromise in the making. That seems to me an opportunity for us to sit around the table and talk about technology and then talk about other aspects of job creation, because people have to be trained and retrained.

This week I will introduce a bill that is studied not as a bill introduced by a Democrat, but studied for the substance of the bill, called the New Chance for a New Start in Life Act of 2014. This is where you invest in people. It creates an opportunity for someone who is unemployed and still on their unemployment benefit—remember, they have worked and this is unemployment insurance—to get a stipend for certain accredited specific job training that ties to the market.

My friends, all of us are going to say, Well, they are going to take their money and they are going to be on the basket weaving training program; or they are going to take a truck training program, but they have no license. Accredited programs so that person can provide for their family and their training can be paid for.

And we are going to work through accredited social service agencies. We are going to partner with cities and nonprofit agencies for apprenticeships and internships. Every job is not an apprenticeship. We want to work with our friends in the trade and the labor community.

Unions have done well for America. Thank you for increasing our minimum wages and conditions in the workforce. Let's find a way to work together, but sometimes it is an internship in an office or an engineering company.

And then we have to provide training and employment enhanced for veterans. There are 22,000 veterans included in that large number of those who are needing transitional funds. We need to work with community colleges and Historically Black Colleges and Hispanic-serving institutions to be able to find a way to get chronically unemployed persons in the workplace, investing, paying taxes, and loving it every moment.

I have talked to folks who said that the most they want for Christmas and the new year is to have the alarm clock go off at 6 a.m. and jump out of bed to go to work. How are we going to cut these people off? What sense does it make?

And then it is important to note that added to the component of problems that we have is that poverty in America still exists. The 49 million poverty rate for African Americans and Hispanics greatly exceeds the national average. In 2010, 27.4 percent of Blacks and 26.6 percent of Hispanics were poor, compared to 9.9 percent of non-Hispanic Whites and 12.1 percent of Asians.

That is not targeting quotas. It is going where the problem is.

You know where else the problem is? Single women of any race, head of households. In 2010, 31.6 percent of households headed by single women were poor, while 15.8 percent of households headed by single men and 6.2 percent of married-couple households are in poverty.

In my district, 18 percent of households in the State of Texas, first in 2009 and 2001, ranked second in the highest rate of food insecurity. In my district, 151,000-plus families live in Poverty.

To the extent that we can't solve that problem, that is not shameful. We have seen the poverty gap close nationwide, even though we know children still live in poverty. President Lyndon Baines Johnson, who spoke on the war on poverty on January 8, said, We must live for hope, as I paraphrase.

And I worked diligently with programs from VISTA to Medicaid to Medicare to job-training programs to infrastructure programs to programs allowing young people to go to college. I am a witness of all of those programs. Frankly, I worked in the President's summer youth program in the hard rumble area of my youth.

And I have seen Members mention in the last 24 hours how they participated in the same programs. They happen now to be Members of the United States Congress. I would like to know how many Americans would call in the Congress and say, I am a beneficiary of the war on poverty, the Great Society.

Why can't we find common ground to recognize that we can be efficient, but we can also invest in people?

So I raise an ancient philosopher in my remarks on this question:

> Any city, however small, is in fact divided into two, one the city of the poor, the other of the rich; these are at war with one another.

Plato said that.

□ 1915

And the question is can we now, in the 21st century, rebut that. Can we find a way to have hopeful people who are poor work with hopeful people who are rich and find a way to enrich both of them, to give them work and to make them shining examples of what America is all about?

Laying that groundwork, I hope my colleagues will join me on the Second Chance Job Act that I have just introduced that will go alongside the kinds of incentives in the jobs bill that President Obama has offered and the bill that was passed here in the House.

Why can't we both be on the same page of caring about getting a bill passed that both bodies will look at favorably, taking pieces? Why can't we get back to legislating again, giving and taking, making amendments, finding out what my friend on the other side of aisle wants, finding out what we want here, having amendments being accepted, making the bill one that is not only through the regular order of the committee, but here on the floor of the House, getting amendments that would satisfy and work with all of us?

I think there is more work to do in many, many areas, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to continue now to be able to offer some of my concerns.

Last evening, on CNN, there was a recounting of a young lady, tragically, who attempted suicide, a young bullying victim, first tragically being raped, not being believed, and ultimately coming forward. I am sort of summarizing the facts. And then because this person was a star athlete in one of the Midwestern States, the town turned on this young girl and her friend, bullying everywhere.

And I think it is time for America and the Congress to make a statement on it, a simple statement. I am not asking for much, but I have introduced H.R. 2585, the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2013. You will be surprised how simple it is:

To be able to allow groups from all over America, 501(c)(3)s that may be under the jurisdiction of faith institutions, youth groups, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, tennis clubs, social service agencies, schools, to put their best practices forward and how they believe they can stem the tide of bullying, what kind of intervention, and add to that, cyber bullying. It also provides for gang prevention programs, turn our children toward socially beneficial pathways.

I had one Member say to me, What would be wrong with the Congress making a unified statement that they want to prevent bullying and they want to intervene?

That is the simple process, four corners of the bill. And research studies have shown that approximately 25 percent of school bullies will be convicted of a criminal offense in their adult years.

I believe in intervention. And I would say to my friends who are experts, all of the advocacy groups, I believe it would be very important if we came together and had this one statement that came out of the Congress, that we want parents and schools and communities and baseball clubs and basketball clubs and football leagues to understand that we have all got to pour our energy into letting children know that to live healthy and free of intimidation is a good thing, that have your fun somewhere else.

I don't know whether bullying led to this absurd game of knockout, but we have got to take a stand alongside of the personal intervention that comes about through the normal community ways.

Just for the record, it is important to note, 30 percent of U.S. students in grades 6 through 10 are involved in moderate or frequent bullying as bullies, victims, or both. According to the results of the first national survey on this subject, bullying is increasingly viewed as an important contributor to youth violence, including homicide and suicide. One out of four kids is bullied. The Justice Department says that in this month, one out of every four kids will be abused by another youth.

Surveys show that 77 percent of students are bullied mentally, verbally, and physically. We have to find a way to make a national statement. What better way than a Congress that is the symbol of the most powerful Nation in the world and the most powerful lawmaking body.

Why is it so difficult to pass something as simple as that?

It does not stop us from looking down the future when we have many more resources to deal with to put a huge amount of funding in it once best practices—once we give the spark plug and get people excited about our Federal Government is concerned about this, let's look for enhanced best practices. Let's make a statement on this,

which I think is enormously important.

I want to quickly, and I hope, as we debate these issues on the floor, that there will be Members who will want to have a conversation. I want to say, as well, that many of us have experienced violence in our communities. I am going to discuss that a little later, but I want to say it now. I have had a number of incidences of violence, through knives, through guns, in my own school districts in Houston.

Even though we know that does not define our school districts, I say to them, when you have an incident like that, it is not a reflection on you, but it is a signal and a sign that the community must come together. We will look forward in Houston to putting together a Stop Violence Commission under the 18th Congressional District, bringing people from the faith community, bringing other leaders, working with the Mothers Demand Action, MDA, who have come out every moment to stop gun violence, working with mothers and fathers who have had to bury their children, funerals that I attended over the holiday or before that time frame. I want to tell that mother whose son's funeral that I attended, I have not forgotten. We will embrace you, and we will find a way that we can sit together and make a difference.

Let me switch now for a moment—I will come back to that issue—and remind us of the humanity of comprehensive immigration reform. I said that I had any number of issues that I think are weighing on many of us as Members of Congress, weighing on those of us who are doers and want to do, and I would venture to say that that is this entire body. But we are getting stalled, and for what reason, I don't know.

But my hometown paper was eager to review H.R. 1417, which is a bipartisan product that has come out of the Subcommittee on Border Security and Maritime Security, my colleague from Michigan, and out of the full committee, with the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, a bill that has now been joined under H.R. 15, to put a bill forward in the House.

And I would just ask, why can't we end the suffering of so many, end the divide and deportation of so many families, in the thousands, and begin to look, as the faith community and business community, educational community, health community, research community, business community wants us to do?

Comprehensive immigration reform, Texas is a prime example: 16.4 percent of Texans are foreign born; 42 percent are Latino or Asian; 33.2 percent of immigrants in the State are naturalized U.S. citizens; 11.8 percent are registered voters or new Americans; 87.7 percent of children with immigrant parents are U.S. citizens; 75 percent of children with immigrant parents are English proficient; 70 percent of naturalized citizens have a high school diploma; 61,511 foreign students contribute $1.4 billion to the State economy, and they make up 21 percent of the workforce; 9 percent of the workforce is unauthorized.

We need to get people from underneath the underground economy. We need families able to walk the streets together, mothers not being dragged out of homes. We need the DREAM Act children to be able to raise their heads as U.S. citizens. We need access to citizenship.

This coming Monday, I will gather at Catholic Charities with people from all over the community in Houston, Texas, and we will be standing together, raising our voices as humane Americans. We will be speaking about Latinos and Asians. We will be speaking about Africans. We will be speaking about people from the Caribbean, people from Europe, people from Canada, people from Ireland. We will be speaking about people from all over the world that happen to be in Houston, Texas.

It is time to pass comprehensive immigration reform and pass it now.

I mentioned very quickly that I would be going through a number of issues, but let me just turn to the issue of guns.

Let me pause for a moment and find out how much time I have, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me quickly mention that we must stop the violence of guns. When we think about 5,740 children being killed by guns, I would like, again, for this Congress to look at H.R. 2812, which is a bill that deals with stand your ground that we have not addressed from the Trayvon Martin case.

And I would like them, also, to quickly look at gun safety and gun access prevention, H.R. 65. I find that a way of being able to come together and keeping guns out of the hands of underage children and teaching gun safety to parents and children.

I want to also join with my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee and mention human trafficking is a major issue. It will be commemorated on January 11, but I will be hosting, with the Homeland Security Committee, a hearing on human trafficking in Houston, Texas.

Quickly, I want to make mention of the Congressional Gold Medal that I have for Malala, who is a voice of strength, a young teenager gunned and shot—I wouldn't say gunned down because she lives in Pakistan, only because she wanted girls to have education.

I ask my colleagues to join myself and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to insure that we do have, if you will, the honor of presenting this to her, nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, spoke before the United Nations, and I hope that we will do that.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by mentioning two quick things, and that is, let us not forget our veterans, enormously important, and let us also move quickly for NSA reforms.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee that helped write the Patriot Act, section 215, that was not our interpretation. That was not legislative history for trolling mega-data collection. We can be safe and secure, and we will be presenting a briefing on privacy and security next week in the Judiciary Committee, 2226, at 10:30. I hope all of the colleagues will come.

But I have introduced legislation to make sure that there is a people's advocate in the FISA Court, but more importantly, that we restrain and find a way to restrain the mega-collection. And I hope the President, in the reports that he has just received, will be able to do that as well.

Let me also indicate that internationally, I think this Congress should deal with where we are in Syria and where we were in South Sudan, two places that I am concerned about, the human cost, if you will.

We have a lot to do, Mr. Speaker. I just gave just small bits this evening, but we have a lot to do that we can do together in a bipartisan manner.

And we can look at the Affordable Care Act, just as a point, in closing, because it has been so divisive, and look at it that it is working. People want insurance. We can do that, and we can make sure that, as we do so, Mr. Speaker, then America will see us working together. That is what I would like to see happening.

I have given an array of an agenda that touches the lives of people. Let's get to work.

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

□ 1930

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As always, it is a privilege to be able to come to the great well of the House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world, to be here and have an opportunity to bring a voice to the table and to speak to the American people as well as my constituents in the Sixth District of Minnesota.

I want to join my colleagues in wishing a happy New Year to all the people in the United States. We look forward to a wonderful year in 2014. There are so many things that are good that we can look forward to this year, so many things that this body can get done, that we can agree on.

We can agree on our veterans, standing for them, thanking them, first of all, that tonight, as we are here in this Chamber, we have men and women

across the globe who are laying their lives on the line for us. Our prayers are with you, and our prayers are with your families.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for you and for all of our colleagues, that we want to let our troops know, there is nothing more important than the work that you do to secure our liberty and our freedom. We are for you, and we will be standing here for you this year, as we have in the past.

We also stand together in recognition that the first and greatest obligation of all of us, as Members of Congress in this Chamber, is to secure the safety and security of the American people, the welfare of the American people, Mr. Speaker. We do that here domestically, but our obligation is to make sure that our national security is held safe here in the homeland but also our vital American national security interests across the globe.

To that end, several of my colleagues and myself took a fact-finding trip in December. After we had concluded our work in December, we went into the Middle East. We took a very extensive journey. This was no pleasure trip in any way. This was a working mission. We went first into Amsterdam. While we were there, we met an individual who has one of the most extensive collections of communist penetration throughout the world. It was interesting, as we dialogued with him about communist infiltration, what that has meant over the course of history, particularly over the last century, and what that means for Americans today.

From there, we journeyed into Cairo, Egypt. While we were there, we spoke with leaders of Egypt. There has been a tremendous change that has occurred, and we know that literally in just over a week's time, people in Egypt will have an opportunity to go to the ballot box and vote in a referendum on a brand-new Constitution.

A very brief recent history of Egypt is that there was an overthrow in Egypt of the Mubarak presidency, which had been stable for some 30-plus years. The people of Egypt spoke. They were very unhappy with their government. There was a referendum that had occurred, and during that time, the Muslim Brotherhood came to power through the president, President Morsi. The Muslim Brotherhood, through the Freedom and Justice Party, established a new regime.

So repulsed were the people of Egypt by the Muslim Brotherhood and their tactics during the course of just something over a year that the people of Egypt took to the streets, some 33 million people in what some people say was the largest human demonstration ever in the history of the world because the people of Egypt were outraged at the atrocities and the extremism of the Muslim Brotherhood as they were displayed across Egypt.

Really, so much of this so-called Arab Spring has been the persecution of Christians, religious minorities, and women, particularly in the Middle East region. Nowhere has this been felt more than in Egypt, and the people rose up.

You see, in the Egyptian Constitution, which was put together by the Muslim Brotherhood, there was no avenue for the people to remove the Muslim Brotherhood president, President Morsi. There was no impeachment process like we have in the United States. The only option available to the people was to go into the streets and demonstrate and seek the removal of the Muslim Brotherhood president. That is what the people effectuated.

In that time, there is now an interim president. His name is President Mansour. I met with him numerous times in Cairo. We have had very good conversations with interim President Mansour. He told me in Egypt, together with my colleagues, that he would not be seeking reelection. We also met with General el-Sisi, the head of the military in Egypt, trying to maintain order in that country.

We heard some very good news, and, Mr. Speaker, among the news that we heard while we were in Egypt was this: Egypt enjoys the most favorable relationship with the Jewish State of Israel that they have had in over 35 years. The Obama administration asked Egypt to work harder in the Sinai. That is the border, Mr. Speaker, between Egypt and Israel.

The Obama administration asked the Egyptian Government to work to clear out al Qaeda and to try to secure that border. You see, Mr. Speaker, the Muslim Brotherhood, instead, had been placing more attacks through using al Qaeda and al Qaeda elements in various flavors. When you think of the old phrase of Baskin-Robbins and its 28 flavors of ice cream, there are multiple flavors, if you will, Mr. Speaker, of al Qaeda. There is the Al-Nusra Front. There is Jemaah Islamiyah. There is one organization after another, but they share the same ideology.

Much of this ideology makes its way through an organization called the Muslim Brotherhood, and the Muslim Brotherhood was actively facilitating attacks on Israel through tunnels ruled by Hamas, which is essentially another affiliate, a franchise of the Muslim Brotherhood in the Gaza region. So whether it was weapons, whether it was attacks, whether it was fighters, Israel had its hands full in the Sinai border.

Now the good news is that General el-Sisi, interim President Mansour in Egypt took to heart the request from the Obama administration and, for their own survival, worked to take apart the al Qaeda network and the strength that there was of jihadist-based fighters on the Sinai, and they have been incredibly successful.

I am pleased to report to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, that what we heard from the leadership in Egypt was that over 70 percent of the jihadist activity on the Sinai has been silenced, deconstructed, taken apart. That means that Israel has had a better time, a more peaceful time on its border, but also, this has helped the Egyptian Government as well.

The Nile River in Egypt is kind of a dividing point. You have western Egypt. You have eastern Egypt, eastern Egypt being the more violent, where it has been essentially a ''wild west,'' if you will, in the Sinai. It has been very difficult for securing peace in the Middle East, very difficult for Israel, but we have to thank the current interim government, under the leadership of President Mansour and under the guidance of General el-Sisi in the Sinai region. That is the good news. Of all of the turmoil and all of the chaos that there is today in the Middle East, this is our bright and shining spot.

The United States, in my opinion, needs to do everything that we can to encourage and foster peace in this region. As I believe that my colleagues, whether it is on the Democrat side, on the Republican side, whether it is in the House, whether it is in the Senate, this is something that we agree upon. We want to see peace in the Middle East, peace in the largest Arab country in the Middle East, which would be Egypt, but also peace in the Jewish State of Israel, and this is the place to forge that peace.

The good news is to hear that on this very sensitive border, we are seeing the Egyptians working together to make sure that there can be peace to fight a common enemy, and that would be al Qaeda and the radical elements in this regime. That is good news.

We went from Cairo, Egypt, where we heard very good news from General el-Sisi, very good news from Amr Moussa, who is heading the Committee of 50 which is writing the new Constitution that the people of Egypt will be voting on in the referendum on January 14 and January 15. I believe the people of Egypt will see the wisdom in this new Constitution which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, does have a provision for impeachment so that the people in Egypt in the future will have an opportunity to be able to change their President and their country. They also guarantee the freedom of belief in Egypt, and they have a dedication to rebuilding the houses of worship that were destroyed by the Muslim Brotherhood.

The Muslim Brotherhood destroyed shops, homes, and places of worship of Coptic Christians in Egypt. The government is committed to rebuilding the Christian houses of worship in Egypt. This is a wonderful advancement for peace and for tolerance in that region of the world, and one that I think we should encourage and get behind.

From there, my colleagues and I, in a delegation which was led by Representative STEVE KING of Iowa—also in attendance was Representative LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas and also Representative ROBERT PITTENGER of North Carolina—from there, we went on to Beirut,

Lebanon, which has been a hotbed of violence because Iran has seen an avenue of advancement. Working through the terrorist organization Hezbollah, Iran has been bringing increased terror between Sunni and Shia in southern Lebanon.

We flew into the airport at Beirut. The airport at Beirut is controlled by Hezbollah. There, we met with the ambassador. We met with leaders of political parties. It is devastating to hear what they have to say about the increased violence.

A suicide bomber wearing a vest detonated that vest during our time when we were there. Obviously we weren't anywhere nearby. We weren't in any form of danger, but a vest was detonated. Four people were killed. Also, a soldier had shot into Israel and had killed an Israeli soldier during the time that we were there. There has been a very, very strong, increase in violence. Violence occurred prior to our entry. Violence continues to occur, and there are now new reports, Mr. Speaker, of Iran bringing even more dangerous, larger deadly weapons into that area, again, bringing to the fore the increase in fighting between Sunni and Shia.

That is the kind of pressure that the Jewish State of Israel is looking at on its northern border, without even contemplating what is happening in Syria.

Syria, Mr. Speaker, has completely fallen apart. It is in complete chaos now, with Assad having estimated to have killed over 200,000 of his own people. Now the so-called moderates who were being backed, led by General Idris—General Idris has now, reportedly, left Syria, and the extremist elements, including al Qaeda, of the Islamist jihadist regime are now fighting against Assad.

So we have two very bad options in Syria today, and very recently, these Islamist jihadist fighters took over a weapons cache of very dangerous weapons, and they now have control of those weapons.

Where do we go from here in Syria? It is a very, very difficult question.

We have such utter chaos that Lebanon now is the recipient of the greatest number of Syrian refugees on a daily basis. So we have the tension of Palestinian refugees who have gone into Lebanon. We have Iran, which has its presence through Hezbollah, the terrorist organization, very agitated. Some estimates are that as many as 100,000 missiles are located in people's homes, in schools, in nurseries, in nursing homes, embedded in civilian areas right on Israel's northern border. There is an utter and complete breakdown and chaos in Syria.

Then you have all of the tension in Iraq, with increasing battles going on, again, between Sunni and Shia in Iraq. Iraq at one point had been fairly close to being secured by an American presence. It is has now utterly fallen apart.

There continue to be attacks by the Taliban. A new report just came in that the Taliban, presumably, is responsible for six Americans who were killed in December. We have Karzai, the head of Afghanistan, who is not willing to agree to final settlement terms in Afghanistan to have aid and U.S. presence, despite the fact that the United States supplies something like 95 percent of the economy in Afghanistan. This is the thanks we are getting out of Afghanistan.

We have that kind of tension and pressure together with numerous prisons where the worst of the worst Islamist thug al Qaeda-flavored jihadists have been let out of prisons and are going into Syria. From Syria, who knows where, again, adding to the pressure on Israel. At the same time, we have what, in my mind, was the very dangerous P5+1 agreement dealing with Iran and dealing with trying to prevent or at least stop or at least freeze in place Iran's nuclear program, which all of the world knows will be meant to give Iran a nuclear weapon and the missile delivery systems capable of delivering those weapons against Israel, against Western Europe, and against the United States.

□ 1945

This is the greatest threat that the world faces today: a nuclear Iran. And even while we are here in this Chamber tonight, Mr. Speaker, many people think that the 6-month freeze is on tonight, that when President Obama went to the microphone—it was about a little after 10 o'clock at night on a Saturday night—to announce with vigor that we had concluded this agreement with Iran and we will now have a 6-month freeze, that 6-month period hasn't even started yet. No one knows when that 6-month period of a so-called freeze will even start.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying, quite frankly, is that as we are standing in this Chamber tonight, Iran continues to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon. They are enriching it to 20 percent. That is not a small amount. It may sound small. That is a huge leap towards weapons grade uranium. They continue to install centrifuges. They have new-generation centrifuges that can spin to enrich uranium six times faster than the current generation.

Iran hasn't given up one ounce of its storage of enriched uranium. They haven't stopped their research and development on their delivery systems of their missiles. They haven't stopped research and development on the warheads that would go on the tips of missiles to deliver a nuclear bomb. They haven't stopped the production on the facility of plutonium at Arak. That continues going on. Nothing has stopped.

In fact, the only thing we have heard from Iran is from the Iranian leadership. The Parliament has said, why don't we start enriching to 60 percent? You see, weapons grade is 80 percent. Why don't we up it even further? That is what the Parliament is saying today after the agreement was signed. The mullahs, the religious leaders that effectively control Iran, are saying that this agreement means nothing to them. As a matter of fact, the leader of Iran said that they won't change one iota of their nuclear program. You see, it is very interesting. I think that when madmen speak, the world should listen, and Iran is acting in a way that is indicative of the madman of all time.

Currently, Iran's plan is to have domination across the world by the use of nuclear weapons to wipe millions of innocent people off the map, beginning with the Jewish State of Israel. You see, about 80 percent of the people that live in Israel travel to the greater Tel Aviv area for their employment. It doesn't take much imagination to see how easy it would be for Iran to send multiple nuclear missiles and virtually wipe out the Jewish State of Israel.

But let us never think as Iran calls Israel the Little Satan, Iran calls the United States the Great Satan—and we should never delude ourselves to think that this is a Middle East-only problem. It isn't, Mr. Speaker. I wish I could say it was. This is a problem the world must deal with.

During the course of our travels in December for the week that we were in the Middle East, we were very disturbed by what we heard from various leaders. As a matter of fact, there was one leader that we met with in Lebanon during our time there in that very dangerous area—it was so dangerous, as a matter of fact, that this leader about a year earlier had been shot. There were three snipers—he pointed over a wall. They had to build a wall around his house. He is now confined to his house, in the compound around his house. It is too dangerous for him to even leave. There were three snipers about a mile away that took a shot at him while he was in his backyard. He almost lost his life, and now he is confined to his backyard.

This is what he had to say to us, Mr. Speaker, when they were there. He told us that, unfortunately, in the last 2 to 3 years, there has been virtually no U.S. leadership in the Middle East. That is reminiscent of what we heard the former leader, Lech Walesa, of Poland tell the world, that the United States is no longer the political leader nor the moral leader of the world, that we have effectively walked off the world stage and that the world needs the leadership of the United States. We heard that repeated by this leader in Lebanon.

He also told us that the opinion of the United States has gone down dramatically in the Middle East. He said he has a brother who is in the United States, and it has been a shock for his brother, a very intelligent individual in the United States, a shock to see how the United States has failed to respond to the rise of Islamic jihadist activity in the Middle East and how it is negatively impacting United States national security. He said there is no

strategy; there is no outlook. It seems to be that the United States just acts day to day—no strategy.

Shouldn't our strategy be the security and safety of the American people? Shouldn't our strategy—shouldn't our aim be securing American vital interests in the Middle East, standing with the best ally we have in the world, the Jewish State of Israel? And yet the Middle East doesn't have any idea what our strategy is because they are telling us it looks like it is ad hoc, day to day. He said, I'm telling you this as a friend. He said that prior there were no Russians in the Middle East, no Russian influence and presence. He said that now the Russians have strengthened and have a very strong presence in the Middle East. He said it has been very frustrating in the last 2 or 3 years.

He said the Arabians have long been our friends, friends of the United States. But the Saudi Arabians, he said, no longer seem to trust the United States. He said the P5+1 agreement has made Iran stronger than ever before. And he told us that Iran is Hezbollah, and so he is facing things from Hezbollah every day. He said that there is more money available for Hezbollah because we have decreased, we have essentially lifted sanctions on Iran. All this has done is free up money so more money can go to the terrorist organization Hezbollah in Lebanon, and that is being used to hurt Israel, as well.

Well, whether it is Syria, whether it is Iraq, whether it is Bahrain, whether it is Saudi Arabia, all of these countries are wondering what in the world the United States is doing. Because what they are saying to us is that things are much worse on the ground in the Middle East. As the Iranians have only turned their burner off temporarily, they can turn it back on again. I quote from him, This makes Iran stronger than ever, stronger in the Middle East.

That is what we heard, Mr. Speaker, on the ground from leaders in Lebanon that Iran has been strengthened through this failed P5+1 agreement.

From Lebanon, Mr. Speaker, we went down to Tripoli, Libya, to get some answers on Benghazi and get some answers on what the P5+1 agreement will mean in Libya. Well, we spoke with the Prime Minister in Libya; we spoke with leaders of the Justice Department and the foreign minister, as well. I asked them specifically about Benghazi. I asked them why was our FBI prevented from going into Libya—specifically to Benghazi—to conduct an investigation for 4 or 5 weeks after the terrible tragedy on September 11? And the response that we received was that this was a great insult to Libya when this attack occurred and that this was an attack against Libya and the Libyan people.

Now, this compound that was attacked in Benghazi is considered sovereign American soil. When Chris Stevens, our Ambassador, was killed and the three other Americans—brave Americans—were killed, this was an attack on America, on our compound, on our Ambassador and on our American soldiers. This was an attack against us—not on Libya—against us. There was absolutely no reason why the Libyan Government prevented our FBI from coming in on our sovereign territory and conducting an investigation.

Journalists were inside. We know that CNN picked up the Ambassador's diaries and walked out with the Ambassador's diaries. Other sensitive information was on the ground and people came in and walked away with it. But the FBI couldn't get in? This is the only Ambassador in 30 years to be killed, and we couldn't get in to find out what in the world happened, ask people and figure out what is going on? It has been over a year. We still don't know who, what, where, when, how, why, and how much were we prevented from knowing, because we were kept out of that country by over 4 and 5 weeks. It was wrong. And I told that to the leadership in Libya when we were there. It was wrong. That needs to be rectified. We demand and we expect full cooperation in getting to the bottom of Benghazi. That must be done, and that is a bipartisan issue. That is not a partisan issue.

Well, from Libya, we traveled up to Israel where we met with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the defense secretary. We were extremely grateful for the time we had there. Again, there is no question, the Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, told us, that it was the worst day in 10 years when the P5+1 agreement was struck—the worst day in 10 years. No one will be more negatively impacted by a nuclear Iran than the Jewish State of Israel.

Wouldn't you think it would be wise for the United States and for the great nations of the world to listen to the concerns of the land that is on the slaughtering block when they say, wait a minute, this is the worst thing we could do, the P5+1 agreement, because this will not prevent, this will not stop Iran from getting a nuclear bomb? That was confirmed on this most recent trip when we were with the Prime Minister. He is very concerned about that.

He is also very concerned about the International Criminal Court, as well, and the fact that Israel will soon be drawn into the Criminal Court. There could be actions taking the United States in. We want to be under U.S. law. And we need to maintain the United States as a sovereign Nation and our American people subject only to United States sovereign law. We don't want the American people subject to some international court. The American people must now and for always only be subject to the American courts because only here will we be allowed to enjoy the protections under the Constitution that we have today. That will not happen under the International Criminal Court.

From Israel, we traveled and went on up to Vienna where we met with the International Atomic Energy Agency. This agency is tasked with overseeing the P5+1 agreement with Iran. We appreciated our time in Vienna; we appreciated being able to speak with those who were present to talk about the process, what they will do. But I will tell you, on behalf of my colleagues, we didn't leave with a sense that we could have complete trust in knowing that the IAEA, while they will perform their jobs, that they will be able to completely appreciate when and if Iran decides to move into the creation of a nuclear weapon. That is something that we can't get wrong. Where do we go if that is wrong?

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time is expired.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Well, I thank you. I appreciate that, and thank you for allowing me time to relate some of my concerns that we heard on our recent trip to the Middle East.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014 AT PAGE H62

THE CLASS OF 2006 FONDLY PAYS TRIBUTE TO GABBY GIFFORDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the colleagues that have joined me today for our 30-minute Special Order, and this is a special Special Order.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1171. An act 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; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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. 667. An act to redesignate the Dryden Flight Research Center as the Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center and the Western Aeronautical Test Range as the Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 10, 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:

4401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Non-interference Demonstration for Removal of Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement of the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0563; FRL-9904-89-Region 4] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonable Further Progress Plans, Contingency Measures, Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets, and a Vehicle Miles Traveled Offset Analysis for the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria 1997 8-Hour Severe Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0333; FRL-9904-72-Region-6] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0058; FRL-9904-49-Region-3] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4404. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Third Rule Implementing Export Control Reform (RIN: 1400-AD46) received January 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4405. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-247, ''Controlled Substance, Alcohol Testing, Criminal Background Check and Background Investigation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4406. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-248, ''Distillery Pub Licensure Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4407. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-249, ''Campaign Finance Reform and Transparency Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4408. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-251, ''Manufacturers' Sunday Sale Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4409. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-232, ''Prescription Drug Monitoring Program Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4410. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-234, ''Transportation Infrastructure Mitigation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4411. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-233, ''YMCA Community Investment Initiative Real Property Tax Exemption Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4412. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-236, ''Department of Health Grant-Making Authority for Clinical Nutritional Home Services Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4413. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-235, ''Transportation Infrastructure Improvements GARVEE Bond Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4414. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-238, ''Party Officer Elections Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4415. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-237, ''Critical Infrastructure Freedom of Information Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4416. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-240, ''Board of Elections Nomination Petition Circulator Affidavit Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4417. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-239, ''Department of Corrections Central Cellblock Management Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4418. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-241, ''Board of Ethics and Government Accountability Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4419. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-242, ''Patent and Student Empowerment Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4420. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-250, ''Prohibition on Government Employee Engagement in Political Activity Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4421. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-252, ''Manufacturer Tasting Permit Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4422. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-253, ''Funeral and Memorial Service Leave Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4423. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-254, ''Focused Student Achievement Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4424. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-255, ''Tax Clarity Equity Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4425. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-256, ''Historic Music Cultural Institutions Expansion Tax Abatement Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4426. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-257, ''Fair Student Funding and School-Based Budgeting Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4427. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-258, ''Closing of a Portion of the Public Alley in Square 858, S.O. 12-03336, Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4428. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-259, ''Earned Sick and Safe Leave Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4429. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-260, ''Tax Exemption for Teacher Awards Temporary Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of January 4, 2014]

Mr. CONWAY: Committee on Ethics. Annual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Ethics for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, First Session (Rept. 113–323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–324). 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. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3824. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 3825. A bill to establish the National Freight Mobility Infrastructure Improvement Program to improve freight mobility in the United States, to establish the National Freight Mobility Infrastructure Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 3826. A bill to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3827. A bill to prohibit the United States from providing financial assistance to Benin until Mr. Mojaidou Soumanou is released from prison; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3828. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to draft disclosures describing the rights and liabilities of customers of domestic care services and require that such services provide such disclosures to customers in any contract for such services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 3829. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 1, United States Code, with regard to the definition of ''marriage'' and ''spouse'' for Federal purposes and to ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3830. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3831. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the dialysis pilot program implemented by the Department of Veterans Affairs and submit a report to Congress before expanding that program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 3832. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the surety bond requirement applicable to home health agencies as a condition of participation under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 3833. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the Medicare durable medical equipment face-to-face encounter documentation requirement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3834. A bill to ensure that certain communities may be granted exceptions for floodproofed residential basements for purposes of determining risk premium rates for flood insurance; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3835. A bill to require new procedures for health care Exchange Web sites with regard to personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3836. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Pat Summitt, in recognition of her remarkable career as an unparalleled figure in women's team sports, and for her courage in speaking out openly and courageously about her battle with Alzheimer's; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 3837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect employees in the building and construction industry who are participants in multiemployer plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a consumer renewable credit for utilities that sell intermittent renewable power; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3839. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to assist the repair and replacement of bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3840. A bill to establish the Office of Net Assessment within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.J. Res. 105. A joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. FARR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring the 1915 Panama-California Exposition, and that the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. TIERNEY:

H.R. 3824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 3826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 3829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which states that ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;'' and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: 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. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit the following statement regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution of the United States to enact the accompanying bill cited as the ''Vested Employee Pension Benefit Protection Act.''

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of the Constitution—to regulate Commerce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To declare War . . .'' and ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

This bill would establish an independent organization within the Department of Defense to develop and coordinate net assessments of the military capabilities of the United States compared to potential adversaries in order to identify emerging threats or opportunities. Congressional authority to establish such an office falls within two clauses of Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, which give Congress the specific power ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces,'' and, more generally, ''To declare War.'' The organization that would be established by this bill is a function of the ''Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' and Congressional power to declare war.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.J. Res. 105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. COTTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 60: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 140: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 164: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 176: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 310: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 543: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 556: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 685: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 946: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 975: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1010: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1094: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1098: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1143: Mr. COLE and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1186: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1213: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1309: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1476: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1507: Ms. HAHN and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1518: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1563: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1692: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1717: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1750: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1761: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1796: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1801: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1812: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1852: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1861: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1946: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1950: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2085: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2300: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2305: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2444: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2455: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2482: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2560: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2590: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2694: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2703: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2717: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 2725: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2734: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2780: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2785: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2801: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2827: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2868: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2893: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 2909: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2914: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2955: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2994: Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2998: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 3040: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3097: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3111: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3121: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 3154: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 3207: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3211: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3279: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 3303: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 3335: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 3344: Mr. MESSER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 3362: Mr. LATTA and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 3367: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3377: Mr. COTTON and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3390: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3404: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3413: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 3421: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3436: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3453: Mr. KILMER and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3461: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3465: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3478: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 3485: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 3486: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 3530: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3546: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3633: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3635: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MICA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3649: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3685: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 3686: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3708: Mr. KLINE, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 3712: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3717: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 3724: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3726: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 3731: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3732: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RADEL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 3747: Mr. CLAY and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 3755: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3780: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 3787: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3790: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 3808: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3811: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 3819: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HURT, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H. Res. 11: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 72: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 97: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H. Res. 135: Mr. HANNA.
H. Res. 153: Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 425: Mr. COTTON.
H. Res. 436: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Res. 440: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VELA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BASS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 442: Mr. BARTON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

67. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Municipal Legislature of Aguada, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 19 requesting that the President grant immediate and unconditional freedom to Oscar Lopez Rivera; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 2014 No. 5

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, creator of the universe, create hearts within our Senators that will make them strong enough to know when they are weak. Give them sufficient bravery to choose the more difficult right. Lord, inspire them to be gracious in defeat and humble in victory. Give them enough integrity to face themselves when they are afraid, as they remember that perfect love destroys trepidations. Teach them, O God, how to stand up in the storm with complete confidence in the ultimate triumph of truth.

We pray in Your majestic 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business with the time until noon divided equally. The Republicans will control the first 30 minutes, and the majority will control the second 30 minutes.

At noon, all post-cloture time on the motion to proceed to S. 1845, the unemployment insurance extension, will expire and the Senate will begin consideration of the bill. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. REID. Another day has passed and we still have a vast majority of Republicans standing in the way of the extension of unemployment benefits.

Some Republican Senators are having conversations about possible offsets for a full-year extension. I have said a number of times I think we would be ill-advised to have another short-term extension. If we are going to have an extension that they are talking about paying for, let's do it for 1 year. We don't need to come back and worry about this in 3 more months.

Let's see how they wish to pay for this. We have heard proposals. The proposals are, one, to stop people having health care. The other is to go after children, the earned-income tax credit for American boys and girls. It doesn't sound like a very good idea to me.

Then we have a number of proposals suggested by another Senator late last night that, if we look at it, it is not worth $5 billion. It is worth much less than that. To do what has been suggested by one Republican Senator would be to devastate the disabled, and that wouldn't be appropriate.

I would be interested if there are other proposals. As I have indicated on a number of occasions, I continue to say offsetting the cost of emergency unemployment benefits is not something I agree with.

President Bush extended emergency unemployment insurance five times. Not one of these five times was there a whimper from my Republican colleagues or certainly Democratic Senators that it should be paid for. It wasn't right to offset the cost when President Bush was President, and it is not right to offset the cost now that President Obama is in the White House.

We have cut the deficit in half since President Obama took office, and overall debt reduction has been even more transparent, almost $3 trillion. While we must keep up our good work, we have more to do. We must solve the Nation's job crisis if we ever hope to solve fiscal problems.

Today's long-term unemployment rate is more than double what it was at any time Congress let emergency job assistance expire. Since many Republican Senators are insisting that the cost be offset, I am pleased to talk, as we all are on this side of the aisle, about a long-term emergency extension of unemployment benefits. I repeat, I am waiting to hear from my Republican colleagues about how to pay for this extension.

It has been a week since families already hanging by a thread were kicked off of unemployment insurance benefits. Think about this. People who have been out of work for month after

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

month learned at the beginning of this year they wouldn't get $300 a week.

Remember, this is not charity. First, they have to lose their job, through no fault of their own. Then they have to go out every week, look for a job, and have to list where they have gone.

For every job that is available in America today, there are three people looking for that job. I was stunned when I had my news briefing this morning when one Republican Senator said: There are so many jobs that are unfilled in America today. Let these people go get those jobs. Try that one on for size.

For many the benefits were the only thing preventing them from descending into poverty or even becoming homeless. Hundreds of thousands of children, as a result of these benefits, have been stopped from going into the rolls of the poor.

These families can't wait any longer for relief. I am optimistic my Republican colleagues will help us find a way out of this, and put people first and partisanship second.

Tuesday, House Republican leaders were forced to send a message to their Members reminding them these people are out of work, be compassionate. Then, of course, the memo came to the Senate.

Can one imagine having to remind Senators about having compassion for people who have been long-term unemployed?

Yesterday afternoon the Republican leader spoke in this Chamber for a long time, 45 minutes. Not once during this discussion were the words ''jobs,'' ''the economy'' or ''unemployment'' mentioned—not once.

Middle-class Americans are hurting. We know the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and the middle class is being squeezed.

During the last 30 years, the middle class has lost 10 percent of the earnings they had in the previous 30 years, whereas the top 1 percent during that same 30-year period had their income and wealth triple.

These people who are struggling out there are working two jobs. Some are even trying to do it with three jobs, and some of it is part-time, just in an effort to get by. The rest have watched their wages shrink at the same time, as I have indicated, as the richest of the rich are doing much, much better.

What beleaguered Americans need is not a memo on basic decency, as Republicans got on Tuesday, or a bitter diatribe about the rules of the Senate; they need solutions. For 1.3 million Americans today and 5 million Americans over the course of this year, extending emergency unemployment benefits is a solution.

Raising the minimum wage so a mother or father working two jobs can afford the rent and an electric bill in the same month is a solution. Investing in job creation and education so the workers of today can compete for the jobs of tomorrow is a solution. Whenever my Republican colleagues are prepared to stop complaining and start working with Democrats to create solutions, we will be here waiting.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Before my friend, the Republican leader, makes his remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.; finally, that the previous order with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 1845 be modified so all postcloture time on the motion to proceed be considered to be expired at 2:15 p.m., rather than the earlier time I mentioned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. For months the Democrats who run Washington have been desperate to distract from the pain of ObamaCare. If we listen to them, they think they have found something that might work for them.

The one thing that can actually distract folks from the misery of this law is the misery of the economic malaise they have presided over for the past 5 years. We truly have to hand it to them in one respect. It takes a lot of chutzpah to spend an entire Presidential term pushing policies that are supposedly meant to help the little guy and then turn around and blame everybody else when they flop.

But chutzpah won't solve the problem, and the poll-tested talking points and failed stimulus ideas we have seen Democrats trot out thus far won't do much to improve the plight of millions of Americans struggling in today's economy.

To me that is the real tragedy, because the discussion about how to help Americans battle against the odds day after day is a conversation we actually should be having. In fact, it is a debate Republicans are having. In recent days we have seen several leading Republicans talk about how to tackle poverty in the 21st century.

Unlike the Democrats' outdated ideas from the sixties, Republicans are thinking about ways to update our Nation's approach with fresh proposals that speak to the situation Americans actually find themselves in today, not back in the sixties.

The Republican approach is to learn from past mistakes. It is about turning the left's good intentions into policies that can actually get the job done, and it is about moving beyond the treatment of symptoms and getting at the underlying problems.

That is the thinking behind the Economic Freedom Zones Act, which Senator PAUL and I recently introduced. It aims to shine a light into some of the most impoverished corners of our country, to raise up cities and families who have been left behind and sometimes literally crushed by the outdated ideas from the sixties and to actually do that in a way that lasts.

With this legislation, some of the most disadvantaged areas of our country would acquire the ability to apply for economic freedom zone status that would help lift the burden of some of the poorest families in our country. Small business owners would see fewer government regulations, enabling them to create jobs and drive prosperity. Entrepreneurs would see punitive tax barriers peeled back, allowing them to lead a recovery with new ideas and new energy. Failed educational systems would see reforms that lift up disadvantaged children, giving new hope to a younger generation. Cities and regions that now face a dark future could transform themselves, if they chose, almost instantly into magnets for new ideas and for new hope.

If our Democratic colleagues are serious about their focus on economic distress—if it is more than only some poll-tested ObamaCare distraction—then I would invite them to work with us on innovative new approaches such as this.

This could allow the Senate, for instance, to consider our proposal as an amendment to the unemployment insurance legislation currently on the floor, because this is a discussion that needs to be about helping people. These economic freedom zones are similar in some ways to the Promise Zone initiative recently developed by the Obama administration.

I was pleased to hear that eight counties in eastern Kentucky will soon receive Promise Zone designation. That is why I wrote in support of granting this designation last year, because there is no doubt that eastern Kentucky is a region that has suffered enormous hardship in recent years—much of it, unfortunately, related to the very same Obama administration war on coal families. But the promise zone designation is a step in the right direction nonetheless. Senator PAUL and I will be heading to the White House later today for a promise zone event because we are encouraged the President is finally—finally—focused on a concrete approach to jobs that Members of both parties can support, proving that we can accomplish things when we focus on real efforts rather than political show votes that are designed to fail.

Promise zones are something we can build on with far more comprehensive approaches, such as Senator PAUL's economic freedom zones that would reach even more communities in need

of revitalization. Because let's remember this: Government programs can sometimes help, but they can't do everything. The 1960s mindset about how to fight poverty needs to change to fit the realities of the 21st century.

I want to share a sentiment I read yesterday from Thomas Vincent, an unemployed coal worker from the very Kentucky county where LBJ launched his big-government blitz 50 years ago. This was his take on the so-called ''war on poverty:'' What good are all these government programs if they do not get you a job? It is a feeling, the article noted, that is widespread among his neighbors in Martin County.

This is why Republicans say it is time for modernization and new approaches. It is time to give folks such as Thomas real hope. It is time to give them more than just good intentions.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and with the time equally divided and controlled by the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes.

The Senator from South Dakota.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss amendment No. 2622 I have filed, the Solutions to Long-Term Unemployment Act, that will be before the Senate today.

The bill before the Senate today would extend emergency unemployment benefits for the 13th time since 2008. Let me repeat that. Congress has enacted or extended emergency unemployment benefits 13 times over the past 5 years. At some point you have to start asking yourself: At what point does this no longer become an emergency but it becomes permanent? We have been doing this now for 5 years. This will be the 13th time.

Obviously, there are lots of people in a tough economy who are still hurting. But what this should say to us is that it is time we started not just treating the symptom but fixing the problem we have in America today. And the problem we have is a sluggish economy that continues to sort of stumble along. We have a chronically high unemployment rate with lots of people who have been unemployed for a very long period of time. Over that same period, Congress has pushed through ObamaCare, raised taxes on job creators, while the administration has pursued aggressive regulations that have done little more than drive up costs for many of our small businesses.

So after 13 extensions of unemployment benefits, expensive new regulations, and higher taxes, what is the result? Well, today over 37 percent of unemployed Americans have been out of work for 27 weeks or longer. That represents over 4 million men and women who have been most impacted by President Obama's failed economic policies.

I applaud my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle who have offered up commonsense, even bipartisan, ideas to pay for the extension of emergency unemployment benefits. If we extend these benefits once again, I am hopeful we can find an appropriate way to pay for this extension and not pass the bill on to our children and grandchildren. However, I also have to come to the floor today to challenge all of my colleagues to look at solutions to the underlying problem rather than simply treating the symptoms of long-term unemployment for yet the 13th time.

The underlying problem is we have 4 million Americans who have not been able to find jobs for more than 6 months on account of the stagnant Obama economy. That is almost double—double—the amount of long-term unemployed Americans relative to prerecession levels. So my amendment addresses the underlying problem of long-term unemployment by reducing labor costs, increasing worker mobility, and strengthening Federal worker training programs.

First, my amendment would provide much-needed relief from ObamaCare for any employer who hires an individual who has been unemployed for 27 weeks or longer. As we all know, ObamaCare is full of additional costs and mandates that are stifling economic growth. The ObamaCare employer mandate arguably has the greatest impact on an already weak labor market. The impact of this mandate is so great the administration has unilaterally delayed it until after the next election. Under this mandate, a business with 50 or more employees must provide government-approved insurance or pay an annual penalty of $2,000 to $3,000 per employee. For a smaller or medium-sized business, that is a significant deterrent to expanding and hiring more workers.

Under my amendment, if a business decides to hire someone who has been out of work for 27 weeks or longer, that person would be exempt from the ObamaCare mandate for as long as he or she works at that business.

Second, my amendment would further reduce labor costs by providing a 6-month payroll tax holiday for any employer who hires a long-term unemployed worker. Employers currently pay a payroll tax of 6.2 percent of an employee's wages up to a capped amount known as the Social Security wage base. Waiving this tax is an incentive for employers to hire those employees often considered to be a higher risk by virtue of the fact they have been out of the labor force for an extended period of time.

Consider a job that is paying an annual wage of $40,000. The employer payroll tax holiday in my amendment represents a $1,240 incentive for the employer to hire a long-term unemployed individual. Or take a higher skilled job paying $80,000 annually. A payroll tax holiday represents a $2,480 incentive for the employer to hire someone who has been unemployed for 27 weeks or longer. When coupled with the ObamaCare exemption in my amendment, that is an incentive of roughly $5,000 to hire an individual who has been unemployed for an extended period of time.

Third, my amendment addresses a fundamental problem facing the long-term unemployed by providing relocation assistance to start a job or find better opportunities.

While the national labor market remains weak, there are pockets of prosperity across the country. In my home State of South Dakota, we have an unemployment rate of 3.6 percent. That is second only to our neighbors in North Dakota who are fully embracing the energy renaissance which is occurring in the Upper Great Plains and other parts of the country. Because of South Dakota's low tax and regulatory framework, it consistently makes us one of the best places in the United States to start and grow a business. In fact, one of the biggest issues we hear from prospective business investors is a concern they are not going to have enough workers if they decide to move to my State.

Meanwhile, we have other parts of the Nation that continue to struggle with persistently high unemployment rates. Virginia has an unemployment rate of 8½ percent, and Rhode Island has 9 percent. The number of job openings and hire rates varies from region to region as well. This past summer the rate of job openings in the South was 20 percent greater than in the Northeast. The same trend exists for hiring rates between those two regions.

Part of a dynamic 21st economy is ensuring a mobile workforce that can meet regional demands for good-paying jobs. However, if you have someone who has been living off of unemployment benefits for the past 6 months, that person likely does not have the resources to move to a new State for a new job.

My amendment would provide a low-interest loan of up to $10,000 for anyone willing to relocate to a new job or move to a new State with better employment opportunities. These loans would have to be repaid within 10 years, but no payments would be required for 1 year while that individual or family gets back on their feet. Additionally, if the new job is eliminated within that first year, through no fault of the employee, the loan could be forgiven.

Finally, my amendment would strengthen and streamline Federal worker training programs. We currently have over 50—50—Federal training programs across 9 Federal bureaucracies. It is a broken morass of programs that isn't helping employers or employees, and it certainly isn't an efficient use of taxpayer dollars. Even President Obama, in his 2012 State of the Union speech, said he wanted to ''cut through the maze of confusing [job] training programs'' and create ''one program'' for workers to find the help they need. Unfortunately, like many of the President's promises, that turned out to be more talk than action.

While the President has failed to put forward a real plan to reform our worker training programs, the Republican-led House of Representatives has acted on a plan to accomplish just that. The House-passed SKILLS Act includes several critical reforms that ensure workers receive the training they need for positions that businesses need filled today.

The SKILLS Act would consolidate 35 redundant and ineffective Federal worker programs into a single workforce investment fund that would serve as a single source of support for workers, employers, and job seekers at the State level. This legislation creates much-needed flexibility at the State level and it empowers Governors and local employers to train workers for today's in-demand jobs.

The SKILLS Act cuts through red-tape and eliminates barriers that oftentimes keep workers from receiving the training they need when they need it. For too long we have been throwing taxpayer dollars at a maze of overlapping bureaucracies when we should be providing more targeted assistance directly to job seekers. We need to be training our workers for the high-tech jobs of today and the jobs that will continue to be in demand in the future.

The SKILLS Act accomplishes these goals, which is why I included it in my amendment as a commonsense way to help the long-term unemployed try to find work in today's economy.

There is no one solution to helping the unemployed. However, one thing is clear: We need to find ways to make it more attractive for employers to invest in and hire workers rather than constantly pushing legislation that will raise the cost of doing business in America.

Let's think for a second about the bills the Democratic majority supports or supported in the past. ObamaCare raised the cost of labor, it drove up premiums for millions of Americans and made it more expensive for employers to hire new employees.

Raising the minimum wage will raise the cost of hiring new employees and only worsen the job prospects for the long-term unemployed.

The tax increases pushed by Democrats here in the Senate and the White House apply to millions of small business owners which discourages investment and job growth.

New environmental regulations are driving up the cost of energy and, therefore, the cost of doing business in this country.

I am not suggesting the provisions in my amendment are the only way to make it more economical for employers to hire more workers, but I am suggesting if we want more employment, we need to make it less costly, not more costly, to hire each additional employee. It seems that nearly every policy pursued by the Democratic majority and the White House would raise costs on businesses, especially those small businesses which create the majority of jobs in this country.

We have tried the approach of bigger government, higher taxes, and more regulations for the last 5 years and it has not worked. Let's try something different. Let's have a real debate about how we lower cost and make it easier for employers to go out and hire new employees. Let's focus our efforts on those who need the most help, such as those Americans who have been out of work the longest on account of the lagging Obama economy.

I hope this amendment as well as others that my colleagues will offer will have an opportunity to be heard here on the floor of the Senate and voted on. What we have going on here now in terms of a process doesn't resemble anything like an open process that should allow us to openly debate the big issues that affect the American people. This is a pocketbook issue. This strikes at the very heart of the quality of life, the standard of living, the future economic well-being of Americans all across this country.

I certainly hope the majority leader will allow for an open process which will enable us to enter into that debate, to put forward proposals—mine, among many others—which could be considered and voted on that would actually improve the overall situation of middle-class Americans. It is high time we had that debate. I hope we can, and I hope the majority will give us that opportunity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Georgia.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, before I make my remarks, I commend the Senator from South Dakota and underscore what the Senator said regarding the SKILLS Act passed by the House of Representatives.

I am the ranking member of the labor subcommittee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. Six years ago the Workforce Investment Act expired in its authorization, and for 6 years it has languished in the bowels and in the heart of the Senate and the House of Representatives, going unauthorized.

During that same 6-year period of time between 2008 and today, America has experienced terrible unemployment, terrible job loss, terrible increases in unemployment, and extensions of that unemployment.

The Senator from South Dakota is exactly correct: If we were doing our job and reauthorizing programs in the law today—such as the Workforce Investment Act—and training people for the skills of the 21st century and the jobs of the 21st century, we wouldn't be talking about unemployment compensation, we wouldn't be talking about the great tragedies of America. We would be talking about America's greatest prosperity. So I commend the Senator from South Dakota for pointing out what is critically important for us to recognize as Members of the U.S. Congress.

I come to the floor, though, to talk about the Affordable Care Act, I will tell a couple real-life stories which came to me by email. But before I do, my job is to do what the people of Georgia want me to do. I have office hours when I am home. I answer my own phone calls. I try to respond to the concerns they have. I try to see that people get referred to the right place.

Since January 1, I have dealt with almost nothing but the Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare—and the consequences of that act, and what effect it is having on the American people and the people of Georgia—and, in particular, on the two great promises used on the floor of this Senate to sell that legislation to the American people: One, if you like your policy, you can keep it; and, if you like your doctor, you can keep him or her. Both were clear, unequivocal promises.

I will tell two stories today that came to my attention which illustrate how it was not true. And these are just two of many stories. The first is from Jane.

> Congressman, This is not my story but my friend's story, Steve. . . . He has suffered with multiple myeloma for more than 10 years. This is a disease that usually kills within 5 years of being diagnosed. But with the excellent health care he has been able to receive through his health care program he has had access to the Mayo Clinic and a myriad of drugs. Now he has been told that his plan will be cancelled since the plan does not meet the minimum standards set forth in the ACA.
>
> Now he can no longer continue his treatments because the various plans have deemed the drugs he needs to stay alive as experimental. WOW! Really that is just awful and not enough is being said about this government take over of our lives is affecting those that are critically ill.

And what about the promise made that if we liked our plan we can keep it? Steve doesn't have a plan, but he still has multiple myeloma.

This story comes about the promise that: If you like your doctor, you can keep them. This is from Felicia in Alpharetta, GA, a story I hear more and more as I travel my State:

> My husband and I are both currently paying individual health care policies as he currently has a small business and I used to own one. He is on a Kaiser HMO and I am on a PPO with Blue Cross Blue Shield. We have

both received numerous letters with conflicting information regarding changes to our current policies. We are reasonably intelligent people and yet we cannot figure out what is actually happening with our health care nor do we believe the government has any clue what is happening with this new legislation. Also, in comparing an equivalent Obama care policy to my current policy, I have only 10% of the doctors available in network to what I currently have and of course, my doctors are not in network. Please STOP and REPEAL this ridiculous legislation. I DO NOT SEE ANY EVIDENCE that the government can improve our current health care, only EVIDENCE that it has caused much confusion, created wasted time, wasted money, and driven Americans crazy!

These are two emails sent to me out of many more I could be reading. But it is important for us to understand the impact the Affordable Care Act is having on the American people and the people of my State. In fact, I will share my personal experience from just over the Christmas holidays.

In December, I enrolled through the DC health care plan to buy my health care because all of Congress was moved into the DC health exchange to comply with the ObamaCare legislation. I worked hard to try and match the same care I had before under plan 105 Blue Cross/Blue Shield under the government health care. I couldn't find exactly a good enough match of PPO, but I came close—close in everything except premium. The premium went up 20 percent. And I think most of the American people—certainly people of my age—are realizing the same type of experience where premiums are going up and up.

I would suspect the reason for the Executive order to extend next year's open enrollment date beyond the election is in part because the administration suspects what I suspect; that is, the realities of less enrollment than thought, and fewer young people going into coverage than thought is going to mean higher premiums, less access, and less affordability.

But let me share another story which is really poignant. Fortunately, I was able to help, but when I found out, it broke my heart. It is a story about my grandson Jack and his speech therapist.

Jack is a great kid, a highly intelligent kid, but had some speech problems and so had a special speech therapist named Dr. Tim. Over the Christmas holidays I got to meet Dr. Tim, and we were talking about his job, what he does as a speech therapist, and about Jack and all of his improvements.

Dr. Tim turned to me and said: I don't want to burden you with my personal problems, but my youngest daughter has cystic fibrosis and has had it into her teenage years; and I have had health care coverage up until a week ago, when I was notified my health coverage would no longer pay for the drugs it takes to keep her alive.

For anybody in this Senate or in America who understands cystic fibrosis, it is a terrible debilitating disease of the lungs and people never used to live to the age of 21. But because of medicine, health care, and breakthroughs in pharmaceutical therapy, people live past the age of 21. In fact, we have a Georgian who lived into his 50s before he passed from cystic fibrosis. But they cannot live if they don't have the pharmaceutical therapy. And there are no substitutes and there are no replacements.

This doctor lost his health care reimbursement for pharmaceuticals for cystic fibrosis in part because of the judgments and the applicability of the Affordable Care Act. To his credit and to the credit of the health care system and the insurance industry, he was able to in part replace it but not nearly as close to what he had on the policy before.

These are just a few stories about Americans who are experiencing terrible problems because of the change in our health care system.

The promises we made are not being kept. The promises that were made to sell the Affordable Care Act to the American people and to the Congress of the United States are not being kept. It is important for us to understand that cannot stand. And if what happens next year happens as I think it will, costs will skyrocket again for the American people, access and affordability will go away or will not be nearly as good as it is, and we will have taken a health care system which was the envy of the world and turned it into a health care system that is the biggest problem in the world.

I want things to work. I want to help the American people. I want them to have access to affordable health care. I want them to have access to their doctors and to be able to keep their policy. We need to work toward that as we go through the tragedies of the implementation in 2014 of the Health Care Act—ObamaCare—which today is America's No. 1 personal problem for the average American citizen.

I am grateful for the time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I come here to speak about a couple items. We are now in a second-day delay as the majority leader and his caucus decide whether Republicans will be allowed to offer alternatives and to offer amendments to the proposal before us, and that is extension of the Unemployment Insurance Act.

I was one of six who voted for the motion to proceed for the very purpose of achieving the opportunity to offer ideas which I have had and to allow others on our side of the aisle to offer their ideas as to how we can improve this program, and how we ought to address it at this point in our continuing effort to struggle out of the great recession now into its fifth year.

Unemployment is still high in my State—over 7 percent—as a number of States, which is unacceptable, and particularly into the fifth year after a recession. The growth has been so anemic and so tepid, we are sort of staggering our way into a better position.

Nevertheless, while some people are finding jobs and getting back to work, there are many who aren't. That is a serious subject and something we ought to be debating and talking about.

Unemployment insurance is one of the programs which has been proposed to help those in need. There are people who are genuinely in need of that help and have made every possible effort to get back to work and, for many reasons, have not been able to do so. But we also know, and it has been documented, that there are many people who have taken advantage of this program and basically said, I don't have to work hard to get back to work because I am getting enough support from the government.

We have to acknowledge the fact that there are policy issues which have to be discussed as we go forward without automatically extending a program where we know reforms would make the program better and would put us in a better position to help people get back to work and to move our economy.

We also know, working now to just pass a budget for the first time here in several years to work off of, the number we agreed on we wouldn't go over is now being violated. The very first legislative piece which has come before this body violates the budget agreement which was agreed to a short time ago. So a number of us would like the opportunity to propose ways to offset the spending if this program goes forward.

The combination of those two things—reforms which will allow us to continue to support those who are genuinely unable to find work from those who are taking advantage of the program and abuse of the program, as well as suggestions as to how we can support efforts toward more full employment through training programs, through any number of initiatives—my colleagues would like to at least talk about, at least debate, and at least have a vote on. We are in the minority here. We are not sure we are going to win any of those votes. Although I think if we make persuasive enough arguments and it makes enough sense, perhaps we will.

Given this 2-day delay in terms of a decision from majority leader HARRY REID as to whether to allow us these opportunities, it appears that through this tactic of supporting the motion to proceed we have literally put the ball in HARRY REID's office and his caucus court as to what they want to do.

We went through the year 2013, and since July, Republicans have been offered a total of only four amendments to all the things done in the last 6

months of this year. That is not how the Senate is supposed to work. That is a dictatorial dictate by the majority leader, unprecedented in 200 years or more of operation of this Senate.

So we are waiting for that decision, and, obviously, that decision will have a bearing on my position on this particular issue.

I would also comment on the fact that lately we have been hearing a lot from the President about income inequality, and I anticipate we will be hearing a lot more as we move toward the 2014 elections in November. There will be a debate on this, and I hope there will be a debate which allows both sides to look at this in a serious way and try to find ways to address the issue. But if we do that, I think it is important we understand that the President's signature accomplishment, the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare, as it is called—is contributing to the problem of income inequality. So any debate on that issue, to be factually accurate and to be truthful, needs to incorporate a conversation about the impact of ObamaCare.

As recently as 2012, we were told by the President that the health insurance premiums paid by small businesses and individuals ''will go down.'' Yet even as the administration recently has admitted that many Americans will pay more for health care because of ObamaCare, this week the latest report on health spending trends from CMS—the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid—disclosed that health care spending in the United States rose 3.7 percent in 2012. That is less than it rose in previous years, and that is a good sign.

Many are saying, well, the reason for this is the Affordable Care Act. Had we not passed the Affordable Care Act, this wouldn't have happened. Apparently, though, they did not read the rest of the report because the report also states that the provisions in the Affordable Care Act had minimal impact on total national health care spending. So while the administration may claim that their bill, ObamaCare, is lowering overall health care spending, the report says it has only had a minimal impact.

What is happening is that there are reforms being made through the private sector, through the providers, in terms of more efficient, more effective ways to deliver health care. That is not operating because of the health care act. In fact, the health care act, if we are truthful about it, is contributing to the problem of inequality.

Many Americans are experiencing, despite what the President has said, higher premiums or paying outrageous deductibles when they purchase coverage through the ObamaCare exchanges. Let's bring this down to a personal level because I have been receiving hundreds, actually thousands of emails, phone calls, letters, comments that I hear back home from Hoosiers who basically say: This ain't working. It is sure not working for me.

But I want to bring it down to the personal level so we can understand what individual families are going through at this particular time with this mandate imposed upon them relative to their health care coverage.

Thomas from Indianapolis wrote to me and said he went on the ObamaCare exchange to take a look at health insurance plans that would be available to him and he was, as he said, ''shocked to find that it was at least $200 a month.'' That is $2,400 a year more than he had been quoted just a few months before from a broker. He added, ''I have thought about just going without insurance''—as we know many individuals are thinking about and have decided not to sign up for this program. Of course, the program is built financially on the fact that millions will sign up and that is not happening. I predict that is going to break the back of the program. He added:

> I have thought about going without insurance, but my family suggested that I not do that. The Affordable Care Act has created a terrible quandary for me. At this point I feel as if the Federal Government is like a mean Big Brother, making my life miserable.

William from Granger, IN, emailed me to tell me his wife, who works as a part-time nurse, now is no longer offered health care because she is part time. So William then decided, OK, I will have to go into the exchange and find insurance for my wife and my family and discovered that their premiums will rise to $19,076 a year. He goes on to say, ''So much for 'if you like your plan, if you like your doctor . . . your costs will go down by $2,500.' ''

Let me repeat that. The President has said your costs are going to go down by an average of $2,500 a year. William's costs increased over $7,500 a year. That is a $10,500 swing. That is not what was promised.

Brandy from Cambridge City, IN, told me:

> I have been offered insurance through work at a cost of $318 or $80 a week. I then checked HealthCare.Gov and have been given a quote of $450 a month. I work a minimum wage job and work as many hours as I can to get by as it is. After taxes and child support, neither option is an option that I can afford.

He also cannot even afford to pay the penalty of the payment.

These are just a few of the hundreds, if not thousands, of Hoosier comments I have heard from people who are experiencing sticker shock when they search for so-called affordable care under ObamaCare. I don't know if these people are Republicans or Democrats, conservatives, moderates, liberals, nonvoters or voters. These are just human beings who live in my State, regardless of their political affiliation, who are basically saying this thing is killing us. All these examples, multiplied by hundreds if not thousands, are contributing to the inequality the President is talking about.

The inescapable truth is that the Democrats forced an unwanted, unpopular, and unread—the famous quote from then House Speaker NANCY PELOSI—''We have to pass the bill so we can find out what is in it''—and we are finding out about what is in it—an unwanted, unpopular, and unread 2000-plus page, one-size-fits-all health care bill, dictated by one party without any support from the minority.

I am questioning whether this is the best way to deal with health care issues. Jamming this thing through on Christmas Eve day in 2009 has turned out to be a disastrous Christmas gift for the American people. Families across our country who are being forced to redirect money they would have used to pay rent, to help their children attend school, to put food on the table, to pay the electric bills, are finding many cannot even do that.

As we discuss the issue of income inequality, and it appears the President is going to want to do that throughout this coming election year, let's not pretend that ObamaCare is helping the situation. It is not. We need to face up to the fact that the Affordable Care Act—I bet the writers of this bill, if they could do it over again, wish they had not used the word ''affordable.'' They could call it the health care act or health care act for American people or whatever. If they went back and rewrote it, I bet you they would drop the word ''affordable,'' based on the facts, not the perception, the fact of what this health care bill is.

I suspect they would have wanted to pass this in a bipartisan way so that at this point in time they would not have to take full responsibility for this act. Too many hard-working American families are paying more, not less, for health care because of ObamaCare, and it is contributing to the inequality the President continues to talk about.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last few days our friends across the aisle have been telling the American people that we have a choice when it comes to the extension of long-term unemployment benefits. On one hand, they are saying we can do exactly what the President, Senator REID, and his allies want, which is to extend benefits for 3 months at a cost of $6.5 billion that we will have to borrow from somebody or we will do nothing at all.

Well, I am here to suggest that is a false choice, as President Obama likes to say from time to time. We can do better than that. As a matter of fact, several of my Republican colleagues have offered their suggestions. I have in my hand a list of 23 amendments that would deal with everything from improving access to workforce training to finding a way to pay for this money that would otherwise have to be borrowed from the Chinese or other creditors of the United States and added to our $17.3 trillion debt.

In other words, there are a lot of good ideas. We just have not been given the opportunity to debate them and offer these amendments and actually do what the Senate used to do. As the Republican leader said yesterday, we actually used to have committees that voted on amendments and then passed bills that came to the floor. We used to actually have an open amendment process where people could offer their amendments, and then we would debate them and vote on them. What a novel idea. That, of course, is called legislating. That is what the legislative branch—Congress—is supposed to be doing. That is not what we have been doing.

The majority leader is basically the traffic cop for the Senate floor. He is the one who determines whether we have an opportunity to have this sort of fulsome debate so we can offer these constructive, bipartisan—in many instances—ideas.

We would like to try to reform our unemployment compensation system in order to help grow the economy, help the private sector create jobs, and get more people back to work so they don't have to depend on extended unemployment insurance. However, if they do find themselves in a difficult circumstance, as many Americans unfortunately do, they can then go back to school by the using Pell grant, for example, to go to our community colleges, which do a fantastic job of helping people learn new skills that make them a good fit for the good jobs, of which there are many. Unfortunately, there are not enough skilled workers in the workforce who are qualified for those jobs.

To give the Senate a flavor for some of the ideas, my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator COBURN, who is always full of a lot of ideas, filed an amendment to ensure that people don't claim unemployment insurance and Social Security disability benefits simultaneously. If there is a case of double dipping, that would seem to be it, and it is an abuse of the system. He has filed an amendment that would prevent millionaires and billionaires from receiving unemployment checks. I know it is hard to believe, but people with incomes of $1 million or more have claimed nearly $21 million worth of unemployment benefits in a single year. That is unbelievable. What an abuse. That is an insult, really, to people who are in dire straits and need help, to know there are people gaming the system either by double dipping or being millionaires and claiming unemployment benefits. Again, we have borrowed $250 billion to pay these extended unemployment benefits since 2008, and there are some millionaires and billionaires who are gaming the system for their benefit. Why wouldn't we want to fix that? Why wouldn't we want to have a vote on those good ideas by our colleague Senator COBURN?

Meanwhile, our colleague from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT, has filed a commonsense amendment that would define full-time employment as a 40-hour workweek for the purposes of ObamaCare. The Presiding Officer—and since he walked in, I will pick on my friend from Maryland—remembers when we had a number of leaders from organized labor who came to the White House and said that ObamaCare is turning full-time work into part-time work. Because of the penalties associated with the employer mandate and the like, many employers are shifting full-time workers into part-time workers. That is not just a concern on this side of the aisle; it is a broad concern which impacts a lot of people.

I remember recently being in Tyler, TX, at a diner, and the owner of that diner said he tragically had to put a single mom on a 30-hour workweek in order to avoid some of the penalties of ObamaCare. So to make up for that lost income, she had to go and get a second part-time job because of ObamaCare and its unintended consequences. So Senator SCOTT has an amendment that would address that problem.

I hope the majority leader will rethink his longstanding position—at least over the last 6 months—of basically shutting out any other constructive ideas not just on this side of the aisle but on the other side of the aisle as well, as the Republican leader pointed out yesterday.

In addition, our colleague from Indiana, Senator COATS, has several ideas. One would offset the extension of long-term unemployment benefits by delaying the individual and employer mandates under ObamaCare until 2015. We all recall that the President and this administration on its own initiative—I am looking hard to find where they have the authority, but nevertheless they did—delayed the employer mandate for a year on their own. Well, this would take the money saved from delaying the individual employer mandate and use that to pay for the extension of unemployment benefits.

Another amendment would offset the cost of this extension by requiring people to provide a Social Security number before they claim the child tax credit. All it would do is make them provide a Social Security number to make sure that we root out fraud and abuse in the child tax credit claims. It would save billions of dollars, and it would allow us to pay for this short-term extension of long-term unemployment benefits.

I would also add that I think most people need to be reminded that actually the basic program of unemployment insurance covers people for up to half a year, but over the last 5 years Congress has extended that up to 99 weeks, which is about 2 years. Well, this is supposed to be an emergency program, and thankfully the economy is starting to show some signs of improvement and growth. So what we need to do is get off of this temporary emergency measure and get back to normal circumstances and try to find ways to pay our bills and make sure people don't abuse the American taxpayer by gaming the system. We need to continue to look for ways to help people learn the skills they need in order to get the good, high-paying jobs that exist, among other things.

Well, here is another idea. Our colleague from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE, has filed an amendment that would restore the military pension benefits. This is something, if you will remember, that was taken out of the Murray-Ryan budget deal that passed before we left for Christmas, and I think it is fair to say there is broad bipartisan support for restoring those cuts to the military pensions, and Senator AYOTTE's amendment would do that.

All of these amendments deserve debate, which I am trying in some small way to provide here, but others have their ideas and have their way of talking about it, and they also deserve a vote. But, again, the majority leader, Senator REID, is the traffic cop on the Senate floor. As Senator MCCONNELL pointed out yesterday, the Senate has been dramatically transformed from a place where the Senate was justifiably claimed as the greatest deliberative body on the planet but no more.

We can return to the way the Senate used to be by having this sort of constructive, bipartisan, fulsome discussion and vote on good ideas and make legislation better and not settle for something less. I said—and it is true—that Senators have a right to debate and offer legislation. I am not sure many people across America have thought very deeply about what that means.

This isn't about the Presiding Officer's rights as a Senator or my rights as a Senator. This is about the rights and the voices of the 26 million people I represent, because when I am shut out of the process—when I can't offer amendments and ideas about how to improve legislation—they are shut out as well, and that is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I was unaware there was a time limit. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Chair.

So these amendments represent just a small sample of the ideas our side of the aisle has put forward to help the long-term unemployed, accelerate job creation, and grow the economy—something I know we all want. We all want it, so why not talk about it. Why not vote on these ideas. Why not get the Senate back into the position where we have the give and take of ideas and where we come up with the best for the American people.

A few other amendments my colleagues from Ohio and Kansas, Senator PORTMAN and Senator ROBERTS, have

offered would increase accountability and much stronger safeguards in the U.S. regulatory system. Regulations are what the bureaucracy does. We can't vote for them or against them. We can't hold them accountable that way, and they are out of control. If someone wants to know why those bills are so important, it is because last year the Obama administration imposed $112 billion worth of new regulations on the U.S. economy—$112 billion worth of new regulations in 2013 alone.

Our colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, who is the ranking member of the energy committee, is rightly concerned about the impact of misguided regulations on our energy industry—primarily the oil and gas industry—and she has taken the time to draft a bold plan for reforming U.S. energy policy that would promote economic growth, job creation, national security, and responsible stewardship of our environment.

In conclusion, I wish to recognize—in terms of a summary of some of the ideas, 23 of which I have on this card, but I will just mention a few of them—the ideas of our colleague from Utah, Senator MIKE LEE, and his efforts to reform our dysfunctional tax system in a way that supports middle class families who are working hard to provide for their children. We should agree, as Senator LEE has advocated, that tax reform should aim not just to simplify the Tax Code and fuel job growth, but also to ease the burden on hard-working, middle-class families.

There are a lot of great ideas out there. I can't think of a better time to talk about them than this time, when the President of the United States has made a priority of income inequality which, unfortunately, has become worse under his administration, not better. This has been further exacerbated by burdens such as ObamaCare, which we find out is just a bundle of broken promises, including: ''If you like what you have, you can keep it.'' ''It will lower costs, not increase them.'' We are finding out none of that is true.

There are a lot of great ideas that we could, working together in the interests of the American people, agree on that would actually improve their economic situation and help restore the American dream. But what is the American dream to somebody who has been out of work and can't find work? It is a disappointment to say the least. We need to help people to not maintain their dependency on a government benefit in perpetuity but to liberate them from that dependency, to help them regain their self respect and sense of dignity by finding work and providing for themselves and their families, and to live their version of the American dream. In the process we all benefit. The Federal Government can pay its bills because people are paying taxes because they have good jobs, and America will be the same America we inherited from our parents and grandparents and, hopefully, we will make it better for the next generation and beyond.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

SOUTH SUDAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have taken the floor of the Senate—and when I was a Member of the House, the floor of the House—to talk about circumstances that are occurring somewhere in the world where people are being killed, displaced; people are being uprooted simply because of their ethnicity. Ethnic cleansing has occurred around the world. I have taken the opportunity to put a spotlight on it in an effort to say that the civilized world needs to bring an end to those types of crimes against humanity. I have used the opportunity as a member of the Helsinki Commission, and now as chairman of the Helsinki Commission, to point out what America's priority needs to be, and that is to be a leader in the world to prevent ethnic cleansing.

Many of us believed, after World War II, that the world would never again allow circumstances wherein people were killed simply because of the ethnic community to which they belong. I have spoken about Bosnia, Rwanda, Darfur, and Syria, and now we see the same thing happening again in South Sudan.

I just came from a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that was convened to discuss the crisis in South Sudan with two witnesses: the Honorable Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of African Affairs, and the Honorable Nancy E. Lindborg, Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance. These two witnesses were giving an update to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as to the circumstances in South Sudan and what we can do to try to bring about a resolution.

I rise today to discuss the deteriorating circumstances in South Sudan. As some of my colleagues may know, ongoing political tensions between forces loyal to President Salva Kiir and forces loyal to the former Vice President Riek Machar, coupled with preexisting ethnic tensions, erupted in violence the night of December 15. I join the President and Secretary Kerry in calling for an immediate end to the violence in South Sudan. Currently, it is estimated that nearly 200,000 people have been internally displaced as a result of the conflict, with another 32,000 having fled to neighboring States. The U.N. estimates that thousands of Sudanese people have been killed since December 15. Let me just remind my colleagues that three years ago today the people of South Sudan started a voting process that later that year led to their independence as the youngest new country in the world.

Our U.S. Ambassador, Susan Page, has remained in Juba, along with a security detail and minimum key personnel. I thank her; it is very courageous of her to remain in South Sudan so we have our leadership on the ground to try to help the people. I applaud her bravery and sacrifice and those who are with her.

The worsening violence has spurred a humanitarian crisis. The President has nominated Ambassador Booth to be our ambassador to that region to try to get a peace process started. He is currently in Ethiopia trying to get the international community to respond to a political solution to South Sudan. The international community has responded rapidly, including by working to significantly expand the size of the U.N. mission in South Sudan, but since the evacuation of foreign aid workers, most humanitarian agencies and the international NGOs are heavily reliant on brave South Sudanese staff who put their lives at risk to help their people.

These are large numbers for the country of Sudan—the number of people displaced and the number of people killed. Let me share with my colleagues one of many examples of the crisis and how it has affected people in that region.

I recently learned that at the onset of the December clashes, one local staff person from an American NGO was rounded up, along with seven members of his family, and taken to a police station in Juba. He ultimately escaped to the U.N. compound, but his family was killed, along with more than 200 others. He is from the Nuer ethnic group, which now lives in fear of ethnic targeting by members of the country's security forces from another ethnic group, the Dinka. Media reports also suggest that individuals in uniforms have entered the U.N. bases in several locations and forcibly removed civilians taking shelter there. On December 21, two U.N. peacekeepers were killed after a group attacked a U.N. peacekeeping base that was sheltering 20 civilians.

There is no safe harbor today in South Sudan. The U.N.'s base can be overrun, and people killed because of their ethnicity. The international community must respond.

I remain extremely concerned at the reports out of South Sudan, all of which suggest serious crimes against humanity are occurring in the country. The world cannot stand by and bear witness to another ethnic cleansing as we have seen in so many other places around the world. We must do all we can to ensure a peaceful resolution of the crisis and accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in South Sudan.

Our first priority is to get peace on the ground, to stop the killings, so people can live in peace. We need to work with the international community so humanitarian aid can get to the people who need it—and that is very challenging considering that international

NGOs cannot operate today in South Sudan—and we must hold accountable those who have committed crimes against humanity. We have said it over and over, but unless we hold accountable those who have perpetrated these atrocities, we will see it again and again. U.S. leadership is critically important to make sure that we document what has taken place and that we bring to justice those who are responsible for the crimes that have been committed.

There is no question that a solution to the crisis in South Sudan must be political and not military. We understand that. South Sudan again is at a crossroads, and after coming so far, it must choose to renounce violence immediately and pursue a path of peaceful reconciliation.

I am encouraged that President Kiir and former President Machar have sent negotiators to Ethiopia to participate in mediation talks. While these talks are a good first step, in the interim the violence must end, and both sides must be committed to negotiating in good faith. It is my hope these talks can bring about the bright future so many South Sudanese aspire for. The people of South Sudan deserve to understand the true meaning of safety and security, of peace, and prosperity. The United States stands with the people of South Sudan through these difficult times. We must pledge to continue to support those who seek peace, democracy, human rights, and justice for all of the citizens of the world's newest nation.

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. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. My colleague from South Carolina will join me shortly on the floor, but I will make some remarks while I am waiting.

When the Senator from South Carolina joins me, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FALLUJAH

Mr. McCAIN. Some of us were in the Senate 10 years ago in 2004 when U.S. troops led two major offensives against Al Qaeda and other militants in the Iraqi city of Fallujah. Some of us remember how 146 of our brave men and women in uniform lost their lives and more than 1,000 were wounded. Those fights were some of the bloodiest and toughest battles since the Vietnam war. Success was costly, but success we had. Ten years later, Al Qaeda fighters have once again raised their black flags over Fallujah, and they are battling to control other parts of Iraq.

This tragic setback is leaving many of our brave Iraq war veterans—and especially those who shed their blood, risked their lives, and lost their friends in fighting against Fallujah—questioning what their sacrifice was worth. Sadly, they find themselves agreeing with Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, a former marine who fought in Fallujah. He said:

> We did our job. We did what we were asked to do, and we won. Every single man and woman who fought in Iraq, and especially in those cities, feels a kick in the gut for all they did, because this President decided to squander their sacrifice.

Prior to 2011, President Obama frequently referred to a responsible withdrawal from Iraq, which was based on leaving behind a stable and representative government in Baghdad and avoiding a power vacuum that terrorists could exploit.

The President's Deputy National Security Adviser Antony Blinken in 2012—and I am not making this up—stated that ''Iraq today is less violent, more democratic, and more prosperous . . . than any other time in history.''

Based on the President's own markers, the administration is falling short of its own goals. The illusion of a stable and representative government has been shattered by increasing sectarian tension, and it is clear terrorists are exploiting the power vacuum left behind.

The Obama administration blames Iraqis for failing to grant the necessary privileges and immunities for a U.S. force presence beyond 2011. This is misleading—in fact, false—because as we saw firsthand, the administration never took the necessary diplomatic effort to reach such an agreement.

The Senator from South Carolina and I traveled to Iraq in May 2011, only several months away from the deadline that our commanders had set for the beginning of the withdrawal. We met with all the leaders of Iraq's main political blocs and we heard a common message during all of these private conversations: Iraqi leaders recognized it was in their country's interest to maintain a limited number of U.S. troops to continue training and assisting Iraqi security forces beyond 2011.

But when we asked Ambassador Jeffrey and the Commander of U.S. Forces in Iraq Lloyd Austin, while in a meeting with Prime Minister Maliki, how many U.S. troops remaining in Iraq would perform and how many the administration sought to maintain, they couldn't tell us or the Iraqis. The White House still had not made a decision.

It went on like this for the next few months. By August 2011, leaders of Iraq's main political blocs joined together and stated they were prepared to enter negotiations to keep some U.S. troops in Iraq. An entire month passed and still the White House made no decision. All the while, during this internal deliberation, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff GEN Martin Dempsey later testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the size of a potential U.S. force presence kept cascading down from upwards of 16,000 to an eventual low of less than 3,000. By that point, the force would be able to do little other than protect itself, and Prime Minister Maliki and other Iraqi leaders realized the political cost of accepting this proposal was not worth the benefit.

To blame this failure entirely on the Iraqis is convenient, but it misses the real point. The reason to keep around 10,000 to 15,000 U.S. forces in Iraq was not for the sake of Iraq alone. It was first and foremost in our national security interest to continue training and advising Iraqi forces and to maintain greater U.S. influence in Iraq. That core principle should have driven a very different U.S. approach to the SOFA—the status of forces agreement—diplomacy.

The Obama administration should have recognized that after years of brutal conflict, Iraqi leaders still lacked trust in one another, and a strong U.S. role was required to help Iraqis broker their most politically sensitive decisions. For this reason the administration should have determined what tasks and troop numbers were in the national interest to maintain in Iraq and done so with ample time to engage with Iraqis at the highest level of the U.S. Government to shape political conditions in Baghdad to achieve our goal.

We focus on this failure not because U.S. troops would have made a decisive difference in Iraq by engaging in unilateral combat operations against Al Qaeda and other threats to Iraq's stability. By 2011, U.S. forces were no longer in Iraqi cities or engaged in security operations. However, residual U.S. troop presence could have assisted Iraqi forces in their continued fight against Al Qaeda, it could have provided a platform for greater diplomatic engagement and intelligence cooperation with our Iraqi partners, it could have made Iranian leaders think twice about using Iraqi airspace to transit military assistance and weapons and arms and equipment to Assad and his forces in Syria and, most importantly, it could have maintained the significant diplomatic influence the United States at that time possessed in Iraq—influence that had been and still was essential in guaranteeing Iraq's nascent political system, reassuring Iraqi leaders they could resolve their differences peacefully and politically, despite their mistrust of one another, and checking the authoritarian and sectarian tendencies of Prime Minister Maliki and his allies.

The administration's failure in Iraq has been further compounded by its

failure in Syria. In Syria, where President Obama has refused to take any meaningful action, the initially peaceful protests of early 2011 were met by horrific violence by the Assad regime.

This President and this administration have stood back and watched while over 130,000 people have been brutally killed and a fourth of the population displaced. In his promise to avoid military action and reduce the U.S. footprint in the Middle East, we have seen the resurgence of Al Qaeda throughout the region, Hezbollah and Iran emboldened in Syria, Russia reasserting its principal presence for the first time since it was kicked out of Egypt by Egyptian President Sadat in 1973, and the destabilization of the region in ways that will inevitably reverberate here in America.

Again, there are those who may applaud President Obama's decision to disengage, arguing this isn't America's problem to solve. That the United States is fundamentally limited in its ability to influence developments in the Middle East is a consistent theme within the administration. No one denies there are limits to what the United States can do. That is always the case. But as Secretary Hillary Clinton told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as she was leaving office:

> Let me underscore the importance of the United States continuing to lead in the Middle East, North Africa and around the world. When America is absent, especially from unstable environments, there are consequences. Extremism takes root, our interests suffer, and our security at home is threatened.

Nowhere do her words ring more true than in Syria and Iraq today, begging the question that by fleeing Iraq and sidestepping Syria has the administration helped empower terrorist forces in ways that have created long-term threats to U.S. national security? I am afraid it is hard to argue the answer is no.

The administration must recognize its failed policies and change its course. America has lost credibility and influence over the past years, and we simply can't afford to remain disengaged. It is time that America stands and take its rightful role in resolving these conflicts to best serve American interests. It is time we adopt a comprehensive strategy for addressing the growing threats that are now emanating from the region and move forward from a position of strength. A return of Al Qaeda to Anbar Province is a sobering reminder for the administration that the tide of war is not receding.

I see my colleague from South Carolina is here. I am sorry I didn't realize he had come to the floor. I know the Senator from South Carolina and I need to discuss a recent unfortunate development in Afghanistan, but before we do, could I recall for my friend from South Carolina the many visits—and I have lost count, but many visits—we made to Iraq from 2003 really up to 2012, and that one of the most interesting visits we had was when we were in Ramadi and Colonel MacFarland announced to us that the Sunni sheiks had come over—that the major sheik had come over, and he had sent some tanks over—and that was the beginning of what we know as the Anbar awakening—a turning point in the entire conflict. That, coupled with the surge, changed the fortunes of war in Iraq.

By the way, the surge was opposed vehemently by the President of the United States and the former Secretary of State, then Senator Clinton, who stated in a hearing with General Petraeus that she would have to have a ''willing suspension of disbelief in order to believe that the surge would succeed.''

But setting that aside, later, when we came back again to Fallujah and Ramadi, the Senator from South Carolina and I walked down the main street of Ramadi—down the main street—with Iraqis everywhere, proving the success of the surge in Anbar Province. Yet now, on the same streets we walked down—the exact same streets—there are now vehicles filled with Al Qaeda, flying the black flag of Al Qaeda.

The bloodiest war of the conflict that was fought during our entire involvement with Iraq was the second battle of Fallujah. There were 95 brave Americans killed and over 600 wounded. What do we tell these young people and their families? What do we tell them? I tell you what we have to tell them. We have to tell them their sacrifice was squandered by an administration that wanted out and didn't want to remain and consolidate the gains that were made through the sacrifice of American blood and treasure.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would be glad to respond to the Senator's comments.

No. 1, I understand the average American thinks of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as having been long and difficult wars costing a lot of money and a lot of American lives. But the point of the war is to make sure that radical Islam is contained and eventually defeated, and that is going to take an effort on our part.

Does it matter that the Al Qaeda flag flies over Fallujah and Ramadi? I think it does. I think when Al Qaeda occupies a city anywhere in the world, it potentially affects every city throughout the world. Imagine the Nazis having come back in Germany and occupying part of Germany. We didn't let that happen. We had a following force in Japan and Germany to make sure the transition from totalitarian and dictatorial states to functioning democracies would occur. We are still in Japan and Germany. We are not taking casualties.

To go into the Mideast and replace dictatorships and think you can do it in a matter of months or even a decade is probably not going to hold water, quite frankly. The good news is we were in a position in Iraq in 2010 where if we had left behind a residual force not to be in combat but to provide the logistical, air support, training, intelligence capabilities missing in the Iraqi Army, this would have been a very different outcome.

And it does matter to my fellow citizens here in the United States. If Al Qaeda is on the rise anywhere, it does affect us. Remember Afghanistan? Remember when the Russians left and the Taliban took over and they invited Al Qaeda and bin Laden in to be their honored guests? The rest is history. The reason 3,000 Americans died on 9/11 and not 3 million is the terrorists, the radical Islamists, Al Qaeda and their affiliates can't get the weapons to kill 3 million of us. If they could, they would.

So the goal is to create stability and marginalize Al Qaeda throughout the region. Unfortunately, as Senator MCCAIN has predicted for a very long time, the absence of a following force allows security to break down and the vacuum was filled by the emergence of Al Qaeda in Iraq.

I would like to go over some testimony from June of 2010, when General Austin was about to take over from General Odierno the command of our operations in Iraq. General Austin told me during my questioning that we were inside the 10-yard line when it came to being successful in Iraq. In other words, the surge had worked. The surge Senator MCCAIN supported during his Presidential campaign worked.

President Bush made his fair share of mistakes in Iraq, but to his undying credit he adjusted policies. We were all in. He gave General Petraeus all the troops we had to give and he stood behind General Petraeus, and over a 2- or 3-year period there was a phenomenal turnaround in the security situation in Iraq. The surge started in late 2007, early 2008.

Here is what had existed in 2010 in June. Basically, we were inside the 10-yard line, and General Odierno said: I think the next 18 months will determine whether we get to the goal line or give the Iraqis an opportunity to hit the goal line beyond 2011.

So we were in a good spot. The surge had worked, and we needed to close this thing out. I asked this question back in 2010: What would happen if Iraq had become a failed state? Let's say we are inside the 10-yard line but we are not smart enough to get in the end zone. What would happen? Here is what General Odierno said:

> . . . if we had a failed state in Iraq, it would create uncertainty and significant instability probably within the region. Because of the criticality of Iraq, its relationship to Iran, its relationship to the other Arab states in the region, if it became unstable, it could create an environment that could continue to increase the instability.

I don't believe we are close to that. I believe we are very far away from that happening. I think we are definitely on the right path. But those are the kinds of things which would happen if we had a complete breakdown inside Iraq. Here was a quote:

The top U.S. commander in Iraq, Army Gen. Lloyd Austin, has said repeatedly that Iraq is not yet fully capable of defending its own air space or land borders, and that it needs help in other areas such as intelligence and logistics.

Our military commanders were telling us that the surge had worked, but we were not there yet.

Here is what I would like to say to the administration: If you believe Iraq was the wrong war to fight and we shouldn't be there, own your decision. Don't blame the Iraqis.

The truth is the administration, led by President Obama, had absolutely no desire to leave one person behind in Iraq because this was Bush's war and America was tired, and he ran on the idea of ending the war in Iraq. When it came time to make that fateful decision about a small 10,000 or 12,000, whatever the number was, residual force to maintain the gains we fought so hard and to keep Iraq stable, he now wants to tell the world it was the Iraqis. I know differently.

I know, and so does Senator MCCAIN, that this administration made it impossible for the Iraqis to say yes because this administration would never give the Iraqi Government a troop number from the White House as to the size of the force.

I remember General Austin saying publicly we needed 18,000. The bottom line from the Pentagon was somewhere slightly north of 10,000. I remember the discussions in the White House got down to 3,500 and it was cascading down.

I remember General Dempsey answering my question as to how the numbers were reduced: Was it as a result of the Iraqis saying, no, that is too many troops to leave behind in Iraq or were the numbers reduced because the White House did not want to have that many people left behind? He said the cascading down from 18,000 all the way to 3,500 had nothing to do with the Iraqis. It was the uncertainty and unwillingness of the White House to commit to a number.

So what happened? We left the country with 200 U.S. troops advising and assisting, no capability. Everything they talked about happening if we do not get Iraq right and get into the end zone from the 10-yard line in 2010 is happening on steroids. Everything our generals told us about what would await Iraq if we didn't get this right is coming true at an accelerated pace.

So I turn it back over to Senator MCCAIN.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I ask the Senator again: One, Iraq and Syria now are in danger of becoming a base for Al Qaeda and movement back and forth between that area of Anbar Province, which obviously poses an enormous threat, because we know what the ultimate goal of Al Qaeda is.

Could I also recall for my friend from South Carolina the meeting we had with Maliki—after we had met with Allawi, after we had met with Barzani, the leader of the Kurds, who all agreed we would get together and endorse a U.S. troop presence to remain in Iraq. This administration refused—even after we came back and begged them to give us a number—refused to give the number, claiming it had to be endorsed by their Parliament, which was absolutely false.

But now we see Iranian aircraft overflying Iraq with weapons and arms for Bashar al-Assad. We see Anbar and that area of Syria and Iraq now becoming possibly a base for Al Qaeda to operate. We see the two major cities in Anbar, Ramadi, and Fallujah—where so much American blood was shed—now with vehicles driving around with the black flag of Al Qaeda on display.

I think it is important we make it clear. The Senator from South Carolina and I are not advocating sending combat troops back to Iraq. That is impossible. It may be an avenue, but it is impossible, and we are not advocating that. We are advocating that we give advice, send equipment, and we give them some capabilities. We help them with intelligence. There are certain places we can help them. But at the same time, now Prime Minister Maliki has to reach out to the Sunnis and get a reconciliation.

From the day U.S. troops left Iraq, Maliki began to persecute the Sunni. He even charged his own Vice President, who was a Sunni, with treason and the Vice President had to leave the country.

So if any of this is going to work, if we have any influence—and have no doubt who has the influence in Iraq today: Iran. But if we have any influence, we have to tell Maliki we want to help and we want to give him the kind of technical assistance he needs. But he has to reach out to the Sunni in the way that took place in the Anbar awakening back in 2008. Because without national reconciliation, all the equipment and all the assistance we can give the Iraqis will not help.

So I do blame Prime Minister Maliki. Responsibility lies with his behavior toward the Sunni, but we were not there to influence him. We were not there. It is not only the kind of assistance we could have provided them that they need, but it also is the influence issue. No expert on Iraq today will tell you we have anything but a minimal influence and Iran has that. If anybody thinks Al Qaeda's control of large portions of Iraq and Syria is not a threat to the United States of America, then they don't understand the nature of Al Qaeda.

Mr. GRAHAM. As to the future of how to move forward, Prime Minister Maliki with all thought did go to Basra and take on the Shia militia.

The political gains we made in Iraq are being lost by lack of security. If we would have had a residual force, the political momentum toward reconciling Iraq would have continued. Without security, people go back to their sectarian corners. I would argue that the Sunnis need to up their game too.

But the immediate problem is how do you repel Al Qaeda from Fallujah and Ramadi? The way it worked before is you had the Sunni awakening, where the Sunni tribal leaders in Anbar had a taste of the Al Qaeda agenda and said: No, thank you. They were literally killing children in front of their parents for smoking. The stories coming out of Anbar Province about the abuse the people of Anbar suffered under Al Qaeda control would break your heart. So the Sunni leaders married with American military personnel to drive the Al Qaeda elements out of Anbar.

We are not there now. So how do you get Al Qaeda dislodged from Anbar Province, Ramadi and Fallujah? You are going to have to get the Sunni tribal leaders to work with the Iraqi Army.

I think now is a good time to send a former military commander of the U.S. forces—someone who is retired if that is what is required—to see if they can bring these parties together to form a military alliance between the Sunni tribal leaders and the Iraqi Army so the weight of the Iraqi Army can be brought into this fight. The distrust is high. But the way Al Qaeda was defeated in the past was the U.S. military working with the Sunni tribal leaders. We are not there.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would argue, I say to the Senator from South Carolina, two names which spring to mind would be General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker, probably the two most respected people in Iraq today. Maybe we are getting into too much detail, but I do agree with him on that.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bottom line is we have to change the momentum. We are not there. But Senator MENENDEZ, to his great credit, is willing to release his hold on the sale of Apache helicopters to allow the Iraqi military an advantage over Al Qaeda. I think Senator MENENDEZ did the right thing.

So supplying arms in a smart way is part of the strategy to move forward. But we have to get the military in Iraq working with the Sunni tribal leaders.

I would ask Senator MCCAIN this question: On the other side of the border in Syria is complete chaos, is hell on Earth. I don't know how we stabilize Iraq long term until we deal with the dismantling of Syria where Al Qaeda occupies the region right across the Iraqi border. How does a breakdown in Syria affect Iraq?

Mr. MCCAIN. I don't think there is any doubt, I would say to my friend from South Carolina, that this has become an almost safe operating area on both sides of the Syria-Iraq border for Al Qaeda.

It is interesting. There has been a little good news in the last day or two; that is, some of the more moderate forces in Syria have struck back at this radical Islamist group because of the incredible cruelty of al-Nusra and ISIS, which is the radical Islamic group both in Iraq and Syria. Interestingly enough, that is being accomplished without any U.S. help. Thank

God for the other countries such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and others which have been of assistance to these people. They have been driving out some of the more extremist element. We are working with the Russians to remove the chemical weapons.

In Syria today, Bashar al-Assad, from helicopters, is dropping these crude cluster bombs which are just shrapnel that kill anybody within lethal range. Since dropping it on populated areas, Bashar al-Assad has slaughtered innocent men, women, and children.

So here we are working with the Russians. Today there was a U.N. resolution from the Security Council condemning Bashar al-Assad's barbaric behavior. Guess who vetoed that. Our friends, the Russians. This is the most Orwellian situation in Iraq anybody has ever seen throughout history. Russians are working with us to remove chemical weapons from Syria and at the same time aircraft from Russia are landing full of weapons to kill Syrian men, women, and children. I am not sure a Syrian mother can differentiate between her child dying from a chemical weapon or dying from one of these cluster bombs that Bashar al-Assad is unloading from his helicopters.

So we have this grandiose idea the Secretary of State and the administration have been pushing for months and months to have a Geneva II. The first Geneva failed. Does anyone on God's green Earth believe that Bashar al-Assad, who is winning, is going to preside over his own transition from power? Of course not.

I will never forget—I am sure the Senator from South Carolina will never forget—the testimony of our now still Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta before the Armed Services Committee: Bashar al-Assad inevitably will leave.

The President of the United States: Bashar al-Assad, it is not a matter of when, it is not a matter of whether he will leave but a matter of when.

Meanwhile, the weapons pour in from Iran; Hezbollah, 5,000 of them; 130,000 people slaughtered, and one-quarter of the population being slaughtered, while this administration not only sits by and does nothing but the President of the United States says nothing.

This will go down as one of the most shameful chapters in American history. If the policy of this administration is to only focus on counterterrorism, get out of the Middle East, and remove any involvement of the United States in the Middle East, I can assure my colleagues the Middle East will not allow the United States of America to not be involved.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I may just conclude. I have a quote from Speaker BOEHNER, who said he would support the Obama administration if it decides to leave troops in Iraq beyond 2011.

I remember Senator Obama and Senator Clinton not being particularly helpful to the mistakes made in Iraq during the Bush administration. In fact, the entire election in 2008 and the primary was about Iraq. I remember the politics of Candidate Barack Obama, who basically used the Iraq war to win the nomination, for lack of a better word. I remember during the campaign he talked about Afghanistan being a good war. We will talk about Afghanistan later. It is not a happy story either, I am afraid.

But the bottom line is that there was bipartisan support for troop presence beyond 2011, a residual force. This administration chose to ignore the advice of the commanders, and they created the situation where the Iraqis could not say yes. Yet they want history to record this being a problem created by the Iraqis for not giving legal immunity to U.S. soldiers. History is going to be written about our times. How this ends, nobody knows. But I know this: It is not fair to say that the reason we have nobody left behind in Iraq is because of the Iraqis. It is fair to say that the administration got the result they wanted, and they should own that—good, bad, or indifferent. Don't create a straw person for the situation that you drove and you created.

As to Syria, please understand that this whole conflict started when people went to the streets peacefully to ask for more political freedom after the uprising in Egypt; that this war in Syria did not start with a Sunni uprising or Al Qaeda invading the country. The conflict in Syria started when the people of Syria, from all walks of life, started demanding more from their government, from this dictatorship, and the response they received from their government was to use lethal force.

It has broken down now to a regional conflict where the Iranians are backing Assad and you have Sunni Arab States backing parts of the opposition and you have Al Qaeda types coming from Iraq and other places filling in the vacuum created by this breakdown in Syria.

At the end of the day, what Senator MCCAIN had been talking about for 3 years is that once you say Assad has to go—no President should say that unless they are willing to make it happen. Assad was on the ropes. With just any effort on our part, a no-fly zone to boots on the ground, any assistance at all in the last couple of years and Assad would be gone, the transition would be well underway. It would have been bloody at first, but we would have behind us now a Syria moving toward stability because the good news is the average Syrian is not a radical Al Qaeda Islamist. Syrians have been living peacefully with each other—Christians, Sunnis, and Alawites—for hundreds of years. Now Syria has become the central battle for every radical Islamist in the region, and it is just sad and sorry to witness.

But what does it mean to us? It means that if this war continues—our friend the King of Jordan is under siege. The Lebanese Ambassador testified a couple of weeks ago in our committee that the country is saturated. Almost 1 million refugees from Syria have gone to Lebanon. There are over 5 million in Lebanon today. They have added almost 1 million refugees from Syria. They didn't plan to get to 5 million people until 2050. The Kingdom of Jordan—the Jordanians have received over 600,000 refugees, with no end in sight.

Syria is not a civil war. Syria is a regional conflict where you have proxies backing each side in Syria that are taking the entire region into chaos. It is killing Iraq. It is destabilizing Lebanon and Jordan. It has to be addressed in an effective way.

If you want to be President of the United States, certain requirements come with the job: having a vision, making tough calls at the time when it would matter. On President Obama's watch, you had the Arab spring come about and you had a desire by this administration to leave the region at any and all costs. Now you have absolute chaos. The only way we are going to fix this is for America to get reengaged. We do not need boots on the ground, but we need leadership.

It just breaks my heart to see how close we were in 2010. The surge did work in spite of opposition from President Obama as Senator and Secretary Clinton as Senator. In spite of their vehement opposition, the surge did work, and on their watch we are about to lose everything we fought for. Al Qaeda is the biggest beneficiary of our withdrawal from Iraq. Al Qaeda is the biggest beneficiary of our indifference in Syria. Al Qaeda is thriving, and our allies and our friends are in retreat.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, thank you for your patience.

We yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. HEITKAMP).

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m. today, and that I be recognized at 3 p.m., with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. PORTMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1900 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I yield back my time.

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. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING JAVIER MARTINEZ

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, many of us have come back from a couple of wonderful weeks in our home States, traveling and visiting with families, and had the privilege of spending time with loved ones and sharing our hopes and plans for the new year. Not everyone was so fortunate.

I rise today to honor the memory of yet another tragic victim of gun violence in Connecticut and our country.

On December 28, in New Haven, shortly before the beginning of this new year, one family's time together with their son was cut short when Javier Martinez was shot and killed.

I have his picture here in the Chamber. His memory is with us today, as I ask this body to honor him, along with other victims of gun violence who have died since Newtown, and those who have died before Newtown, and now I ask them to be remembered not only in words but also in action by this body, so that Javier shall not have died in vain.

He was only 18 years old. He was a senior at Common Ground High School in New Haven, one of the really extraordinary educational institutions in our State.

His teachers and classmates describe him as a kind, intelligent young man who was becoming a leader in the school and in his community.

He had a bright future. In fact, he had the whole world, his whole life ahead of him.

At Common Ground, a charter school that focuses on sustainability and connecting students with natural resources in their own communities, he was absolutely thriving.

I have heard that some of his classmates and teachers at Common Ground are perhaps watching right now or will watch at some point, and I want to thank them for joining in honoring his memory and continuing his work to make our planet, our world, our Nation, and the community of New Haven better, and keeping faith with his memory.

Javier cared about his community and the environment and the issues of sustainability and clean air and clean water, and he took action to improve the world around him.

Last summer he participated in a highly competitive internship at the Nature Conservancy, where he worked to protect endangered species. A director of this program regarded Javier as one of the most outstanding participants that the program ever had.

He spent last spring planting trees—planting trees—with the New Haven Urban Resources Initiative. He planted trees that he will never sit under, but the world will be better for all that he did—one small act, one small part of what Javier did to make New Haven and the world better.

This past fall he joined a crew of West River Stewards, identifying and documenting sources of pollution along the West River in the New Haven area.

Not only did he have a bright future ahead of him, but he knew what he wanted. He was pursuing the American dream. He was seeking and working to make America a better place for him and for his fellow students at Common Ground.

By all accounts he was not only dedicated and hard working, but he had a good heart. He had a great sense of himself. He stayed out of trouble. He had no criminal record whatsoever, it goes without saying. He worked hard at his studies.

He was loved in New Haven by his classmates, by his teachers, and by all who knew him. He had a growing dedication to protecting that world. Unfortunately, our society failed to protect him, failed to protect him during the simple act of walking home, failed to protect him from gun violence, failed to protect him in a neighborhood where he thought he would be safe as he walked.

On that early morning of December 28, shortly before 1 a.m., he was found shot to death on the streets of New Haven. In fact, he was walking from his house to a friend's house. He did not have a car, so his only choice was to walk. He sustained multiple gunshot wounds and was pronounced dead at the scene.

The police are continuing to investigate. Have no doubt that they are working hard. The New Haven Police have been extraordinarily responsive and responsible in combating gun violence, so I know they are going to get answers. Whether they will ever get enough answers to prosecute someone remains to be seen. But I know they are dedicated to finding out what happened on that night.

The death of Javier Martinez is a tragedy, heartbreaking. It is heartbreaking, as are many of the random deaths in America resulting from gun violence. This young man is a testament to our continuing responsibility, our obligation, and our opportunity to combat and prevent gun violence on the streets and in the neighborhoods across our country.

Just a few weeks ago I spoke on this floor, in this very place, about another promising young person from Connecticut who was killed by a person with a gun whose name was Erika Robinson. The victim of that crime, Erika Robinson, just like Javier, was killed because she was at the wrong place at the wrong time.

We ought to remember some of the other victims. We should keep in mind all of the now tens of thousands, just since Newtown, who maybe survived but who are changed and challenged in ways they never could have envisioned. Their lives have been changed forever.

Amber Smith, who worked as a manager in a New Haven Burger King restaurant, was shot on September 15, 2013, when two robbers entered that Burger King.

The robbers demanded that she open a safe in the business, and one of them shot her in the upper hip and through her leg. She was just 19 years old at the time on September 15, 2013.

She remembers thinking that she was going to die and wondering who would take care of her two small children. She almost bled to death but was saved, fortunately, by receiving surgery in the emergency room. So she survived the shooting, but she lives with the psychological and the physical trauma of that shooting every day.

These random acts of violence may not always make the national news, they may not always take a life, but they change lives, and they take lives one or two at a time.

Those shooting deaths of Javier Martinez and Erika Robinson have become all too often the mundane evil of our time. The banality of evil is found in gun violence, and we seem to accept it all too often with indifference as another news item. Yet it should be as repugnant and abhorrent and unacceptable as the deaths of 20 innocent children in Newtown and 6 great educators because every act of gun violence diminishes us as a nation and as a community.

Our country has come to the point that gun violence can happen anywhere. If your life has not been touched by it, there is a near certainty that it will be at some point—tragically, unfortunately—because far too often communities suffer in silence. We need to end that silence. We need to end the inaction and the acceptance of this mundane and banal evil that lives among us.

While we have failed to act in this Chamber, even though we had a majority of 55 Senators ready to approve very simple, commonsense measures to stop gun violence, the President has done what he can through executive action, most recently on mental health. I commend him for those actions. He has done what he can to strengthen Federal background checks for firearms purchases. I thank him for that action.

These changes are incremental, but they are steps in the right direction.

States have taken the leadership on this issue as well, maybe even more so than the Federal Government. My own

State of Connecticut, laudably, has passed laws to effectively ban, for example, the sale of assault weapons.

But this body and this government need to act. The Federal Government has a responsibility that only it can address, because we know that guns are trafficked across State lines. Stolen and illegally bought guns are trafficked across State lines. No single State can put a stop to it.

We know that without action in this body, mental health will remain an unmet need in this country. We know that without action in this country, background checks for people who buy firearms will be incomplete and inadequate.

So Javier's death should be a reminder and a call to action. As the people of his family and New Haven mourn his death, we should celebrate his contributions in making our planet better, in protecting the precious resources that, unfortunately, he was unable to enjoy, and resolve to protect better the innocent people, particularly our children, who at any moment, at any place, may become victims of gun violence.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in morning business for debate only until 3:15; that the majority leader be recognized at 3:15, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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. COATS. 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. COATS. Madam President, we have been discussing, the last couple of days, the unemployment insurance issue. A number of us have had concerns relative to the effectiveness of the program relative to the cost that would undertake and how it would be paid for if it goes forward and is extended and the reforms we think would be needed to make this a much more effective program. We have not been offered the opportunity to do more than just discuss it on the floor. We have not been offered the opportunity to offer amendments, offer our ideas, have them debated and voted on. It is my understanding that the majority leader will be coming to the floor shortly to potentially—well, to tell us what the decision is relative to whether we will have that opportunity.

Let me very quickly say I have been working with my colleagues Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire and Senator PORTMAN from Ohio. All three of us voted for the motion to proceed because we felt this is an issue that ought to be discussed and debated, and not simply dismissed, and because we would like to make corrections to the program that make it more viable.

We would like to raise the issue of, is there a better way to deal with unemployment in this country? We have some amendments that would allow us to move and improve and move to what we think is a better way, as well as pay for a bill that, without being paid for, exceeds the budget agreement we just entered into.

I offered four amendments. I was not insisting on offering all four. They were similar to what my colleagues had offered. The three of us want to very briefly speak to these and indicate to our colleagues what it is we would be doing. I offered the original bill way last fall, which would delay the individual mandate under the Affordable Care Act.

As we all know, the President has delayed for 1 year the mandates on employers who provide health insurance for their employees, but did not so do so for individuals, for those who do not have coverage under their employer. We did not feel that was fair. Why one entity and not the other? It also violated the law that the President took the liberty to exercise.

We are saying: Well, let's at least be fair, that those who are not covered by the 1-year delay on the mandate of employers would be subject to having to comply and we have—I will not go through all of the details, but we have seen the disaster that has happened in terms of that rollout.

My amendment, No. 2611 to this bill, I am going to select out as the amendment I am going forward with. My colleagues also have excellent ideas. They will be offering those. Frankly, I agree with all of their amendments and what they are doing also, so I think we are pretty much on the same page.

This amendment would delay the individual employer mandate under ObamaCare for 1 year. The estimated cost savings on this is $35 billion. I think that is a savings that obviously could be used for a number of offsets. I think at this particular point in time, I would yield the floor and let my colleague from New Hampshire explain her amendment and how the savings would be applied to some very necessary things.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Indiana. As he said, I, as did my colleague from Indiana and my colleague from Ohio, moved to allow this bill to go forward for debate. I thought it was important that we have a debate on obviously the situation of struggling workers in our country and on the issue of whether to extend unemployment benefits for them.

I have been clear that on the pending bill if there is a way we can responsibly pay for this temporary 3-month extension to do that, I would be willing to support that—except the current bill does not have a way to pay for it—because I do not believe we should be adding to our debt, $17 trillion, and our yearly deficits in order to do this.

But let me say that I have a very commonsense amendment. It is amendment No. 2603. Let me say what it is about. My amendment fixes what is an abuse in our Tax Code. The Treasury inspector general found that individuals who are not authorized to work in this country are collecting billions of dollars in tax refunds by filing for an additional child tax credit. The disturbing part about this trend is that there has been a steady increase each year of billions of dollars collected by illegal workers seeking these refunds.

Investigations of these tax refunds have found some gross examples of fraud; examples of refunds for children, children who do not live in the United States of America; examples of fraud of many children who may not even exist. For example, in Indiana, they found four unauthorized workers claiming over 20 children who lived in a residence, fraudulently collecting tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars. They found examples of tax refund claims for children who live in Mexico, not the United States of America. In North Carolina, 1,000 tax returns were linked to 8 addresses—1,000 tax returns were linked to 8 addresses, refunding $5 million in tax refunds. Another example in North Carolina: 398 returns associated with 2 apartments—398 returns, refunding $1.9 million to workers who are not authorized to work in our country. There was no evidence that the children being claimed either lived in the United States of America or even existed, for that matter.

My amendment is very straightforward in terms of the fix. The filer of the tax return who is going to claim the additional child tax credit would have to list a Social Security number. This is the same requirement for those who claim the earned income tax credit for which you can receive a tax refund if you qualify. So it would be simply to add that same requirement.

What the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated is that we could save $20 billion over the next 10 years simply by treating this child tax credit just like the earned filers income tax credit, that filers would have to use a Social Security number as well.

What would this $20 billion go for? With this $20 billion, we can pay for the recent cuts in the budget that were unfair, where our men and women in uniform, military retirees, were singled out for cuts to their retirement, to their cost-of-living increases, including, by the way, our wounded warriors, those who have medically retired, who got a cut to their cost-of-living increase in this recent budget. This was the only group that was singled out in

this way, those who have taken a bullet for our country, many who have done multiple tours for us in Afghanistan and Iraq, and some who have suffered horrible wounds, including those many of us have had the privilege of visiting at Walter Reed. So we can pay for and fix the military retirement cuts, as many Members on both sides of the aisle have said we have a commitment to do, because we think that was unfair.

What else can we do with this? We can also pay for the bill pending on the floor, the 3 months extension of unemployment benefits for American workers who are struggling during this period, who are trying to get back to work.

Finally, we can also take the remainder of the savings and apply it to the deficit. Again, fix tax abuse, where there has been fraud, rampant fraud found by investigations by requiring a Social Security number, such as the earned-income tax credit, and in return it is a three-for.

We can pay for the 3-month unemployment extension on this floor, we can fix the unfair cut to military retirees and to our wounded warriors, and we can help reduce our deficit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator's time has expired.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 1845 is considered expired.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1845) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. This is similar to ''Groundhog Day'' because this is a picture we have already seen in the very lucid speech given by my friend from New Hampshire.

She should have gone back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We have been through this before.

We are not going to hurt American children, and that is what it does. We have been through this. This is something we have tried to use in the past to pay for things that are very unfair to American children.

The other issue is there have been some efforts made, and good-faith efforts made by the Senator from Ohio, to stop double dipping—people who are on disability and are drawing unemployment insurance. We agree with him. We can take care of that, but it does not save $5.4 or $5.6 billion.

The disability community at this point is outraged that anyone will even suggest this. We can stop the double dipping. We are happy to join with them in doing that, but that savings is a little over $1 billion. We are pleased, and that is part of the proposal we will all have in a little bit.

I received a phone call from a person who has done more for helping people who are disabled than any person in the history of this body, the senior Senator from the State of Iowa. He had been previously engaged and he heard about this. Those of us who know TOM HARKIN know what he does to protect the disabled. I know my friend from Ohio has good intentions, but the disability community will never allow this to happen, and they are right.

My friend, the junior Senator from Nevada, as some of us know, has had casts on one leg and now the other leg. He has had some surgery on his ankles. He has had to replace the Achilles tendons in both of his legs. A cast broke, I think it was on his left leg—maybe it was his right leg. I don't remember.

I talked to him this morning and he had to go to the emergency room to get his cast replaced. I am waiting to hear from him. I have explained this proposal in some detail to him and his staff, but he hasn't had an opportunity to speak to his staff since he had to rush to the emergency room—at least that is my understanding—so I am waiting until he gets back.

The proposal Senator REED has come up with extends unemployment insurance through mid-November. The package does what the Republicans wanted. It is entirely paid for. There are structural changes which they have been demanding, and we have done that. It has reforms that reduce slightly the number of weeks an unemployed person can remain on the unemployment insurance, while all along preserving extending the weeks of high-unemployment States.

The legislation proposed by Senator JACK REED tightens the rules for unemployment insurance. It would include a proposal, much like that advocated by the Senator from Ohio Mr. PORTMAN, that would prevent people from collecting both unemployment insurance and disability insurance at the same time. That is clear.

Much of this offset is simply an extension of the Murray-Ryan agreement we all voted for—or a lot of us voted for earlier. This provision would extend the sequester on mandatory programs for another year. If Republicans have a complaint about this, don't call and complain to JACK REED. Call PAUL RYAN. This is his. This is his idea—maybe not on this specific issue, but this is his proposal, his idea.

We believe if it is good enough to help other proposals propounded by my Republican friends in the House, it is good enough to help the unemployed.

In this proposal, there has been a desire to address the concerns of the Republicans and Democrats. Is it perfect? Of course not, but JACK REED has done a remarkably good job, and we believe this is a sound and balanced proposal.

I would also say this takes care of it for the good part of this year. I wish we could have done it until the first of the year. We can't find enough money. I have been waiting here for more than 24 hours for a reasonable proposal by my Republican friends to pay for this. We don't have one yet.

We are not going to strip the rights of people who have health insurance, and we are certainly not going to go after little boys and girls in America who have the child tax credit. There comes a time when we have to move forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

Mr. PORTMAN. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, objection was heard.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. Madam President, I first of all appreciate everyone's cooperation here—patience more than cooperation. We are doing our best. I have already said what we are trying to do here, and I will repeat just a part of it.

We have a proposal that is paid for. It is a pay-for that we have used and it is something I think is totally valid. The original idea came from PAUL RYAN, but we have used it on another occasion. This has nothing to change that original proposal except to extend it for 1 year. The proposal of my friend from Ohio—an issue he has alerted us to—we think we have taken care of in this amendment. I think it is a fine proposal, but the breadth of what he is trying to do is really unfair and we can't do that. So we are doing our utmost.

We have structural changes in this. It is paid for—a pay-for for almost to

the first of the year, as much money as we are able to find. But we have done everything the Republicans have wanted: It is paid for, there are structural changes, and we have taken care of the double dipping of those in the disability community on unemployment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2631

Mr. REID. Madam President, on behalf of Senator REED of Rhode Island I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. REED of Rhode Island, proposes an amendment numbered 2631.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2632 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2631

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2632 to amendment No. 2631.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion on the Reed of Rhode Island amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 amendment No. 2631 to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed (RI), Martin Heinrich, Richard Blumenthal, Michael F. Bennet, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Max Baucus, Debbie Stabenow, Bill Nelson, Amy Klobuchar, Thomas R. Carper, Edward J. Markey, Benjamain L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Charles E. Schumer, Patrick J. Leahy.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2633

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a motion to commit on S. 1845 and it has instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2633.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2634

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2634 to the instructions of the motion to commit S. 1845.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2635 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2634

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2635 to amendment No. 2634.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4 days'' and insert ''5 days''.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The 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 S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Edward J. Markey, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Mark R. Warner, Mazie K. Hirono, Christopher Murphy, Tom Harkin, Sherrod Brown.

Mr. REID. Madam President, 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. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I tried to be recognized before the majority leader decided to fill the tree, which means taking away the opportunity for amendments to be offered—although there will be an attempt in a moment to offer some. I am disappointed in that, because I think we were very close to reaching an agreement which would have enabled us to move forward with allowing Senators on both sides of the aisle to offer some of their ideas on the unemployment insurance extension.

Recall. This is an important debate we are having for the American people. It is about whether we go beyond the roughly 26 weeks in unemployment insurance to having an emergency extension again. On this side of the aisle, there were a few of us who, in fact, crossed over to vote with the entire Democratic majority to say let's have that debate. We thought we were doing so in good faith in that there would actually be a debate on two issues. One is whether it should be paid for and how it should be paid for, which I will address in a second, but second is how we should reform the unemployment insurance program and do other appropriate policies to get at the underlying problem, which is a record level, a record number of Americans who are long-term unemployed.

Clearly what we are doing isn't working, and we believe this is an opportunity for us to help improve the program to actually address the real problem. The President of the United States wants us to do that. He called me on Monday and told me he had hoped we would be able to address this issue by voting for the motion to proceed to begin the debate so that over the next few months, while we had a short-term extension of this program, there could be even more detailed discussions about how to improve the legislation and how to add other elements to it—specifically, on how to give people who are long-term unemployed the skills they need to access the jobs that are available. Unfortunately, we are not going to have that opportunity now, it appears, to have the debate over how to pay for it, what the payfors ought to be, and, again, how to improve the program.

But let me say this is unfortunate, because we had 60 votes to proceed. That includes certainly three of us who are here on the floor today, and all three of us are willing to move forward with this with a reasonable provision to pay for this over the 3 months, and again, during that period to come up with a better and improved unemployment insurance program. We were not

part of the discussion as to the pay-for that the majority leader has just put forward.

I appreciate his good faith in wanting to include one of the proposals I had in my amendment. I honestly do appreciate that. I will say the offset he has put in, which I have just learned about because I didn't have an opportunity to see until now, has an important difference—a difference between what was just offered in the new Democratic proposal and what is in my proposal. My proposal, which I have come to the floor to talk about three times now, has been previously proposed by the House. It says that if you get unemployment insurance or you get trade adjustment assistance, then you also do not receive Social Security disability insurance in that same month.

Why? Because these programs are mutually exclusive. If you are on Social Security disability—SSDI—that means you are not working, by definition. If you are working and lose your job, you are then continuing to look for work and you get TAA. If you have lost your job and you are continuing to look for work, which is required, you get unemployment insurance.

This is why this same general program is laid out in the President's budget, and in fact it is something I believe the administration supports in others.

The proposal the Democrats included says that if you receive unemployment insurance in the month you receive Social Security, then your SSDI is reduced by the amount of unemployment insurance received.

Why does that matter? It is not the same. And it matters because the proposal the majority leader has proposed it saves a lot less money. According to the Congressional Budget Office, my proposal would save about $5.4 billion; theirs, as I understand it from the distinguished majority leader today, will save about $1 billion.

So again, I appreciate his wanting to include it, and I think it is in the same spirit as the amendment I offered, but honestly we haven't had the chance to talk about this. I tried today to sit down with the Democratic sponsor of the underlying legislation, the other Senator REED, who in good faith said he wanted to talk about it, but we haven't been able to schedule that. So we have not had the discussion. So we are just learning today what is again the sort of take-it-or-leave-it proposal that is in the majority leader's proposal in filling the tree.

There is a possibility, I think procedurally—and the majority has expressed some interest in looking at this—in taking that agreement and altering it somewhat over the next couple of days, because the cloture would not ripen, as I understand it, until Monday afternoon, but that still doesn't give all of our other colleagues a chance to offer their good ideas, and there are a bunch of them out there.

The Senator from New Hampshire offered hers day before yesterday, and she talked about it today on the floor, where she wants to take away some of the existing missed payments that are in the child tax credit. I would think all of us would want to do that—to preserve child tax credits for those who are truly eligible. For those who are not eligible, obviously, they shouldn't have access to it. It seems like a sensible amendment to me. I am a cosponsor of that amendment.

Senator COATS raised his ideas today, and I think he has some good ideas that ought to be debated.

So my hope is we would be able to go back to where we were prior to filling the tree and to say let's have a discussion. It can be limited. I think there are a very limited number of amendments.

I see the distinguished Republican whip on the floor, and he indicated to me today there are something under 20 amendments offered by the Republican side. I don't know how many of those have actually been filed, but it seems to me we could have had a good debate on that and still should.

So my hope is that we can come up with a solution here. I do think it is going to require us providing some opportunity for other people to be engaged, and specifically those who want to get to a solution, which is a lot of people on this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle—both sides of the aisle. Let's sit down and talk. We are adults. We have been elected by millions of people to represent them, and it is our responsibility, indeed our commitment to them, we would sit down across the aisle and work these things out, as you would in any other relationship—in your marriage, in your business, with your neighbors.

We had some discussion about this yesterday, that for some reason in the Senate it seems we are unable to have even the most basic level of discussion and debate. So I am open to that. I had hoped to do it today. I put my ideas out there; parts of them have been accepted, and I appreciate that, but, frankly, not the way we had laid it out in my own amendment. I do believe, if we have the opportunity, if we were to back up and to actually solve this problem, meaning to provide what the President says he wants, which is a 3-month extension of long-term unemployment, we can sit down, roll up our sleeves as Republicans and Democrats, and come up with a better way to address what is a crisis in this country, which is more long-term unemployed people than ever in the history of our country.

Those people are hurting, and clearly the current system isn't working. So to just extend it is not the answer. The answer is to allow the Senate to do its job; that is, to reform these programs so they work for the people we represent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. It is the same time and time again. Things are never quite right. They want to offer amendments. We have been waiting here since Monday for pay-fors. The only pay-for we have heard realistically to take care of this is something everyone knows we disagree with—to take away health care benefits from the American people.

The proposal by my friend from Ohio is not a good proposal. It hurts people who are disabled, and that is the fact. We have stopped dual payments. That is what our amendment does.

This is something we have been going through—the American people have been going through now for years.

My friend worked with the senior Senator from New Hampshire on energy efficiency. Now, if that wasn't quite a show. I had conversations on numerous occasions: Yeah, we have it all taken care of. Republicans are trying to move forward on this.

It went on for weeks and weeks. We never got anything done.

So we are where we are. Democrats don't need a memo to tell them to have a good conscience about people who are disabled, to be compassionate about people who are unemployed. We don't need a memo. We know that people who are long-term unemployed are desperate for help. We are compassionate. We don't need a memo to tell us that.

The American people want to know where we stand. Are we going to extend unemployment benefits for people who have been out of work for a long time? That is the issue before this body. And we have bent over backward, through JACK REED, to come up with a proposal to pay for this, to get rid of this issue for this year. We have structural changes in this amendment. We have a pay-for which came from PAUL RYAN, the Republican Vice Presidential candidate this last election cycle. He is chairman of the Budget Committee. So I think we have done a yeoman's job through JACK REED, we need to move on, and that is what we are going to do.

If there is a proposal my friend has—and we know his expertise, but the problem with his expertise is it is never quite right. It is almost but not quite right.

So the time is now to fish or cut bait. And they can make all the motions they want to try to complain about ''We didn't offer enough amendments. We need to be more like the Senate used to be.'' Well, I know what the Senate used to be because I was a used-to-be Senator, and it doesn't work the way it used to not because of anything we do wrong but because of the obstruction of President Obama's agenda. Every day it is more obstruction.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask the distinguished majority leader whether it is the position of his caucus and his position personally that people ought to be able to collect unemployment compensation and disability benefits simultaneously?

Mr. REID. No. And that is why JACK REED's proposal stops it.

Mr. CORNYN. I would further ask the majority leader, it is my understanding that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio would discontinue the simultaneous collection of disability and unemployment benefits. But the majority leader objects to that amendment and instead is blocking that amendment and other amendments by the Republican side of the aisle by one which changes the effective date of the bill 1 day. In other words, it is purely a blocker amendment, has zero substance whatsoever, and does nothing to improve the underlying bill.

Mr. REID. Is there a question in all of this?

Mr. CORNYN. Isn't that right?

Mr. REID. Is what right?

Mr. CORNYN. What I just said.

Mr. REID. No, it is not right, because what the amendment of the Senator from Ohio does is hurt people who are disabled. Part of JACK REED's amendment stops people from drawing both benefits at the same time.

Mr. CORNYN. I would ask the distinguished majority leader one more question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I would be happy to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Is the majority leader aware there are 24 Republican amendments on file, almost all of which deal with the underlying bill in an attempt to either improve workforce education and training, provide other reforms to the unemployment compensation system, or otherwise help the economy recover so that people won't have to depend on unemployment insurance and they can get a job? Is the majority leader aware that there are those amendments and those ideas on this side of the aisle?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I don't know the exact number, but there are always a lot of proposed amendments around. What I would say is this: Rather than continually denigrating our economy, our President, and, frankly, I believe, our country, I think we should have some more constructive things around here.

For example, we had today a conversation for 1½ hours with Chairman Bernanke. He is going to be there until the first of next month. It was a very good discussion. He talked about the vibrancy of this economy now. He said, as we have been saying here, it is not as good as it should be, but with a little bit of help, it would be on fire. Now, why isn't it on fire? Because of the obstruction over here.

As the Presiding Officer knows, the new Fed chair, Chairman Yellen, has also said unemployment benefits are a great impetus in helping the economy. For every $1 put into the economy in unemployment benefits, we get $1.50 back.

This bill recognizes that these benefits don't go on forever. That is why we make structural changes. We would be happy anytime to sit down and have a good discussion with the senior Senator from Texas and anyone else to talk about things we can do.

We have had a lot of programs that deal with job retraining. In 1998 when we did that, it wasn't a bad deal. Here it is all these many years later, and of course we need to sit down and talk about ways to improve retraining. This whole country needs that. That is also something Chairman Bernanke said today.

So I repeat, let's start being constructive around here, and instead of talking about how terrible things are, let's talk about how things are improving. We have had 8 million new jobs since Obama has been President. We have a lot of good things that have happened. Has it been perfect? Not even close to perfect.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Of course.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is it the majority leader's intent to allow votes on any Republican amendments?

Mr. REID. On what?

Mr. MCCONNELL. On the bill we were just discussing.

Mr. REID. This is Thursday. We have been waiting since Monday to get a proposal from the minority, the Republicans, as to what they believe would be a good way to pay for this.

Nothing, other than whack ObamaCare. So the answer is that we are where we are now. We have tried a number of different ways on many different pieces of legislation to say, OK, let's just do germane amendments. No. How about relevant amendments? No. How about having a specific number of amendments and giving the minority more than the majority? No, can't do that either. We want unlimited amendments on everything. As a result of that, we have continued obstruction which has taken place in this body for 5 years. It is time we get back to legislating the way we used to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is the answer to my question, I would say to the majority leader, no?

Mr. REID. The answer to the Senator's question is no.

Mr. MCCONNELL. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to make two corrections quickly and then yield to my colleague from Indiana.

One is that the proposal I did offer had nothing to do with ObamaCare, as I thought the majority leader understood, and others do not, including the amendment from the Senator from New Hampshire. So we do have a number of amendments and a number of good ideas. We had a debate.

Second, it is in the President's budget. So if it is such a terrible proposal, I am surprised the President would have proposed it.

Mr. REID. Would my friend yield for a question?

Mr. PORTMAN. Of course.

Mr. REID. Does the Senator also understand that in the President's budget, he calls for revenue, does he not?

Mr. PORTMAN. Yes, he does. He calls for major tax increases.

Mr. REID. And my friend would also acknowledge that when Presidents submit these budgets, don't they propose a budget rather than nitpicking different pieces of the budget one at a time?

Mr. PORTMAN. The Senator is correct. After having put together a budget myself, I would say you have to stand by all those policies. And I think if we were to call on the Office of Management and Budget or the Treasury Department, they would tell you they stand by these proposals. So, yes, it is a package, but they put them in because they think they are good policy.

So my point is that we have some good ideas not related to ObamaCare, since that seems to be an objection by the majority leader, and I hope we can work something out. I do think there is an opportunity for us to do so. But I don't think we can do it unless there is a little bit of give-and-take and some discussion, at least, which we have not been able to have yet.

With that, I yield for my friend from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I will be brief. I know my colleagues probably have travel plans. But this is something we had earnestly hoped that by six of us supporting the motion to proceed, we would have the opportunity to offer an amendment, debate that amendment, and have our colleagues vote on that amendment.

For the majority leader to simply say—and I quote him: I have looked at these amendments that Republicans have offered, and none of them are reasonable.

Isn't that something this body is supposed to achieve by something called a vote? Do we have one person here who runs the place and says: I will decide whether your amendment is not reasonable. And if I decide your amendment is reasonable, along with all the other 23, then we won't have any vote or debate or the ability to offer any amendment whatsoever.

I thought the way we settle things here as to whether this body thought something was reasonable or helpful or might correct some of the inequities which have been talked about here was decided by a vote of 100 Senators. But it has been decided by the decision of one Senator who has the power to do what he is doing. But this just perpetuates.

The majority leader said he has been waiting since Monday for Republicans to offer a pay-for. I was down here Tuesday offering four options to pay for.

I know the majority leader doesn't sit in the office and come to the floor

when I come down to speak or turn on the television, but I think his staff would have told him: Well, Coats has four pay-fors.

And I said: I am not asking for all four, Mr. Leader. You select the one you think best fits the thoughts and ideas and values of your caucus.

So I put four out. The majority leader said we are delaying time. We have been waiting for nearly 2 days now for the majority leader to make up his mind in terms of what he wanted to do.

The three of us who were listed as surprise votes for the motion to proceed weren't even asked to be part of any negotiations. We were trying to look for a solution to the problem, come together and have something to offer to our colleagues to vote on, but we weren't even asked to be part of that.

So here we are. I am representing the people of Indiana. Their voice is shut down. I don't even have the ability to offer an amendment, which my constituents sent me here to do. They didn't send me here just to be told: Sit down and forget it; one person decides. So I am very disappointed.

With that, in the interest of time I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment No. 2611.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. If he will just withhold—and he can offer his amendment—I do want to say this. We get nowhere with dueling amendments. We have learned that in the past. Dueling amendments don't do the trick.

The issue is pronounced, it is here before us, and we went a step further. In the past we haven't paid for this. Five times, President Bush signed bills extending unemployment benefits not paid for.

Again, we have done a good job reducing the debt. We have a lot more we can do, but we have reduced it almost $3 trillion already. The issue now before us is are we going to extend benefits for people who have been unemployed for a long time. That is the question. We bent over backward to try to come up with a compromise, a bipartisan piece of legislation. I repeat, it is paid for with a PAUL RYAN pay-for. There are structural changes. It is a pretty good deal. I am very disappointed we are at a point now where we have been for 5 years. Nothing is ever quite good enough. They always want more amendments. They always want more amendments.

But the issue is before us. Is this body going to vote to extend unemployment benefits paid for with PAUL RYAN's pay-for and with structural changes or are they going to turn their back on people who are desperate?

Mr. COATS. Madam President, may I ask the majority leader to yield for just one question?

Mr. REID. Sure.

Mr. COATS. The majority leader just said this body gets nowhere by offering amendments. Does he mean throughout this year it is worthless, meaningless for Republicans to offer any amendments to any bill to try to make improvements to the bills or to try to make their voice heard or the voice of the people I represent, the people of Indiana, heard on this floor?

Mr. REID. My friend, the Senator from Indiana, is of those Senators who used to be here when the good old times were here. We didn't have ''gotcha'' amendments. Every amendment offered, with rare exception, is a ''gotcha'' amendment. That is not what we do here.

I have been waiting since Monday to get pay-fors as to how we can extend unemployment benefits for people. They come up with stuff that doesn't even pay for 3 months' worth of extensions. Amendments are important, but I think we have to go back to the time when Senator COATS was here the first time and start working together to get things done in this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, this is 100 percent different from the time I was here the first time. We were able to offer any amendment to any bill at any time and the majority leader, both Republicans and Democrats, allowed us to do that. This is the first time I have had the experience of not being able to offer an amendment.

I think I heard the majority leader object, but I was not sure. Did he object to my unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The objection was heard.

Mr. REID. I was there, just like my friend. Things were different then, they certainly were, because we did not have hundreds of filibusters that would take place. Filibuster was something that was used rarely. In those days would you ever filibuster the Secretary of Defense or all the other Cabinet officers? Of course you would not. That is why action had to be taken.

But what my Republican friends have to realize is that filibuster is not a right, it is a privilege. It has been abused. My friend can lecture me, and I am happy to listen to his many lectures, but I was here. I know how things used to work and what has gone on in the last 5 years would never have taken place in those days.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. He brings up the Secretary of Defense frequently. Was the Secretary of Defense defeated or confirmed?

Mr. REID. No, he was only delayed while we had two wars going on in this country.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Has a member of the President's Cabinet ever been defeated on a filibuster in the history of the Senate?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in response to the question of my friend, in fact what has happened—and we find this with the judges—they stall for weeks, months, and sometimes years. When the vote comes it is pretty good, but in the meantime they have done significant damage to this institution and our country by stalling and making it so the President of the United States has a very difficult time doing his job because he doesn't have his people there when he needs them.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask my friend, the majority leader, then is what he finds offensive the fact that there are debates about these matters? Since none of these members are being defeated, what is the issue? I am having a hard time understanding it. Is it the fact that there is controversy, that there is debate? Since none of them are being defeated, is he also suggesting we have no controversy about anybody sent by the President of the United States?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, of course that is a question that is a great big softball—of course not. We need debate. We need good, strong debate about nominations and everything else. But what we don't need is hours and days and weeks and months of obstruction. That is what we have here.

My friend, the Republican leader, is picturing to everyone within the sound of his voice something that doesn't exist. There has been obstruction that has been carried to an extent that no one ever dreamed would happen in this great Republic.

That is what the objection is. The objection is to obstruction. Was it only a debate when my Republican colleagues decided the DC Circuit—some say the most important court in this country, even, some say, more important than the Supreme Court—when they decided there were vacant seats there and for 5 years held up filling those seats? Is that a debate? No. It is obstruction.

If we turn to the dictionary and look up ''obstruction,'' they would point right over here.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the majority leader yield for another question?

Since he has conceded that no Cabinet members have been defeated prior to the decision of the majority leader to break the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate, is it not the case that 215 of President Barack Obama's judges have been confirmed and only 2 have been defeated?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, during the time we have been a country, and I don't know exactly long it has been, more than 230 years—I can't come up with it this second—there have been 23 district court nominees filibustered. Twenty of them have been during the 5 years of the Obama administration, and that example is throughout the government.

The American people know what is taking place in this body. They can try to paint over a picture that things are just fine, all we are doing is wanting a

little bit of debate. There has been stalling, obstruction that is untoward and never considered. I just can't imagine how my Republican colleagues can justify what they have done. But they do. I accept that.

But we have an issue before this body. Again, they are trying to divert attention and go to how many amendments, what are the rules. The issue before this body is whether the long-term unemployed get an extension of their benefits. As we speak, there are people all over this country who are desperate to be able to get $300 a week to be able to survive for another week, hoping they will find a job. The sad part about that—my friends say we need to do something about making sure these people fill these vacant jobs. There are lots of places people find work. For every job opening there are three people unemployed trying to find a job.

I have answered the question to the best of my ability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from Indiana had a consent request? Oh, I wanted my friend from Indiana to know I was not trying to object to something he has a right to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, let me just say I share in the comments of my colleague from Indiana and my colleague from Ohio. The three of us voted in good faith to debate this bill. I did so because I thought we should try to debate this issue; that both sides, if they had an idea about how to pay for this in a responsible way, we should bring it forward. When I hear the majority leader say I have been waiting since Monday, I filed an amendment on Tuesday. That amendment is straightforward. That amendment is one that would fix fraud in our Tax Code that came to light in 2011 in a Treasury IG report. What it would simply require is those who seek the additional child tax credit to file a Social Security number just like those who seek the earned-income tax credit in this country.

Why is that? Because the investigations of this tax refund people receive found they were claiming it for people who, No. 1, were basically not authorized to work in this country but were claiming it and, second, for children who may not even exist. Investigations found that for children who do not even live in this country. So a commonsense amendment that—by the way, would it pay for it? It would pay for 3 months of unemployment insurance for American workers and for this issue we have before this Chamber. It would pay for it to fix the military retirement cuts to the COLAs—that also impacted our wounded warriors—that were done in the most recent budget that were unfair, that Members of both sides of the aisle have come together to say we should fix and agree it is unfair.

What else would it do? It would reduce the deficit. What I hear from the majority leader is: I hear that idea. We have heard that before. You may have heard it before, but we have not been allowed a vote on it.

Are they so afraid of having a vote on something such as this that the people of New Hampshire whom I represent can't get a vote on, trying to fix this abuse in our Tax Code, on trying to solve this issue pending on the floor and to pay for it so we do not add to our $17 trillion in debt?

By the way, is it so unreasonable? I happened to sign a letter from a Member of the Democratic conference who, after the Treasury IG report was issued that I am citing, was equally as concerned as I am about this abuse in the Tax Code, in fact, described it as improper payments and said it seemed reasonable to presume that unauthorized workers were not eligible for this tax credit and called on the Commissioner of the IRS—this is a respected Member of the Democratic conference who expressed concerns about it. That Member said: ''We need to stop these unauthorized payments immediately.''

That was in 2011 and we cannot even get a vote on this? We can reasonably disagree, but the only way we can express those disagreements in this body, as my colleagues have said, is to be allowed to vote and to be able to represent our States and to get votes on amendments.

With that, I will ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment No. 2603.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, talk about fiddling while Rome burns. If you are one of the 1.3 million people in this country, 222,000 in my State, whose house is burning down because they are going to lose the safety net of $300 a week to feed their family, to take care of their kids, to heat their homes, and my colleague talks about letters? I will tell you about a letter I got from a woman who sets her thermostat at 55 degrees and she has a 2-year-old and a 1-year-old, and all they do on that side is complain that their amendments, they are so important—24 of them. They know they are all partisan.

We are trying to work on a bipartisan solution. Somebody explain to me why the Republicans never objected to extending unemployment so many times when George W. Bush was President. Not a one. It was fine.

So do we make economic policy by who is in the White House or by the needs of our people?

This idea of going after children is one of the worst ideas I have ever heard, and I am shocked. I am shocked. You are going to hurt children. You are going to take food out of their mouths. It is outrageous. If there are abuses, I say to my friend, put those people in jail.

If there were one corrupt Senator—and there could be and there might be and there was in the past—and every one of us got painted with that brush, which is what the Senator did in her speech, is to taint every poor child who happens to benefit from that credit. Let us not go down that partisan route. Let us support our leader and let us work through the weekend to come up with a plan. I think the majority leader has one.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I would say, first of all, I voted in good faith, one of six Republicans, to debate this bill to solve this problem. I cannot get a vote. If the Senator from California objects to this amendment, then why don't we vote on it? This is nothing about protecting children—unless the Senator is trying to protect children who may not exist or trying to protect children who do not live in the United States of America. This is about protecting abuse within the Tax Code which, again—I have a letter from a Member of her caucus who recognized this problem as well, based on a Treasury IG report done during this administration. This amendment is about protecting the American taxpayer, and the American taxpayer needs some protection in this body when it comes to tax fraud.

Let me say that we need to be able to have votes on behalf of our States and on behalf of the American people, and if we disagree, let's vote them down. I don't see what the issue is unless they are worried it is going to pass because it just makes too much sense.

I have a parliamentary inquiry. Is it correct that no Senator is permitted to offer an amendment to the unemployment insurance bill while the majority leader's motion to commit with instructions with further amendments is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Ms. AYOTTE. I have a further parliamentary inquiry. If a motion to table the Reid motion to commit with a further amendment is successful, would there still be Reid amendments pending that would prevent me from offering my amendment or any of my colleagues from offering their amendments which would pay for this and improve it and try to address the problems we are supposed to be debating on this floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Ms. AYOTTE. I have an important amendment, and that amendment would fix the abuse within the Tax Code that has been identified by a Treasury IG report and subsequent investigations. My amendment would pay for this 3-month unemployment extension for American workers—those who are struggling to find work. It is an amendment that would fix the unfair cuts to our military retirees and

wounded warriors. I am concerned about the $17 trillion in debt and what it will do to the future of our children and this country, and this amendment would reduce the deficit as well.

I would ask for a vote on my amendment, amendment No. 2603, but in order for the Senate to consider my important amendment and amendments that my colleagues have talked about—and I hope amendments on the other side that we should be voting on—I move to table the pending Reid motion to commit with instructions, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 3 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	Manchin	Wicker

NAYS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Heller	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Levin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Casey	Moran
Coburn	Paul

The motion was rejected.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT LEON WILKINS TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Baucus	Heitkamp	Pryor
Begich	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rockefeller
Booker	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden
Harkin	Murray	

NAYS—41

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Chambliss	Heller	Scott
Coats	Hoeven	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Coburn	Moran
Casey	Inhofe	Paul

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion upon the table.

The motion to lay upon the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the Wilkins nomination.

I ask unanimous consent that the next votes be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Heinrich	Murray
Baucus	Heitkamp	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Pryor
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Booker	King	Rockefeller
Brown	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Levin	Shaheen
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Donnelly	Markey	Tester
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Feinstein	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Franken	Merkley	Warner
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Warren
Hagan	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Harkin	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—40

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Hatch	Scott
Chambliss	Heller	Sessions
Coats	Hoeven	Shelby
Cochran	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Johanns	Toomey
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Vitter
Cornyn	Kirk	Wicker
Crapo	Lee	
Cruz	McCain	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Coburn	Moran
Casey	Inhofe	Paul

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. This will be the last vote today. The next vote will be Monday, January 13, 2014, at 5:30 p.m.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion.

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 Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Mark Begich, Brian Schatz, Al Franken, Barbara Boxer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Barbara A. Mikulski, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tom Harkin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, 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. HATCH (when his name was called). ''Present.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Baucus	Heitkamp	Pryor
Begich	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rockefeller
Booker	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	
Harkin	Murray	

NAYS—38

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Scott
Chambliss	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Hatch

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Coburn	Moran
Casey	Inhofe	Paul

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 38, and one Senator responded ''Present.'' Upon reconsideration, the motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT LEON WILKINS TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as we begin 2014, I hope we can set aside our differences and do what is best for this country by confirming qualified nominees to fill critical vacancies facing our Federal judiciary. We can do this today by voting to end the filibuster of Judge Robert Wilkins, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. Judge Wilkins was nominated last June, and it is time that he received an up-or-down vote on his nomination. Last month, before we adjourned the Senate, we were able to confirm two other exceptional nominees to this court—Patricia Millett and Nina Pillard. Once Judge Wilkins is confirmed, the DC Circuit, which is often considered to be the second most important court in the Nation, will finally be operating at full strength. The American people deserve no less.

Judge Wilkins is an outstanding nominee. He was unanimously confirmed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia less than 3 years ago. He has presided over hundreds of cases and issued significant decisions in various areas of the law, including in the fields of administrative and constitutional law. Prior to serving on the bench, he was a partner for nearly 10 years in private practice and served more than 10 years as a public defender in the District of Columbia.

During his time at the Public Defender Service, Judge Wilkins served as the lead plaintiff in a racial profiling case, which arose out of an incident in which he and three family members were stopped and detained while returning from a funeral in Chicago. This lawsuit led to landmark settlements that required systematic statewide compilation and publication of highway traffic stop-and-search data by race. These settlements inspired an Executive order by President Clinton, legislation in the House and Senate, and legislation in at least 28 States prohibiting racial profiling or requiring data collection.

Despite the progress made in the past several decades, the struggle to diversify our Federal bench continues. If confirmed, Judge Wilkins would be only the sixth African American to have ever served on the DC Circuit.

Judge Wilkins earned the ABA's highest possible rating of unanimously ''well qualified.'' He also has the support of the National Bar Association, the Nation's largest professional association of African American lawyers and judges, as well as several other prominent legal organizations. I ask unanimous consent to include a list of support in the RECORD.

I urge my fellow senators to end the filibuster on this outstanding nominee. This Nation will be better off with Judge Robert Wilkins serving on the DC Circuit.

I would also note that on December 31, 2013, before the new year, Chief Justice Roberts once again issued his annual year-end report on the Federal judiciary. In this report, he focused on the significant financial strain on our Federal courts. The cuts from sequestration have had a real impact for Americans seeking justice and pose real threats to the dedicated public servants who work in our Nation's Federal courts as well as to members of the public. I hope that we can return to regular order in our appropriations process and ensure that our courts have the resources they require. As the Chief noted, the Federal Judiciary's entire budget ''consumes only the tiniest sliver of Federal revenues, just two-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal government's total outlays.'' We receive the benefit of the greatest judicial system in the world for less than 1 percent of our entire Federal budget. It makes no sense to indiscriminately cut services from our independent Federal judiciary. There are better and smarter ways to save taxpayer dollars.

Another threat facing our courts which is unaddressed in the Chief's year-end report are the continuing vacancies experienced by the Federal courts. Over the last year, the number of vacancies has hovered around 90 because obstruction in Congress has led to filibuster after filibuster of qualified nominees. And the unfortunate action taken by Republicans at the end of the first session of this Congress will only mean further delay in filling these vacancies—Republicans, for the first time ever, refused to allow any currently pending judicial nominees to be held over so that they could be ready for immediate action this year. For purely political reasons, Senate Republicans are forcing us to duplicate work this year that we already completed in 2013. In the jurisdiction of the Senate Judiciary Committee alone, more than 65 judicial and executive nominees were returned to the President and had to be renominated this week. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars and valuable resources that could be spent addressing the difficult issues facing our Nation. We must not take for granted that we have the greatest justice system in the world, and ensuring this continues requires the Senate to fulfill its constitutional duty of advice and consent.

Fortunately, due to the procedural posture of the nomination from last year, we did not have to send the nomination of Robert Wilkins to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit back to the President for renomination. I thank the majority leader for prioritizing this nomination in the first week of the second session of this Congress. I hope my fellow Senators

will join me today to end the filibuster of the nomination of this good man to serve on this important court.

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was unable to attend the roll call vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Robert Wilkins to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the D.C. Circuit. Had I been present for this vote and the two related procedural votes, I would have voted aye.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to proceed as though in morning business for 15 minutes, but prior to that I be able to yield to Senator REED of Rhode Island for 5 minutes and that not be counted against my time; and that I then be recognized after he is done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the Senator from Michigan is recognized and yields to the Senator from Rhode Island.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Michigan, my chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I simply wish to make a few comments about this afternoon's proceedings with respect to unemployment insurance. The reason we were here, and we can't lose sight of that, is that 1.3 million Americans, as of December 28, lost their extended unemployment benefits. They are without the modest support of roughly $300 to $350 a week. Every week, 73,000 more Americans lose this support. We are going to see this number grow and grow and grow and grow while we talk and talk and talk and talk.

Along with Senator HELLER, we proposed a very straightforward mechanism: a 90 day extension and picking up retroactively those who had lost it, unpaid for, so we could work on some of the difficult issues my colleagues have all explored this afternoon.

In listening to my colleagues, we made the determination there was a sincere concern and desire on the part of my Republican colleagues particularly that any extension of benefits be paid for. Most frequently, we don't pay for these benefits. We have on occasion, but most times we consider it emergency spending. We go ahead and authorize the payments and we don't offset it. But the concern was raised repeatedly and very strenuously that these benefits should be paid for. Also, there were several proposals to do that.

So working closely with my colleagues, we considered the best approach for it was not simply to bring up the Reed-Heller bill, the 90 day extension, but to respond as best we could to these concerns. So the provision we brought up today is fully offset, but it goes beyond 90 days because the simple logic was that going through the travail of finding pay-fors is not something we want to do every 90 days. It is something we should do seriously but for as long as possible. So our provision would be able to carry these benefits through to the middle of November, and it required finding offsets.

The other thing we have heard from our Republican colleagues is that we shouldn't use any revenue—no tax provisions. In the Democratic caucus we have seen this extension of extended unemployment insurance benefits come up so many times under Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents completely unpaid for. But also in terms of seriously and thoughtfully balancing the way we pay for provisions, we have many times suggested, which I think is common sense, let's have a mix of revenue and other provisions—spending provisions. Let's do that; 50–50 or some fair combination. In fact, I think the American people would see that as the most sensible approach to doing the work of government. But once again we yielded to the perceptions and the demands, in some respects, that there be no revenue provisions in this bill.

As a result, we had to look for a series of pay-fors that didn't involve revenues. That was a deliberate attempt to reach across and to say: We hear you. You want it fully paid for, you want no spending, and you want provisions that will not involve revenue. So we proposed a major provision—an extension of the mandatory sequestration—that was included in the budget agreement and that had overwhelming support in the Senate—for a bit over an additional year, which gained us, roughly—and these are rough figures—about $17 billion.

Then we took one of the provisions that was offered by my colleague Senator PORTMAN, who has been working very assiduously and very thoughtfully on these issues, with respect to the double collection of both SSDI benefits and unemployment compensation benefits and we tried to focus it and make it narrower, and that resulted in $1 billion, giving us sufficient funds to carry this program through—if we voted today, starting as soon as the House passed it—all the way to the middle of November. That is where we are today.

We still are open to alternatives to try to deal with this issue. I know many of my colleagues on the Democratic side have a long list of revenue provisions. In fact, Chairman LEVIN has, through his work, a list of what many would call—many Americans—egregious loopholes that corporations enjoy. But certainly there are other ways to pay for this. But we are still trying to work through this.

We are still trying to find a bipartisan approach to deal with the issue of the moment, the crisis of the moment, and that is 1.4 million Americans today—and that number is growing—who worked hard and through no fault of their own lost their job and who are now struggling to get by with a modest $300 or $350 a week.

One final point. This is a crisis of the moment. I know some of my colleagues are talking about an issue—the issue of military pensions—that doesn't become effective, as I understand it, until 2015. There are other ways to deal with it. But that is a fair position to advance at any time, and I have great sympathy for that position.

I would hate to see other issues, systematic reform of our training programs—which takes time, effort, and focused attention by committees typically—essentially prevent a response to the immediate crisis of people who are without jobs, who are desperately looking, and now don't have very modest support to pay for their rent, pay for their heat, and provide some support for their families.

We are still engaged. We will have a vote Monday. I hope we can succeed on that procedural vote. Regardless, we are going to come back and back, because this number of Americans—growing each week by approximately 70,000—needs our response, not just our comments on the floor of the Senate.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

IRAQ

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the current situation in Iraq is deeply disturbing. The violence there is a human tragedy, and the resurgence of Al Qaeda-affiliated forces in Fallujah and elsewhere represents a threat not just to the people of Iraq but to our own security and that of our friends and allies in the region. So I very much share in concerns many of us have expressed about recent developments in Iraq.

The United States has announced it will expedite military assistance, including delivery of unmanned aerial vehicles and HELLFIRE missiles. That is appropriate. The administration has stepped up intelligence sharing to help Iraq security forces in their fight. That is appropriate. The administration is holding ongoing conversations with Iraq about other ways in which the United States might assist, and that is appropriate.

One form that assistance might take is in the sale of weapons such as attack helicopters to Iraq. The issue is not whether such aircraft would help Iraq fight violent extremists; they would. The question is whether the Maliki government would use those aircraft, for instance, only against violent extremists, and whether we receive credible assurances that such weapons will be used to target Iraq's real enemies and not to further sectarian political objectives. With credible assurances, it would be appropriate to provide Iraq such assistance.

What it is wrong to do is to blame the Obama administration for the political failures of Iraqi leaders. Blaming the administration for failures and decisions by the Iraqi Government ignores not only history, it also leads to policy approaches that would not be in our interest or in the interests of the Iraqi people.

For example, here is what Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM said recently:

When President Obama withdrew all U.S. forces from Iraq in 2011, over the objections of our military leaders and commanders on the ground, many of us predicted that the vacuum would be filled by America's enemies and would emerge as a threat to U.S. national security interests. Sadly, that reality is now clearer than ever.

That argument ignores some important history. First, it ignores the fact that the 2011 withdrawal date for U.S. forces in Iraq was not set by President Obama but by President Bush. In December of 2008, just before he left office, President Bush signed an agreement with the Iraqi Government that called for withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraqi cities in 2009, and the complete withdrawal of U.S. forces by the end of 2011. President Bush himself, standing next to Prime Minister Maliki in Baghdad as they announced their agreement, said, ''The agreement lays out a framework for the withdrawal of American forces in Iraq.'' So the 2011 withdrawal date was set by President Bush, not by President Obama.

As to whether our military commanders objected to our withdrawal from Iraq, here is what happened: While there was no mention from President Bush or Prime Minister Maliki when they announced their agreement of a U.S. troop presence after 2011, Secretary Gates and others discussed the possibility of some U.S. forces remaining in Iraq after 2011. Then, during 2011, the Obama administration entered into negotiations with the Iraqi Government with the goal of keeping some U.S. troops, in limited roles, in Iraq to assist Iraqi security forces after the 2011 withdrawal date set by President Bush. I and many other Members of Congress supported the idea of continuing a smaller, specialized U.S. military assistance force. While there was disagreement in the administration over the size of a residual force, what decided the issue wasn't how many troops would remain; rather, it was the Iraqi Government's refusal to agree to legal protections for U.S. troops, whatever their number. In the absence of such protections, it was the opinion of the military leaders that no U.S. forces should remain in Iraq, regardless of whether the number was 3,500 or 20,000.

At a November 2011 Armed Services Committee hearing, I asked General Dempsey, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, about the importance of legal protections for our troops as part of any agreement to keep troops in Iraq after 2011. This is what the questions and answers were:

Sen. Levin: Are you willing to have those forces remain without an agreement relative to immunity for those troops?

Gen. Dempsey: No, sir, I am not. . . . It was the recommendation, advice and strong belief of the Joint Chiefs that we should not leave service men and women there without protections.

Sen. Levin: And why is that?

Gen. Dempsey: Because the—of the many institutions in Iraq that are still evolving and immature. The Iraqi judicial system is certainly among those. And we did not believe it was—it was appropriate, prudent to leave service men and women without judicial protections in a country that still had the challenge, as we know it has, and a very immature judicial system.

Later in that same hearing, I asked General Dempsey if our commanders on the ground in Iraq shared that opinion. He responded:

It was the topic of many secure video teleconferences and engagements person to person. . . . I can state that they also believed we needed the protections, both General Austin and General Mattis, in order to leave our troops there.

Before our committee in February of 2013, General Austin, our commander on the ground in Iraq during the 2011 negotiations, testified that there were extensive discussions with Iraq about a continuing U.S. troop presence. He testified:

We worked with the Iraqi leadership all the way up until the point in time when they decided they weren't going to be able to give us the protections that we needed to keep our troops there.

As Secretary Panetta put it before our committee, the key moment in the negotiations was ''once [the Iraqis] made the decision that they were not going to provide any immunities for any level of force that we would have there.''

So our military leaders were very much unwilling to leave any U.S. forces on the ground in Iraq if they could be subjected to the vicissitudes of the Iraqi judicial system. It is therefore wrong to say that the withdrawal took place ''over the objections of our military leaders.'' It was Iraq's refusal to grant important legal protections to our troops that decided the matter.

This criticism of the administration's Iraq policy also understates the importance of factors that have come to the forefront since the 2011 withdrawal. Foremost among these has been an Iraqi Government that has repeatedly pursued a sectarian agenda, disenfranchised Sunni Iraqis, failed to address Kurdish concerns over the status of Kirkuk and the hydrocarbons law, and alienated moderate Shia Iraqis who seek a more democratic and inclusive government. Prime Minister Maliki's governance shortfalls has stoked the sectarian tensions on which Al Qaeda and other extremist groups try to capitalize.

Many Members of Congress have made clear that it is extremely difficult to support more robust assistance to the Iraqi Government unless the Iraqi leadership places the good of their country ahead of sectarian politics and unless it produces a practical strategy for governing Iraq on a more inclusive and less sectarian basis.

For example, last October, I joined five colleagues—Senators MCCAIN, MENENDEZ, CORKER, INHOFE, and GRAHAM—in writing to President Obama, expressing our concern about deteriorating conditions in Iraq.

I ask unanimous consent that our October 29, 2013, letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: We are deeply concerned about the deteriorating situation in Iraq. As Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki visits Washington this week, we urge you to press him to formulate a comprehensive political and security strategy that can stabilize the country, enable Iraq to realize its vast potential, and help to safeguard our nation's enduring national security interests in Iraq.

By nearly every indicator, security conditions in Iraq have dramatically worsened over the past two years. Al-Qaeda in Iraq has returned with a vengeance: It has regenerated the manpower, terrorist infrastructure, resources, and safe havens to sustain and increase the tempo and intensity of attacks and to penetrate deeper into all parts of Iraq than at any time in recent years. Indeed, an analysis this month by the Washington Institute for Near East Policy found, ''In 2010, the low point for the al-Qaeda effort in Iraq, car bombings declined to an average of 10 a month and multiple location attacks occurred only two or three times a year. In 2013, so far there has been an average of 68 car bombings a month and a multiple-location strike every 10 days.'' The United Nations estimates that more than 7,000 civilians have been killed in Iraq thus far this year—a level of violence not seen since the worst days of 2008.

What's worse, the deteriorating conflict in Syria has enabled al-Qaeda in Iraq to transform into the larger and more lethal Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS), which now has a major base for operations spanning both Iraq and Syria. As the situation in both countries grows worse, and as ISIS gathers strength, we are deeply concerned that Al-Qaeda could use its new safe haven in Iraq and Syria to launch attacks against U.S. interests and those of our friends and allies.

Unfortunately, Prime Minister Maliki's mismanagement of Iraqi politics is contributing to the recent surge of violence. By too often pursuing a sectarian and authoritarian agenda, Prime Minister Maliki and his allies are disenfranchising Sunni Iraqis, marginalizing Kurdish Iraqis, and alienating the many Shia Iraqis who have a democratic, inclusive, and pluralistic vision for their country. This failure of governance is driving many Sunni Iraqis into the arms of Al-Qaeda in Iraq and fueling the rise of violence, which in turn is radicalizing Shia Iraqi communities and leading many Shia militant groups to remobilize. These were the same conditions that drove Iraq toward civil war during the last decade, and we fear that fate could befall Iraq once again.

We therefore urge you to take the following steps as Prime Minister Maliki visits Washington:

First, we believe the Prime Minister's visit is an important opportunity to reengage with the American people about the continuing strategic importance of Iraq. Though the war in Iraq is over, Americans need to understand that the United States has an enduring national security interest in the development of a sovereign, stable, and democratic Iraq that can secure its own citizens

and territory, sustain its own economic growth, resolve its own internal disputes through inclusive and pluralistic politics, and cooperate as a strategic partner of the United States—a vision of our relationship that was best expressed in the 2008 Strategic Framework Agreement.

Second, we urge you to make clear to Prime Minister Maliki that the extent of Iran's malign influence in the Iraqi government is a serious problem in our bilateral relationship, especially for the Congress. Published reports demonstrate that the Iranian regime uses Iraqi airspace to transit military assistance into Syria to support Assad and his forces. Furthermore, attacks against the residents of Camp Ashraf in Iraq are reprehensible, especially because the Iraqi government pledged to protect these people. Prime Minister Maliki must understand that actions such as these need to stop. Not only do they make it difficult for Iraq's friends in the United States to build public support, especially in the Congress, to enhance our strategic partnership, but they also undermine Iraq's standing as a responsible member of the international community.

Third, we encourage you to step up our counterterrorism support for Iraq. It is in our national security interest to enhance the effectiveness of Iraq's security forces, especially through greater intelligence sharing. However, in addition to our aforementioned concerns, we must see more evidence from Prime Minister Maliki that U.S. security assistance and arms sales are part of a comprehensive Iraqi strategy that addresses the political sources of the current violence and seeks to bring lasting peace to the country.

This leads us to the final and most important point that we urge you to stress with Prime Minister Maliki: If he devises and implements a real governance strategy for Iraq, the United States is ready to provide the appropriate support to help that strategy succeed. Iraq's challenges will never be solved through security operations alone. Indeed, as the United States learned through its own hard experience in Iraq, applying security solutions to political problems will only make those problems worse.

It is essential that you urge Prime Minister Maliki to adopt a strategy to address Iraq's serious problems of governance. Such a strategy should unite Iraqis of every sect and ethnicity in a reformed constitutional order, based on the rule of law, which can give Iraqis a real stake in their nation's progress, marginalize Al-Qaeda in Iraq and other violent extremists, and bring lasting peace to the country. To be effective, an Iraqi political strategy should involve sharing greater national power and revenue with Sunni Iraqis, reconciling with Sunni leaders, and ending de-Baathification and other policies of blanket retribution. It should include agreements with the Kurdistan Regional Government to share hydrocarbon revenues and resolve territorial disputes. And it requires a clear commitment that the elections scheduled for next year will happen freely, fairly, and inclusively in all parts of Iraq, and that the necessary preparations will be taken.

If Prime Minister Maliki were to take actions such as these, he could cement his legacy as the leader who safeguarded his country's sovereignty and laid the foundation for the new Iraq. In this endeavor, Prime Minister Maliki and our other Iraqi partners would have our support, including appropriate security assistance, and we would encourage you to provide U.S. diplomatic support at the highest levels to help Iraqis reach the necessary political agreements before the 2014 elections. However, if Prime Minister Maliki continues to marginalize the Kurds, alienate many Shia, and treat large numbers of Sunnis as terrorists, no amount of security assistance will be able to bring stability and security to Iraq. That is not a legacy we want for Prime Minister Maliki, and that is not an outcome that would serve America's national interests.

Sincerely,

CARL LEVIN.
JOHN MCCAIN.
ROBERT MENENDEZ.
BOB CORKER.
JAMES M. INHOFE.
LINDSEY GRAHAM.

Mr. LEVIN. In our letter, written as Prime Minister Malaki was visiting Washington, we supported an increase in support for Iraq's counterterrorism efforts. But we made clear that the Iraqi Government must provide a practical plan for using such aid and provide assurances relative to whom advanced weapons would be used against. We wrote President Obama as follows:

It is in our national security interest to enhance the effectiveness of Iraq's security forces, especially through greater intelligence sharing. However . . . we must see more evidence from Prime Minister Maliki that U.S. security assistance and arms sales are part of a comprehensive Iraqi strategy that addresses the political sources of the current violence and seeks to bring lasting peace to the country.

We further wrote:

This leads us to the final and most important point that we urge you to stress with Prime Minister Maliki: If he devises and implements a real governance strategy for Iraq, the United States is ready to provide the appropriate support to help that strategy succeed.

And:

If Prime Minister Maliki continues to marginalize the Kurds, alienate many Shia, and treat large numbers of Sunnis as terrorists, no amount of security assistance will be able to bring stability and security to Iraq.

It is a tragedy for the Iraqi people and a real security concern for the United States that Prime Minister Maliki has yet to produce a strategy for broadly based governance in Iraq. We should not forget the 2011 withdrawal date for American troops from Iraq was negotiated by President Bush. We should not forget the decision to reject an ongoing U.S. troop presence after 2011 was Iraq's, because of Iraq's refusal to assure us that our troops would have protections from Iraqi courts and prosecution. We should not forget that our military leaders supported the decision not to leave our troops in Iraq without legal protections from Iraqi prosecution. We should not forget that while an ongoing relationship is in our interests, no amount of military equipment from us will protect the Iraqi people if their government continues to place sectarian goals ahead of sound governance.

So we should use opportunities to assist Iraq in its struggle against violent extremism and for stability and security, but Iraq's fate ultimately rests with its people and their leaders.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when I conclude my remarks, Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have been honored to serve with Senator LEVIN on the Armed Services Committee. He does an excellent job. He has spent a lot of time and many hours working to try to help us be successful in Iraq and other areas of national defense.

I think Generals Dempsey and Austin were right to say we could not keep our troops there unless they had immunity from local prosecutions. But as I recall the net feeling about the President's decision to withdraw from continued negotiations on this contentious issue, the military felt this was not wise—at least many of them did—and they believed that had we continued to pursue negotiations, we may have been able to reach the kind of agreement which would allow us to help the Iraqi Government be stable and successful. Pulling out as we did always seemed to me to be too rapid, too precipitous, and created dangers which could place at risk that which our soldiers fought and died for. I do believe that is what happened. It is a tragic thing.

I was in Falluja, not long after that bitter battle. We had hundreds wounded and almost 100 killed. The Marines performed with such valor and courage. It was one of the great, courageous performances of the U.S. Marine Corps. It is sad, sad to me to see that today Al Qaeda is flying its flag in parts of that city. It is a tragedy. It did not maintain the faith that we ought to have maintained with those that we in Congress directed to go out and fight this war and to be successful. Maybe yet something can be done successfully to deal with this situation, which I feel deeply about.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. SESSIONS. I am here to share some thoughts about the remarks delivered today by President Obama on the growing problem of poverty and our chronic unemployment that has occurred during the 6 years of his Presidency, after he has declared that the recession is over and was over. Just this week the Senate majority leader, HARRY REID, said that ''the rich keep getting richer and the poor keep getting poorer and the middle class is under siege.''

Wages are not doing well. Americans in large numbers are not doing well, and they are hurting. Washington Democrats, led by the President, are now proposing increased unemployment insurance and new wage-price controls, wage controls to mandate wages that have to be paid, to treat the consequences of a failed economy—a stagnant, slow-growth economy that is not creating jobs. These words and actions represent an admission that the

White House economic agenda has been a disaster for poor and middle class people. It has not worked.

I know he believed it would work. I know he has advocated these policies. I know he promised that they would work. But they are not working. Worst still, the President remains fully committed to the policy regime that he has been advocating, and that is not working. These policies have failed, not just for the last 5 years; they have failed for the last 50 years. They will never work. The President and Majority Leader REID are correct, a nervous American business community is hoarding profits because they don't know what the future is going to be like. Those struggling to get by are feeling the results of corporate cost cutting and the policies that we are seeing executed by the government are impacting this situation negatively. They just are.

I know the people proposing these solutions think they are caring about people who are hurting today. But if we care about them, we will use our heads as well as our hearts, and we will think through as to how to make growth occur in our economy, how to help jobs be created, how to have wages rise instead of stagnating or declining.

Mr. President, $16 trillion has been spent fighting poverty since the war on poverty began 50 years ago, yet where do we stand today? Mr. President, 47 million Americans are on food stamps, 91.5 million are outside the labor force not working, and 46 million are living in poverty. In low-income communities the pain is especially severe. For example, in the city of Baltimore, 1 in 3 residents receives food stamps. In Chicago, 51 percent of the city's children live in a single-parent family. In Detroit, almost 1 in 3 households had not had a single person working at any time throughout the year—almost 1 in 3 households. The city's violent crime rate is among the worst in the country. More than half of all Detroit children live in poverty.

The welfare bureaucracy that the left is determined to defend and expand is failing our fellow Americans. It is just not working. We can do better. We have to do better. No longer can we define compassion by how much money we spend on poverty but by how many people we lift out of poverty.

The amount of money State and Federal governments spend on the welfare bureaucracy each year amounts to more than $1 trillion. That is a huge sum. It is twice the Defense Department budget. If all these funds were converted to cash and mailed to every household in poverty, it would equate to $60,000 per household. Yet as the President now admits, chronic poverty and a widening income gap is the new normal.

We have huge bureaucracies, huge multiple conflicting programs, and programs that are not working and are not helping the people we are supposed to help. They just are not.

Isn't it time that we broke from decades of policies that are proven not to work? Imagine how much better it would be if we combined dozens of overlapping welfare programs into a single credit with better oversight standards focused on the goal of helping people become financially self-sufficient. We need fresh approaches. We have to have fresh approaches. I believe it will happen. The sooner it happens the better off this country will be and the better off poor people will be.

But all we get from the White House are the stale policies of yesterday. What is the agenda the President persists in pushing? Consider the cornerstones of the President's economic agenda, the things he has been pushing in the Senate and the Congress and advocating unilaterally through the powers of the executive President—some beyond all law, it seems to me. These are the things he has consistently advocated for. He wants a government health care takeover, and that is proven to be a job killer. It is killing jobs and two-thirds of the jobs this year that have been created were part-time and in large part that has been a reaction to the Affordable Care Act.

What else? He has a hostility, a consistent hostility to the production of American energy, which makes the country more wealthy, to produce our own energy rather than transferring our wealth abroad, to buy energy from abroad. It creates jobs in America, high-paying jobs.

We have proposals for more and more taxes and more and more regulations that make it more difficult for U.S. workers to compete in the global marketplace. It makes it harder for their companies to be able to export and therefore create more American jobs.

We have a lawless immigration policy that undermines American workers and their wages. It just does. They can say whatever they want to say, but the bill that passed the Senate, the comprehensive immigration bill, would have doubled the number of guest workers. Some say: Well, Jeff, they are just going to be agricultural workers. That is not so. Only a small number are going to be agricultural workers. They are going to be a million-plus workers traveling around the country taking jobs all over America—twice as many lawfully as would be the case under current law. This is supposed to be immigration reform? This is supposed to help American workers find a job or have a pay raise?

We have a weak trade policy. We have to stand up for the American workers on the world stage and make sure that our trading partners are accepting our products like we accept their products, and if they do not, we have to defend the interests of the American worker. That is the way to help them have more jobs and better pay.

We have a welfare bureaucracy that penalizes work. The President is proposing more massive spending, creating more debt. He has had the greatest debt increases in the history in our country. That is destroying and weakening growth in America. It places a cloud over the American economy, as experts have told us.

These policies have been the order of the day for 5 years. That is what we heard. We need to spend more, we need to invest more, and we need to tax more. We have had more regulations than we have ever had in American history. We have had trillion dollar deficits the likes of which we have never seen before, and people wonder why the economy is not doing well.

We blocked oil production in the gulf for an inordinate period of time and are only slowly allowing that to occur. We blocked a Canadian pipeline that would create thousands of American jobs. We blocked energy production on Federal lands. We make it harder for energy production on private lands to occur, and we wonder why we cannot create sufficient jobs and growth. We need lower-cost energy, cheaper energy. That is good for the economy. Falling natural gas prices have been a help because of new techniques in the production of natural gas.

These statist, leftist policies have been tried in America before, and they have been tried throughout the world for decades, and they will never work. Taxes, regulating, more government, and taking over the health care industry will not create prosperity and jobs in America. It just won't. If it would, we would be doing so much better.

Since the President has entered office we have added an incredible $7 trillion to the debt of the United States, and what do we have to show for that? Real wages are lower today than they were in 1999. Take-home pay has fallen for 5 consecutive years. Average household wealth is 60 percent lower today than it was in 2007; 1.3 million fewer people are working today than in 2007. Have we had a recovery? We have fewer people working today than we had 6 years ago, and every month we add 150,000 or more people, basically, to the age cohort of Americans that could be working, because the population is increasing that much. So you have to create real jobs to stay ahead of just normal population growth. There is 1.3 million fewer people working today, even though the population has grown by 14.5 million. There are 1.3 million fewer people who are working today than in 2007, even though the population has grown 14.5 million. That is not good.

So the President is right to be worried about the health of the American middle class and lower-income workers in America. It sure has not been going well. I know he thought his statist ideas would work, and he pushed them steadfastly. He had a Senate that rubber stamped for 2 years what he wanted, including a $800 billion stimulus bill that was supposed to create jobs and prosperity in America, every penny of that borrowed.

If we continue down this road, I fear we are going to sentence an entire generation of young Americans to poverty,

joblessness, and stagnant economic growth in our economy. Majority Leader REID said this week that, ''We should realize that today there is only one job available for three people seeking a job. Think about it.''

I agree that we absolutely must think about that. We should think seriously about it. My first thought is this. Since three people are looking for every one job that is open, then why has the President embraced an immigration bill that would double the flow of guest workers into America? They will take jobs that would be available for American workers. Why? That is what I think about.

As David Cameron, the prime minister of the United Kingdom, said recently: Immigration cannot be a substitute for training our own workforce. Is there something wrong with him saying that? Isn't that an honest, correct statement, speaking for the interest of the average Briton?

We need to help struggling Americans get off welfare, off unemployment, and into good-paying jobs.

We have a loose labor market. We don't have a tight labor market. Byron York recently wrote an excellent column. He showed that the very same companies that signed letters to the President and the Congress demanding more guest workers are laying off American workers by the thousands. Big companies are signing letters that demand more workers, and they are laying off thousands of workers. It is a fact. He listed them. There were 10 or 15 companies. Some of them laid off thousands of people the very year they wrote to this Congress demanding more foreign workers. So now we have to extend unemployment benefits because people can't find jobs. We have to pass a law to set the wage so the wage can be higher because it is not going up through the natural free market as it should if we had a normal market for labor.

Whom do we work for? I know who I work for, and that is the hard-working people of Alabama and the United States. I don't work for the masters of the universe. They are demanding more workers from Congress when millions of Americans are unemployed.

America is not an oligarchy. House Republicans need to firmly tell this President that we work for the American people. We reject any immigration plan that puts special interests or corporate interests before working Americans. They need to say: We are going to defend the working people of this country. They are not being defended in the Senate by the Democratic majority, that is for sure, with regard to the immigration policy.

A small group of CEOs don't get to set immigration policy for the country, no matter how much money they have. How many ads do they buy? We are not going to enrich the political class at the expense of the middle class, and we will reject the immigration bill that passed the Senate.

That is one of the things we could do to help improve job prospects for Americans. It wouldn't cost us a dime. We wouldn't have to borrow money. It would actually get people off welfare and food stamps. It would put them back into the workforce, and put us on a better path.

If we want to reverse the middle-class decline, we need a new economic vision. We need concrete steps to restore opportunity to the American people without adding a penny to the national debt. We need policies that work to create prosperity without borrowing and creating more debt. We just have to do that.

What are some of the things that we can do? Produce more American energy. We can turn the welfare office into a job-training center. We can do this. We are going to have to do this. We are going to have to move people from dependence to independence. We need to streamline the Tax Code and make it more growth oriented, which will help us to be more competitive worldwide. We need to eliminate every Washington regulation that is not needed. These are regulations that kill jobs and kill competitiveness.

We need to enforce trade rules with our partners that defend the legitimate interest of U.S. workers. We need to enforce an immigration policy that serves the national interest—the people's interest—and protects jobs for Americans. We need to make our government leaner and more accountable. Our government needs to do more for less just like good businesses and good corporations and good companies are doing all over America. We need to do that with our government. That will help the economy.

We need to balance the Federal budget, restore the confidence of the American people, the world financial community, the vitality and the future of America, and spare our children from a lifetime of debt.

These are all positive steps that are true to our constitutional heritage and our legacy of freedom and opportunity. Those are the things we should be doing and we can do. They are all steps that will create more jobs and more growth without borrowing money, and these are all steps that will lift millions out of poverty, and help struggling Americans realize the dream of financial independence.

I don't know what the President was thinking when he talked about a few little promise zones—is that what he called them—around the country. This is somehow going to deal with the unemployment problem in America?

He announced this today. I haven't had a chance to study it yet, but these are just a few spots on the map of the country. This is not going to have any kind of systemic impact on our declining growth and the weak recovery we are seeing today. If the recovery doesn't exceed 2 percent GDP growth per year, it will not create jobs faster than the population grows.

I am afraid we are not in a good position there. We are not seeing the growth that we had, and experts are predicting slow growth in the years to come. We have to get off the path we are on and get on the path to growth, job creation, and prosperity. We have to make sure our American citizens are trained, skilled, and moved into good jobs so they can be independent and take care of their families without being dependent on the government of the United States.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it has been a disappointing week here in the Senate. I started out the week feeling pretty good and optimistic. I had a major presentation before the Brookings Institution. I talked about the enormous potential in this country for energy production and the fact that we are at the highest level of energy production domestically than we have been in 20 years and what great prospects we have for that. When we talk about jobs and economic opportunity, it is really one of the bright spots out there.

Of course, the debate this week has been over unemployment compensation and the extension, initially proposed by the President to be a 3-month extension—an emergency, temporary extension. I was one of six Republicans who came together and said: This is an important conversation for us to be having at this particular point in time.

As we know, the long-term employment benefits expired on December 28, 2013. It impacted over 1 million Americans around the country. In my home State of Alaska about 6,500 people lost long-term benefits at the end of the year, and it was one of these cold turkey things. Those who still had eligibility for certain benefits were cut off hard. There was no tapering down. This is hard.

Back here in Washington, DC, we have been living with some pretty cold weather. It is cold weather all the time in Alaska at this time of the year. It is hard to be out of work. It is expensive to keep your homes heated. It is expensive to live there, and so I recognize that the safety nets we put in place are important. It is important for us to have discussions and debates so we can argue and compromise on the issue of long-term employment benefits. That is a conversation we should have. I wanted to have that debate.

I wanted the opportunity for full-on amendments so we could bring up good ideas, such as, good ideas about reform and perhaps tying benefits to job training, retooling, giving people that opportunity to move forward, and debate about how we pay for it. There have been times when we extended long-term unemployment benefits with an offset, and then there have been times

when we extended it on an emergency basis with no offset. But let's talk about it, let's debate it, and let's put up some amendments.

I was part of that group that really thought we would not only be able to talk, but that we would actually be able to weigh in as Members representing our States, presenting our ideas, and speaking for our constituents on issues that are very important around the country. Usually in a body such as the Senate, actions don't happen unless there is an opportunity to vote on issues.

So this afternoon when I listened to the majority leader's statement, he said very clearly that we weren't going to have any amendments on the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. In fact, his words were: We get nowhere with doing amendments. I find that so disturbing.

I have only been in the Senate for 10 years, but what I have seen in my 10 years is a change in the process—a change in an institution where we are no longer taking the good ideas from this side and the good ideas from the other side through an amendment process—or even from a committee process for that matter—and building better policy based on the good ideas that we all have.

Why would we be afraid to vote on amendments? They may take us a little bit longer throughout the day to go through. It disrupts our schedules. My schedule is to work for the people of Alaska, and if that business isn't conducted here through debate and voting, then what is it? What is it?

I was really quite discouraged after the exchange on the floor earlier. Colleagues have worked hard to come up with some good proposals. These are not ''gotcha'' amendments as was suggested by the majority leader.

I think the proposal of the Senator from Ohio—a proposal that is actually contained in the President's budget proposal—was absolutely legitimate. So to suggest that it is an amendment without merit is not fair.

At the end of the day, don't we judge the merit of an amendment, of an idea or of a proposal by presenting it to the body for a vote?

If we truly are at that point where we are simply not going to amend bills, that we are simply going to vote straight up or down on a bill that has been presented to us—probably not even out of the committee process but more likely from the majority leader's chambers—that is a tough place for us to be as a body. That is not what this process is all about.

The minority leader reminded us yesterday that we can do better. We can do better as an institution, but we sure didn't demonstrate that today.

I want to work with my colleagues on the issue of unemployment compensation. I want to be able to recognize that compassion that we show for other Americans who are dealing with great difficulty right now. I want to try to move this country forward with policies that are good and strong and create those jobs.

ENERGY

When I started my comments, I talked about energy production being that bright light. Look at what is happening in the State of North Dakota where, boy, anybody who wants a job can get one. In fact, they can get two or three jobs.

They are ground zero in this type of oil revolution. Their unemployment rate was 2.7 percent last October. There has been a lot of back-and-forth going on about Keystone and its potential for providing direct jobs, direct and indirect end use jobs around the country—42,000 jobs around the country. Wouldn't that be helpful?

When we talk about our opportunities in this country, we need to be putting in place policies that help advance jobs and job creation and the wealth then that comes with it. We can and must be doing more.

One of the areas we need to address is where this administration, in my view, has seen some real policy failures; that is, in restricting access to Federal lands for resource development, blocking and slowing the permitting process. We need to be doing more. The President has touted the gains made in energy production. But I think it is important to recognize that most of those gains have been on private and State lands. The Presiding Officer and I know there are enormous resources on our Federal lands. Let's access them. Let's access them safely and in an environmentally responsible way but in a way that is going to help our economy, help the job situation in this country. I feel we can do so much more. I am hopeful again that we will, in this body, in this institution, be able to work together to solve some of the issues that confront us. But, again, I am disappointed.

I did not come to the floor this evening to talk about the comments made earlier on where we are in the amendment process and not being able to advance an amendment process. But my colleagues can tell I care deeply about this institution. I care deeply about our responsibility to govern around here. I am not convinced we are governing to our ability. We need to make some changes, and it only comes when we acknowledge that those changes have to come and that cooperation has to come from both sides.

EMERGENCY CONNECTOR ROAD

Tonight I come to the floor to talk about a decision that came out of the Department of Interior the day before Christmas Eve. This is a decision that in my view is absolutely unconscionable, and it is a decision that was made by the Secretary of the Interior the afternoon of December 23, in which she rejected a medical emergency connector road between two very remote Alaskan communities, the community of King Cove and Cold Bay.

I have thought long and hard about my public comments to my colleagues in the Senate because I have spoken out about this at home and I was very direct. I was very direct about my anger, my disappointment, and my frustration. I recognize I have to work with folks in this administration, and when we are talking about the Secretary of the Interior, I recognize she is effectively Alaska's landlord. I need to be able to figure out a way to get along with her. But I have to tell my colleagues that this was absolutely a heartless decision by Secretary Jewell. It was a decision that she alone made, and it will only serve to endanger the Alaskan Native village residents of King Cove.

With the decision the Secretary made, she has put the interests of certain environmental groups and the alleged peace and comfort of the birds, the waterfowl in the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge above the lives of hundreds of Alaskans, because 950 Alaskans live in King Cove. By the Secretary's act of denying this short road needed to ensure the people of King Cove reliable and safe access to an all-weather airport in nearby Cold Bay, Secretary Jewell has effectively turned her back on the Aleut people of western Alaska. She has discarded her duty to uphold the trust responsibility the Federal Government owes to its Native peoples.

The uncle of the Presiding Officer served as Secretary of the Interior. He knew full well that trust responsibility. It is a high trust and the Secretary has turned her back on the Native people out in King Cove.

To add insult to what could very well be real injury or even death, Secretary Jewell did this on the day before Christmas Eve. On the day before Christmas Eve, I received a voice mail message from the Secretary telling me that she later in that afternoon was going to deny the road to King Cove. What was I doing? I was doing the exact same thing most of the people around me were doing—we were at the last minute getting ready for Christmas. I was in the parking lot of a Fred Meyer store going inside to get Scotch tape and wrapping paper.

The decision made by the Secretary is one that goes beyond building a 10-mile, one-lane, gravel, noncommercial-use road between King Cove and Cold Bay. This decision makes clear to us in Alaska that our lives—the lives of the people, the human beings who are there—just don't seem to matter to the Secretary. It is clear to me that either she does not understand or she does not care about the most basic needs of our remote residents, and it is quite clear that we have, once again, received unfair treatment at the hands of our Federal Government.

Sometimes it just feels as though those on the outside, whether it is the Federal Government, back here, 4,000 miles away from home, that there is this sense that Alaskans need to be protected from themselves. Quite honestly, that is offensive. Quite frankly, I

have a very hard time believing that if this same situation occurred somewhere in the lower 48, the decision would be the same. The fact is we are out of sight, we are out of mind. There are only 720,000 people in Alaska. There are only 950 people, or thereabouts, in King Cove. Who is going to be upset? Well, I am upset. I am upset. Not only have the people of King Cove been wronged, but the people of Alaska have been wronged. This is not a decision that is going to just go away because we all got caught up in the Christmas holidays. This is not going to be something the people of Alaska or this Senator will forget, because we are not done.

I have been to this floor many times—many times—in fact, I think the Presiding Officer has been in the chair on previous occasions—when I have come to call attention to this lifesaving road and the land exchange that was approved by Congress, signed into law by the President. I feel as though I have told this story so many times I don't need to remind folks, but I am going to provide a brief refresher.

The recent story of King Cove actually started pretty well. Congress came together almost 5 years ago to give the Interior Secretary reason and authority to act in the public interest when it comes to providing access. But as is so often the case, this has become yet another terrible example of the interests of our people put at risk by their own Federal Government. So back in 2009 we passed—I introduced legislation—we passed legislation that proposed to add more than 56,000 acres of State and tribal land to the Izembek Refuge in exchange for a 206-acre road corridor through a corner of the refuge. Again, I wish to repeat the numbers because some people say I must have forgotten a zero: In exchange for 56,000 acres of State and tribal land, a 206-acre road corridor. In addition to the fact that this is basically a 300-to-1 exchange that was offered, there was agreement that this road would be so limited—so limited as to have an infinitesimally small impact on the refuge. The people of King Cove are not insensitive to the fact that this is a very rich ecosystem out there. This is a very rich area. This is where the birds come through. They have no interest in harming or damaging the refuge.

So the agreement was for a one-lane, between 10 and 11 miles long, gravel road, severely restricted by law—restricted by law; not just an agreement where the mayor says, oh, during my tenure, we are not going to use it for commercial purposes. This is in law: noncommercial purposes, one-lane, 11-mile-long gravel road. In addition, there were going to be roping corridors so that if a vehicle is on the road, it wouldn't be able to go off the road and onto the refuge and lay tire marks or impact the refuge at all.

The Department of Interior EIS clearly showed that the actual acreage inside the refuge to be impacted by fill material was just around 2.7 acres. Again, think about the exchange. They are giving up 56,000 acres in exchange for a 206-acre road corridor and, of that, the impact by fill material is just about 2.7 acres. So consider also that the exchange would have added 2,300 acres of eelgrass beds to the refuge.

This is prime habitat and feed for the black brant, and this was something that clearly Secretary Jewell felt was very valuable because she chose to place higher value on those black brants than she did on human and wildlife values. That 2,300 acres, then, is about 20 times more than the eelgrass that the EIS said might have been impacted by erosion as a result of the road. So the rejection of this exchange just dumbfounds me. I don't understand it.

The State of Alaska and the local tribal groups were willing to give up 56,000 acres of land. Keep in mind, these are lands that were given to them under the Native Land Claims Settlement Act. These lands represent who they are, and they are willing to give up 56,000 acres of it for a lousy one-lane, 11-mile gravel, noncommercial-use road. That is how much this road meant to them, because it was more than a road. It was a lifesaving connector. It was a way for them to get to an all-weather airport, the second longest runway in the State of Alaska that was built during World War II; an amazing runway, actually, that isn't encumbered by the topography and the weather as the King Cove Airport is.

So you have a people who are desperate for a solution, so desperate for their solution that they are willing to give up their lands. The most prized thing the Native people have in our State are the lands around them, and they are willing to exchange them for a small road corridor—a 300 to 1 exchange—and the proposed land that would have been provided to the Federal Government is pristine land that is valuable for the waterfowl, for the wildlife, certainly would enhance and benefit the refuge.

But Secretary Jewell said no to this. She said no to this 300 to 1 exchange—an exchange that would enhance the habitat for the birds she wants to protect. It really makes you wonder: Has there ever been such a lopsided land exchange that has been rejected by the Federal Government?

The former head of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Dale Hall, was the one who largely picked the lands and had approved of this exchange back in 2006—long before this legislation was ever introduced. So the Federal agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the head of the Fish and Wildlife Service had looked at all this and said: OK, in order to get this corridor, there is going to have to be some exchange, so let's figure out what it is going to be. He gave his blessing to that back in 2006.

But what this does speak to is how strongly Alaskans feel about protecting the health and safety of our residents, and rightly so. I would submit to you, Mr. President, if Secretary Jewell and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service truly had—truly had—the best interests of both the human residents and the birds of the Izembek Refuge in mind, they would have recognized that adding 56,000 acres, while taking out just 206 acres—and, then again, of that, the amount that would have actually been impacted by fill is 2.7 acres—I think they would provide far greater benefit to the refuge than any small, single-lane, gravel, noncommercial road ever possibly could subtract.

The legislation directed the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct an EIS for the road. So the 2009 legislation that passed the House, that passed the Senate, that was signed into law by the President, directed Fish and Wildlife to conduct an EIS. That agency prepared a faulty EIS. They failed to adhere to the underlying law, choosing a ''no action'' alternative and failing to adequately account for health and human safety when selecting the preferred alternative. This is more evidence of systematic disregard for the well-being of the Aleut who have lived in this region for thousands of years.

I also want to touch very briefly upon Interior's trust responsibility to Alaska Native peoples. The Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Kevin Washburn, went to King Cove. He visited. He actually spent 2 days there. In fact, they actually had some pretty stinky weather when he was there, and I think he saw firsthand what the residents of King Cove deal with in getting in and out. The Assistant Secretary wrote a report for Secretary Jewell. It was not made public until after the Secretary announced her decision, which I think was unfortunate. But again, back to the trust responsibility—the responsibility that the Federal Government has to protect the health and safety of Native Americans.

But here you have the Fish and Wildlife Service, you have Assistant Secretary Washburn, and now, finally, Secretary Jewell, who had the opportunity to encourage or actually make a decision that would improve the lives of the residents of King Cove. They turned their backs on these people, and they diminished the hopes of these first peoples.

The EIS, which recommended no action—no action—to help the people of King Cove has a clear negative impact on the health and safety of Alaska Natives who live in that village. The official report that was prepared by Mr. Washburn regarding his visit to King Cove, I believe, was inadequate—wholly inadequate—and, quite frankly, very weak.

He, the Assistant Secretary, is viewed as a leading legal scholar on Native trust responsibility. I truly have high hopes for him because I believe that his heart clearly is in that right place. But his report falls woefully short of his duty to the Aleut people, and I expected more of him—truly

I did—and I know the people of King Cove deserve better.

The health and safety of the people of King Cove is not some speculative issue. We are not just talking about, oh, the weather is bad there or somebody might get hurt. The fact of the matter is that since 1980, 18 people have died, and they have died because of medevac delays or because of the dangers connected with the medevac flights out of the fishing village.

It is not easy to get in and out of King Cove. They have an airstrip, yes, they do, but they are surrounded on three sides by mountains, and a valley on one and the ocean on another. The Coast Guard describes medevacs into King Cove as one of the more frightening, more challenging operations that the Coast Guard is tasked to do. You might say, why is the Coast Guard doing medevacs? Well, because medevac flights from Anchorage—some 600 miles away—cannot get in. They say: The risk to us to fly in for somebody who is in the midst of a difficult labor and needs to get out to the nearest hospital—which is Anchorage, 600 miles away—is too great or we are not willing to risk our lives. So whom do you call? You call the Coast Guard.

In 2012, the Coast Guard was called in, I believe, five times, at a cost of up to $210,000 to the taxpayers per trip, to bring in a crew to medevac that individual out. So if you can fly in—if the Coast Guard is able to do it, they will be there. But, in the meantime, you have had people die, and you have had planes crash.

If you cannot get out, the alternative is—because there is no road; there is no 10-mile, one-lane, gravel, noncommercial-use connector road—you can go across the water. Think about it. If the weather is bad enough up in the air, think about what it is doing down in that ocean. It is pretty tough.

So you can come across the water for hours in 15-, 20-foot seas, but then, once you get over to Cold Bay, it is not like they can just load you into a nice airplane on the runway there. You have to get docked, and up off the dock to get to the airport.

The fact of the matter is King Cove and Cold Bay—it is a little bit rustic out there. What is in this picture I have in the Chamber is probably a little difficult to see. This is the top of the dock at night. This is about a 20-foot drop to the ocean here. You have metal ladders that you climb up, if you are able. But if you are able, you probably do not need to be medevaced out. A person with a heart condition, how is he climbing up this metal ladder—as the waves are crashing against him in the dark and in the wind? What you are seeing here is basically a sled that has been hoisted up on a crane, swinging around in the wind in the dark.

I do not have the picture here of the elder who had suffered a heart condition and could not make it up the steps. They could not hoist him up. They put him in a crab pot and hauled him up by crane on to the top of the dock so that they could then take him to the airport, where he was safely evacuated out and made it to Anchorage.

As I say, when we are talking about the health and safety of the people of King Cove, it is not speculative. People are dying. People have died. People are afraid to fly. The testimony that the Secretary heard, that my colleagues have heard—as the people of King Cove have come back, they have said: Enough.

The Secretary, in her visit to King Cove in August, stood before the schoolchildren there at an assembly—and she is very good with children, and it was good to watch the exchange—but those children spoke up to her and told her why they needed a road out of King Cove. To hear a child say: We need a road so that I am not afraid to fly and because I don't want anyone to die. This is an issue, again, where the stories we have heard, the Secretary has heard—because I was there with her; we heard the stories together—they are heartwrenching. They bring tears to your eyes. The people, the families who have lived with this have been devastated. The Secretary heard all this, and yet it seems that she has just chosen to ignore the voices of those children, the stories of those elders, the pictures of an elder being hauled up in a crab pot so he can make a medevac to Anchorage.

I want my colleagues to know here in the Senate, as well as the administration, that I am not going to let this issue die. There is a simple reason why. Because I am not willing to let anyone in King Cove suffer or die because they do not have emergency access out of their village.

This decision rested squarely on the shoulders of Secretary Jewell, who then announced this devastating news only hours before Christmas Eve—a heartless decision delivered at a heartless time. The Secretary said to me that there is no good time to deliver bad news, and I would agree. But the timing of this decision was solely hers. There was no deadline within which she had to act. She chose to announce it on Monday afternoon, at 3 p.m., Washington, DC time, knowing that everyone was going to be skating out of here for the holidays, hoping that everyone was going to be distracted with their family events, hoping that no one was going to be watching. She knew that the people of King Cove would be upset. She knew that I would be upset—but less than a thousand people, she thinks. That is not how you do things. It is not how you do things.

The people of King Cove are without hope right now for one reason; and that is because of this decision from the Secretary. I have come here to tell the Senate what happened to them in what was supposed to be—what was supposed to be—a season of joy and celebration. I truthfully cannot use strong enough words to show the depth of my anger for this decision.

I cannot fathom why she came to it, why she was willing to sign her name to it. But I, for one, never thought that we would see a day where, under the guise of making a public interest determination, a Cabinet Secretary would so blatantly disregard the public's health and safety. But we have.

So the question now is, does it stand? Are we going to do what we know is right and make sure that those who live in King Cove are protected? I have my answer. I am going to stand in solidarity with the people of King Cove and others in Alaska and across the country whose well-being is put at risk by misguided government decisions, devoid of proper balance between human and wildlife considerations.

I have not yet identified every opportunity I may have to draw attention to, resist, and seek redress from Secretary Jewell's bad decision.

An obvious and perhaps an easy step would be to introduce yet another bill. But I am not willing to concede that the last word has been spoken on the law, the law we enacted in 2009. That law passed after a great deal of effort. There was debate. There was significant compromise as I have outlined. But that was a law we had all negotiated. I do not believe that law has been properly implemented. Who knows how and whether the courts may address that injustice.

A messaging bill might get some attention. But I am concerned that its immediate consequence may be to legitimize in the eyes of many a bad decision we should be fighting rather than accepting. I think the people of King Cove deserve better.

The Department of Interior needs more balance. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service needs better direction. I am not ruling out any possible remedy. In this case, Alaskans have been made the victim. But I think that all Americans are at risk from this kind of unbalanced decisionmaking. I pledge to my colleagues and my constituents that I am going to keep fighting for what is right, both morally and legally.

This fight is not over. Again, the attention is drawn to the residents of King Cove and a small connector road in a very remote part of our country. But I do think it is emblematic of the bigger struggle, the bigger fight we are seeing as a State with our own agencies, with our own Federal Government.

I have taken a great deal of time this evening. I appreciate the Presiding Officer's attention as I have made my case. I am certain the administration is listening to my words as well. As I indicated at the outset, in Alaska we have no choice but to figure out how we deal with our agencies because they consume, they occupy so much of how we are even able to move forward as a State. I will continue to do what I can to work with this administration in a manner that is going to benefit the people whom I work for. But I will always put the health and safety and best interests of Alaskans first.

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. 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.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today has been an eventful day on the unemployment compensation front. We began the day working with Republican colleagues to put together what we thought was an amendment they would join us in pushing forward. But surprisingly and disappointingly to me, those whom we worked with were unable to join on the amendment.

I am disappointed for a number of reasons, not the least of which is we gave the Republicans what they wanted. It is entirely paid for. The amendment made structural reforms in the unemployment compensation bill, which is something they said they wanted. The amendment includes a proposal, much like that advocated by Senator PORTMAN, that would prevent people from collecting both unemployment insurance and disability insurance at the same time.

Our amendment includes an offset that is PAUL RYAN's offset. It was the same thing we used in the Murray-Ryan budget agreement this body supported a few weeks ago.

So it is totally paid for with something PAUL RYAN suggested and we adopted a short period of time ago. It makes structural reforms they said they wanted—maybe not all of them, but it made structural reforms. It is hard to understand why they cannot take yes for an answer. Maybe it is because they do not want the legislation passed. It is possible.

But I have not given up. I have discussions with a number of Republican colleagues this evening. They said they are going to try to come up with something else. I certainly hope that is the case. We need to understand that there are 1.4 million Americans hurting. It is hard for me to comprehend why something that meets the outlines of what we understood they wanted is not good enough.

Maybe they do not like it because it does not give them an opportunity to—I withdraw that. I think we have had enough talk here today. I am not going to add to that. All I wish to close the Senate with tonight is it is very unfortunate for a lot of people who are truly hurting.

It is paid for with something that is certainly standard around here. We won't be able to use that anymore. States won't be able to use the same money anymore, but it doesn't affect the budget in any way. It doesn't raise the deficit one penny. It sounds as if it is a very good deal to help 1.4 million people.

Explain to somebody who is on long-term unemployment in the State of Colorado, State of Illinois, State of anyplace, and they will say they didn't vote for this because they didn't get to offer unlimited amendments, even though there was a proposal that wouldn't run up the deficit one penny. It was all paid for. It is hard for me to comprehend that. We could explain it to someone, but it is their job to explain it, not mine. My explanation is that it is something the American people want, need, and should have.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VERMONT ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AWARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as the U.S. mission in Afghanistan winds down this year, one thing can be said with certainty: The dedication and service our men and women in uniform is unparalleled. It will truly be with the thanks of a grateful nation that our troops will finally withdraw from Afghanistan by year's end.

This weekend, that appreciation will be front and center in Vermont, when the 3rd Battalion, 172nd Infantry Regiment, Mountain, will receive the Valorous Unit Award for extraordinary heroism in action, against an armed enemy of the United States, during their 2010 deployment to Afghanistan. The Mountain Battalion, as they are known, led Task Force Avalanche in Paktia, a province in western Afghanistan, and they were responsible for security in an area the size of Delaware so that aid and development efforts could go forward.

In the best tradition of the ever ready Green Mountain Boys, the Mountain Battalion knows a thing or two about operating in mountainous terrain. They are the only unit in the U.S. Army specifically designed to neutralize the enemy in a mountainous terrain—expertise that proved invaluable as they supported seven forward operating bases and combat outposts spread throughout the mountains of Paktia. Upon their arrival in 2010, in advance of the parliamentary elections, they found many unsecure roads and zones. The men and women of the Mountain Battalion helped to neutralize supply lines and occupied formerly safe zones to provide a level of security during the election that increased voter turnout in those districts by 15 percent. In large part because of their efforts, Paktia province held the distinction of being the only province that cycle with zero civilian casualties during the election.

Throughout their deployment, the men and women of Task Force Avalanche formed close partnerships with their counterparts in the Afghan National Security Force, living and operating together. They credit success in increasing proficiency and dedication of these forces in Paktia to the close relationship they forged. When the area of operations was hit hard by flooding, it was the Mountain Battalion and their Afghan partners who were there to respond for the civilians facing devastation. They even dispatched a platoon across the border to Pakistan to help flood victims—a border more often in the news for the crossing of foreign fighters and the Haqqani Network. The Task Force trained more than 50 Afghan National Army medics, who in turn provided care to U.S. personnel as well. These medics are just one part of the lasting contribution left by the Mountain Battalion in Paktia.

Also remaining in Afghanistan as a testament to their valor are 2 schools, 4 mosques, a community center, and 22 other projects. The Mountain Battalion is estimated to have contributed $700,000 into the local economy in money and jobs, and it is further estimated that almost 30,000 Afghans were beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance alone after the floods. Despite having been one of the most chaotic provinces in Afghanistan, our Green Mountain Boys left Paktia a better place for the people who live there, and they did so in partnership with the people who live there.

Through 5 months in Paktia, these men and women led 4,300 combat patrols, 9 air assault operations, and 65 named operations. A total of 600 individuals were awarded combat badges, 26 individuals were awarded the Purple Heart, and, tragically, 2 of these brave soldiers sacrificed their lives. Those who returned home brought with them the wisdom and experience of their deployment. As a Vermonter, I could not be more proud of these men and women. They and the mission they so ably performed help define what valor means.

Importantly, this incredible unit is a National Guard unit. Made up of citizen soldiers from Vermont, Maine, and New Hampshire, the men and women of the 3rd Battalion, 172nd Infantry Regiment, Mountain returned from their distinguished service and went back to their jobs and their neighborhoods throughout Vermont and New England. This story was duplicated repeatedly in Afghanistan and also in Iraq. Because of soldiers like these, today's National Guard is a ready and reliable component of America's fighting force, indistinguishable on the battlefield from their Active Duty counterparts, and trusted with essential missions.

I congratulate the Mountain Battalion of the Vermont National Guard on the Valorous Unit Award. You make us proud. You have given us and you have renewed and built upon an incredible legacy.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS McCLURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the outstanding achievements of Ms. Lois McClure, voted the 2013 Vermonter of the Year by The Burlington Free Press.

I am honored to count Lois among my closest friends. Marcelle and I are constantly inspired by her deep and sustained commitment to Vermont and to those of us who call it home.

As I have worked in public service, I have often looked for guidance in the breadth and depth of Lois McClure's philanthropic work. Year after year, Lois has found just the right points of leverage for her work to make Vermont a better place.

Lois McClure continues to build on a legacy of support for the arts, cultural and historic preservation, and environmental conservation, and yet her most meaningful work may be the help that she has provided Vermonters confronting serious medical problems. Whether or not they recognize it, many, many Vermonters have Lois in their corner as they fight back against cancer and other serious illness.

The Leahy Center for Lake Champlain, the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum, the Visiting Nurses Association, the American Cancer Society of Vermont, Fletcher Allen Health Care, and many other Vermont institutions are able to better serve Vermonters today because of Lois's commitment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article about this exceptional Vermonter who has dedicated her life to improving her community and the lives of those around her.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Dec. 31, 2013]

2013 VERMONTER OF THE YEAR: LOIS McCLURE

The true measure of an act of philanthropy can be taken in the lasting impact of what the initial donation set in motion.

Years after the act of giving, the efforts and institutions Lois McClure has chosen to support continue their good work.

McClure's engagement reflects a broad range, many with a common theme a focus on building a better life for people of all ages in her community.

For her life-long commitment to enriching people's lives in ways big and small, the Burlington Free Press editorial board names philanthropist Lois McClure 2013 Vermonter of the Year.

Over the years, McClure has built a legacy of generosity and caring, started decades ago with her late husband, J. Warren ''Mac'' McClure, former owner of the Burlington Free Press who sold the newspaper to the Gannett Co. in 1971.

The McClure name can be seen on buildings throughout Burlington and the surrounding area speaking to the long record of giving for which this couple has long been known in this community.

Lois McClure carried on the work after her husband's death in 2004, and clearly made her own mark on her friends and neighbors, as well as people who may never have heard her name. These are just some of McClure's good works.

She continues to serve as a director of the J. Warren and Lois McClure Foundation founded in 1995, which focuses on improving access for Vermonters to higher education and life-long learning.

She is a major benefactor of the ECHO Lake Aquarium and Science Center—Leahy Center for Lake Champlain on the Burlington waterfront, a wonderland to children, especially, who explore what lies beneath the waters of the lake.

The Lake Champlain Maritime Museum named its schooner Lois McClure in honor of her support for the effort to build a replica of a sailing canal boat that plied the Broad Lake in the early 1860s.

McClure, along with her husband, have long been enthusiastic supporters of the Shelburne Museum, and she has made generous gifts to organizations ranging from the Burlington Community Land Trust to the Vermont Historical Society.

Following a $1 million donation to the Visiting Nurse Association in 2006, McClure told the Free Press, ''I get a kick out of donating money and seeing that money make a difference.'' Yet among all her giving, the realization of a temporary home for cancer patients and their families who are receiving treatment at near-by Fletcher Allen Health Care perhaps became McClure's signature project.

The American Cancer Society's Hope Lodge opened in Burlington in 2008, named the Lois McClure-Bee Tabakin Building in honor of McClure and her long-time friend who each lost a daughter to cancer.

The call for nominations for Vermonter of the Year asked readers to ''Think of someone who has made a difference this year or through a lifetime of work; someone who stepped up in a time of need or proved to be a leader; someone whose acts or accomplishments embodied the best of Vermont.''

McClure has been nominated by readers many times over the years. In 2006, Jane Osborne McKnight wrote in a particularly telling nominating letter, ''I have never met Lois, but have admired her good works for many years. . . . She has personally enriched our cultural life in Vermont and furthered our understanding of Vermont history. These are good deeds that will be felt, undoubtedly, for many generations.''

McClure has lived a life that embodies the best qualities of a Vermonter who looks out for her neighbor and lives for the betterment of her community.

The Burlington Free Press' imminent departure from the College Street building it has occupied since the 1830s creates an appropriate occasion to give McClure the applause she deserves. The paper once owned by McClure's family is moving soon into new quarters on Bank Street.

McClure has built a legacy of making a real difference to many people.

The Burlington Free Press names Lois McClure—a friend to Vermonters, today and for generations to come—2013 Vermonter of the Year.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER TWO RANDY L. BILLINGS

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, on December 19, 2013, Chief Warrant Officer Two Billings gave the ultimate sacrifice to our country while serving as a U.S. Army UH–60 Blackhawk helicopter pilot in support of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. Chief Warrant Officer Two Billings' sacrifice brings great credit upon his family, his home State of Oklahoma, and his country. On January 9, 2014, a U.S. flag was flown above the U.S. Capitol in honor of CW2 Randy L. Billings and for his sacrifice to our Country.''

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HOCKEY WEEK IN FAIRBANKS

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Hockey Week in Fairbanks, a terrific annual celebration that takes place every winter. It has become so popular it will run for 10 days, from January 31 to February 9, 2014. During our long Alaskan winters, we welcome entertainment that celebrations like this offer and the outdoor and indoor activity that hockey represents.

Ice hockey has long been a popular sport all over Alaska, with leagues that run all year for players of all age groups. Due to the commitment and interest of players, coaches, and boosters, a Fairbanks Hockey Hall of Fame was established to honor those who helped develop the sport in Interior Alaska. Because of the foresight and enthusiasm of the hall's board, they also sponsor hockey week.

The activities during 2014 hockey week are varied. There is the popular ''Wear Your Jersey to School Day,'' tournaments for youth, puck shooting, a contest for the best backyard rink, ice sculptures with hockey themes, and much more. Typical of the civic spirit of the organizers and partisans, they sponsor reading programs in elementary schools and conduct blood donation drives as well, during the week.

This year, the organizers have attracted a major exhibit. The outreach program of the Hockey Hall of Fame in Toronto will send artifacts from its collection to be on display in Fairbanks and, later, in Anchorage. Fans will see jerseys, sticks, skates, and many other items belonging to some of the greats who have played professionally.

Each year, the celebration seems to top the previous year's. One of the reasons it does is because of the major force behind the event: Randy Zarnke, the president of the Fairbanks Hockey Hall of Fame. The year after he wrote a book about Fairbanks hockey pioneers in 2005, he started this remarkable celebration. I am happy to add my thanks for his leadership.•

TRIBUTE TO MARIE AND JOHN NOLAN

• Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Marie and John ''Jack'' Nolan of Lincoln, NE, on their 70th wedding anniversary. Their commitment to one another and their devotion to family and faith are an inspiration.

Jack Nolan and Marie Barrett met in Pennington, NJ, where Jack and Marie's brothers were classmates at Pennington Prep School. Jack and

Marie became friends and then started to date. They kept dating as Jack left for college to play center for Temple University's football team in Philadelphia, PA. After the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and the U.S. entrance into the war, Jack volunteered for Army Air Forces Aviation. In an instant, Jack was no longer playing football for Temple but, rather, beginning his primary training in San Antonio, Texas.

Jack's move to San Antonio would be the first of many moves to follow. After completing flight school and additional trainings, he was sent to B–25 bomber school in Greenville, SC. During this time, Jack and Marie wrote letters and remained devoted to one another. Jack knew that he would soon be sent overseas to fight in World War II, but he had one last thing to do at home: marry Marie. Marie travelled on a troop train to Greenville, SC, and married Jack on January 6, 1944. Three weeks later, Jack was sent to fight in New Guinea.

After his service in New Guinea, Jack and Marie were moved to Pampa, TX, and then to Enid, OK, where he taught others to fly the B–25 bombers. World War II ended while they were living in Enid. After the war, Jack remained in the Air Force, continuing his service to our great Nation. I am told that Marie and Jack like to reminisce about their more than 20 moves throughout his military career. They lived in numerous places across the United States, and Jack spent more than a year in Japan. Marie's support of Jack and his military service was unwavering. She remained focused on her husband, faith, and growing family.

His last assignment was at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base in Kansas City, MO. After his retirement from the Air Force in the early 1960s, Marie and Jack remained in Kansas City. Jack coordinated emergency preparedness for the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. Marie served as a church secretary at St. Elizabeth Catholic Church in Kansas City. They called Kansas City home for 30 years.

Since 1990, they have lived in Lincoln, NE. Being active in their church and community and helping others has always been of great importance to them. Marie and Jack have been blessed with four children, six grandchildren and four great-grandchildren. The family has shared that they are grateful for Jack and Marie's relentless love, example of faith in action, and encouragement. Their partnership as husband and wife sets a great example for others to follow. Congratulations to Marie and Jack on seventy years of marriage. May God bless them always.●

REMEMBERING RICHARD E. GUTTING

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a man who, although not a constituent, was very important to my State. Richard E. Gutting Jr., who died on Christmas Eve, spent over 40 years working in and for the commercial seafood industry. As many of my colleagues are aware, the seafood harvesting and processing industry is the largest private sector employer in Alaska. The seafood industry is crucial to the economic health of Alaska and employs more than 63,000 workers in my State, and overall Alaska's fisheries support over 165,000 American jobs.

The successful development and growth of the modern U.S. seafood industry is the result of the hard work of many individuals, and Dick played an important role in many key areas. He was recognized as the foremost U.S. expert on seafood safety and trade policies, and he continued to dedicate his time and energy to the seafood industry right until the weeks before he passed, publishing a daily update on seafood trade developments.

Dick's long career in both government and the private sector coincided with a period of rapid development and expansion of my State's seafood industry. In the 1960s we were focused mostly on salmon and watched as foreign fleets took a wide variety of marine resources from the waters off our shores. The passage of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act—now the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act—on which Dick provided advice and counsel, was a crucial step in allowing U.S. citizens to utilize the fisheries resources just off our shores. His work at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, at the National Fisheries Institute, NFI, and in private law practice helped not just Alaskans but the seafood industry throughout the country.

During his long tenure at NFI, Dick frequently testified before Congress on issues of great importance to the Nation's commercial seafood industry. His legal and policy insights, combined with his calm demeanor, made him a valued advisor to ocean policy leaders such as Senator Ted Stevens, Congressman DON YOUNG, and my father, Senator Frank Murkowski, as they crafted legislation necessary to develop U.S. fisheries while also promoting the consumption of seafood. He also helped mentor an entire generation of both governmental and private sector policy leaders in the commercial seafood industry. Many of those people are now in significant positions in government, academia and the private sector, and they continue to benefit from what they learned from Dick.

Above all, Dick loved seafood, and he loved to share his passion for promoting seafood throughout the country and the world. That is something that as an Alaskan I understand very well, and I appreciate his contributions to my State and to the country.

Although Dick is no longer with us, we are left with his many contributions to the responsible growth of the domestic seafood industry. Our system of fishery management and our robust global trade in seafood products have in many ways been shaped by Dick's four decades of work. These professional achievements, combined with the love and admiration of family and friends, form a legacy that anyone would be proud to leave behind. He will be missed by many Alaskans and by the entire seafood industry.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:04 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. 724. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles.

H.R. 3527. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3628. An act to eliminate certain unnecessary reporting requirements and consolidate or modify others, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 667. An act to redesignate the Dryden Flight Research Center as the Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center and the Western Aeronautical Test Range as the Hugh L. Dryden Aeronautical Test Range.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 724. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 3628. An act to eliminate certain unnecessary reporting requirements and consolidate or modify others, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4193. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a proposed permanent transfer of major defense equipment to a Middle Eastern country (OSS 2013–1926); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4194. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible effects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS–2013–1936); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4195. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible effects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel (OSS–2013–1935); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4196. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period August 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4197. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–166); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4198. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–158); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4199. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013–0202—2013–0204); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4200. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Third Rule Implementing Export Control Reform'' (RIN1400–AD46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4201. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the deployment of U.S. forces to support the security of U.S. personnel and our Embassy in South Sudan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4202. A communication from the Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Gulf Coast Rebuilding (OFCGCR) appropriation, Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol 7090116; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–4203. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2,5-Furandione, polymer with ethenylbenzene, reaction products with polyethylene-polypropylene glycol 2-aminopropyl Me ether; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 9902–90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4204. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Copper Sulfate Pentahydrate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9904–30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4205. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Isopyrazam; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9903–53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4206. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions (Multiple Chemicals)'' (FRL No. 9904–15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4207. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Photovoltaic Devices'' ((RIN0750–AI18) (DFARS Case 2014–D006)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4208. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Trade Agreements Thresholds'' ((RIN0750–AI17) (DFARS Case 2013–D032)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4209. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2013 annual report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4210. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology), transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Department's Chemical Demilitarization Program (CDP); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4211. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4212. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to blocking property of the Government of the Russian Federation relating to the disposition of highly enriched uranium extracted from nuclear weapons that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4213. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4214. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Certain References to Credit Ratings Under the Investment Company Act'' (RIN3235–AL02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4215. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans'' ((RIN3170–AA11) (Docket No. CFPB–2013–0020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4216. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4217. A communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of the Comptroller's 2012 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4218. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Ireland; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4219. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Russia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4220. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the United Arab Emirates; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4221. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Truth in Lending (Regulation Z): Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold'' (12 CFR Part 1026) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4222. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C): Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold'' (12 CFR Part 1003) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4223. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Certain References to Credit Ratings Under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934'' (RIN3235–AL14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4224. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests In and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds'' (RIN3235–AL07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

* Jessica Garfola Wright, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

* Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

* Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

* Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Robert L. Hobbs, of Texas, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years.

Gary Blankinship, of Texas, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Texas for the term of four years.

Amos Rojas, Jr., of Florida, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

Peter C. Tobin, of Ohio, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Ohio for a term of four years.

Kevin W. Techau, of Iowa, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Iowa for the term of four years.

Andrew Mark Luger, of Minnesota, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota for the term of four years.

* 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.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 1899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a consumer renewable credit for a utility that sells renewable power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1900. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1901. A bill to authorize the President to extend the term of the nuclear energy agreement with the Republic of Korea until March 19, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1902. A bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 1903. A bill to provide greater fee disclosures for consumers who have prepaid cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1904. A bill to amend the eligibility requirements for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1905. A bill to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1906. A bill to establish the Office of Net Assessment within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1907. A bill to amend a provision of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1965 regarding prohibitions on investments in certain funds to clarify that such provision shall not be construed to require the divestiture of certain collateralized debt obligations backed by trust-preferred securities or debt securities of collateralized loan obligations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BURR, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 1908. A bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1909. A bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1910. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Pat Summitt, in recognition of her remarkable career as an unparalleled figure in women's team sports, and for her courage in speaking out openly and courageously about her battle with Alzheimer's; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1911. A bill to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1912. A bill to clarify that certain banking entities are not required to divest from collateralized debt obligations backed by trust preferred securities under the Volcker Rule; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 41

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 41, a bill to provide a permanent deduction for State and local general sales taxes.

S. 127

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to provide a permanent deduction for State and local general sales taxes.

S. 217

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 217, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to collect information from coeducational elementary schools and secondary schools on such schools' athletic programs, and for other purposes.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to provide subsidized employment for unemployed, low-income adults, provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities for low-income youth, and carry out work-related and educational strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness, and for other purposes.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1410

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1410, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges.

S. 1719

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1733

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1733, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 1798

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1798, a bill to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not counted as full-time employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1846

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1846, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1848

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1848, a bill to amend section 1303(b)(3) of Public Law 111–148 concerning the notice requirements regarding the extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

S. 1881

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1881, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1881, supra.

S. RES. 317

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 317, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the continuing relationship between the United States and Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2603

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2603 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2608

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2608 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2613

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2613 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2626

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2626 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1900. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, 52 years ago, in 1962, President John Kennedy signed the Trade Expansion Act into law. At the signing he spoke about the importance of trade to the United States and its partners abroad, on how it helps secure our preeminence in a global economy.

Here is what he said:

> We now have the means to make certain that we build our strength together and that we can maintain this preeminence.

His words still ring true today. International trade is a cornerstone of our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, my friend from Montana is absolutely right. International trade is crucial to America's economy. Last year exports supported 9.8 million American jobs, including 25 percent of all manufacturing jobs.

Jobs created through trade are good jobs. On average, U.S. plants that export overseas pay their workers up to 18 percent more than nonexporting plants. They increase employment 2 to 4 percent faster than nonexporting plants. But we can do even better.

More than 95 percent of the world's population and 80 percent of the world's purchasing power is outside of the United States. To succeed in today's world, our farmers, ranchers, and job creators must be able to fairly access the world market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. I hope everyone listened to my good friend's words. He made very important points about statistics that I think most Americans are unaware of, and if they would think about it more, they would realize the importance of trade.

We export so much more now. Exporting is such a large percent of our economy and offers such good-paying jobs that, frankly, I am perplexed more Americans don't want to work harder to get trade agreements passed so we can export more and get more good-paying jobs in America.

I must say that today we have a bold plan to strengthen our trade ties with

nations across the Pacific and in Europe.

What is our goal? Our goal is to seize new export opportunities so that we can boost our economy and create jobs here at home. We all know the big to-and-fro here with unemployment insurance. The key is to have fewer people unemployed. How does that happen? More good-paying jobs.

But there is a big first step we need to take before we can act on our trade agenda. What is that? It is Trade Promotion Authority, otherwise known as TPA.

That is why this afternoon Senator HATCH and I introduced the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act of 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Our bill will help guarantee these landmark trade deals get done—and get done right.

First, the bill updates TPA by addressing 21st century issues. What are these issues? Nonscientific barriers to U.S. agricultural products, unfair competition from state-owned enterprises, arbitrary localization barriers which require U.S. companies to turn over their intellectual property or locate facilities in a foreign country in order to access foreign markets, and unnecessary restrictions on digital trade and data which flows across borders.

Mr. BAUCUS. That is right. Our bill also addresses critical issues such as labor, environment, and innovation and for the first time currency manipulation. Our bill addresses it.

Senator HATCH and I worked with our good friend from the other body, the Ways and Means Committee Chairman DAVE CAMP, to carefully craft these negotiating objectives and ensure that Congress is a full partner in trade negotiations.

Our bill helps lay out in clear terms what Congress's priorities are for trade. It is our opportunity to tell the administration and our partners overseas what we must see in an agreement if it is going to be approved by Congress.

It boosts congressional oversight, increases transparency in trade negotiations, and it gives every Member of Congress the right to a strong voice in the process.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I want to praise the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee over in the House. He has worked long and hard on these issues and is not only a great partner to the two of us but to every Senator.

What the Senator from Montana just said is absolutely right. Our bill empowers Congress, but it also empowers our negotiators. Its approval will help them conclude high-standard agreements that will open new markets for U.S. exports, ultimately bringing jobs and economic growth to the United States.

Lastly, before I turn back to the chairman, I just want to say again how critical this legislation is for our Nation and to commend my friend from Montana, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, for working to make Trade Promotion Authority a reality. He has always been a tremendous leader on international trade, and I am glad to stand by his side to ensure that the Finance Committee and the Senate considers this job-creating legislation in a fair, thorough, and expeditious manner.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I thank very much my good friend from Utah. As President Kennedy said 52 years ago, this is about working with our trade partners to build strength together. It is about maintaining U.S. preeminence. That is why TPA is so important—because it makes our job-creating trade agenda work, and it helps to secure our future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am happy to be on the floor to hear the news from Senator HATCH and Senator BAUCUS that they have reached an agreement on trade promotion authority. I wish to congratulate them on that, working with Chairman CAMP on the House side.

This is incredibly important. These two Senators have worked closely together, as Republican and Democrat, over the last few months with the administration to put in place the opportunity for American workers, American farmers, and American service providers to be able to sell their goods and their services on a level playing field by opening more markets for U.S. products. I congratulate them. It is sad to me that for the past 5 or 6 years we haven't had trade promotion authority, and without their strong efforts we still wouldn't have it today.

It has been noted that this administration, the Obama administration, is the first one since FDR not to have asked for even the ability to open these markets through what is called trade promotion authority and its predecessors until last March. So until last spring they hadn't even asked for it. They did ask for it, and thanks to the hard work of these two Senators and Congressman CAMP, we are now going to have that opportunity. This gives our workers, our farmers, and our service providers the ability to access these markets Senator BAUCUS and Senator HATCH spoke about.

It is critical to economic growth. If we look at the growth in the last two or three recoveries, much of it was because of expanding exports. We all believe the current level of economic growth is disappointing. It is anemic growth. We are looking at long-term unemployment being at historic levels, as we have spoken about on the floor all week. One solution, clearly, is for the United States to do more exporting, and we can't do that without trade promotion authority.

I speak as a former U.S. Trade Representative who had the honor of traveling the world representing our great country. I will tell my colleagues, when we got down to the negotiating across the table with another country in terms of how to knock down both tariff and nontariff barriers to trade, if they didn't know there was an ability with an up-or-down vote to get that trade agreement done in the U.S. Congress with something like trade promotion authority, they would not have put their last and best offer on the table. That is a reality.

Our system is different from most systems in countries around the world. We have to have trade promotion authority—that has been our experience—in order to get these trade agreements done to help knock down barriers to the people in the United States who make the best products in the world, who provide the best services in the world and are just looking for a fair shake and a level playing field.

So these two Senators, by doing this today, have opened up the possibility now for us to have trade agreements that give us the opportunity to grow our economy and create, as they both said, good-paying jobs and good benefits, and I congratulate them for that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will my colleague from Ohio yield?

Mr. PORTMAN. I am happy to yield to my colleague and ranking member from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator because he served as the US Trade Representative. He traveled all over the world. He understands how important these issues are. He understands that without TPA, we wouldn't be able to get these particular trade agreements done. He understands how hard we have worked to try to come up with language we could all accept in spite of some of the proclivities of this administration.

He worked diligently with both sides of the aisle on these issues as the U.S. Trade Representative and continues to as a member of the Senate Finance Committee. I am so grateful we have him on the Senate Finance Committee, with all of his knowledge and his experience, to be able to help us on these particular issues.

I was a little nonplussed last week when one of the leading trade union presidents in this country got on television and was decrying international trade. I made the point a little bit earlier that it means tremendous numbers of jobs, high-paying jobs, growth in our economy. It is hard for me to understand why anybody in the union movement would be against these free-trade policies. They basically allow us to export our goods while, yes, we import others, but that is what free trade is all about.

I wish to personally express my very high opinion of the distinguished Senator from Ohio because I can tell my colleagues that we are so lucky to have him in the Senate with all of his experience in this particular area but in

many other areas as well. He was at OMB as well. There are very few Senators in this body who can claim they have experience equivalent to that of our distinguished friend from Ohio. I personally express my admiration and my resolve to help him help those on the other side of the aisle understand how important his words are here today, how important it is to have free trade, and how important it is to have trade promotion authority so we can have free trade.

Every President since FDR—including him—has been for trade promotion authority—every President.

There is a fear around here amongst some of the Democrats that the unions are going to turn against them. My gosh, the Unions are going to be main beneficiaries of major trade legislation. It is hard for me to comprehend how they can even make a semi-argument against this matter. Hopefully, they will realize this is in their interests, too, because it puts us in the real world, getting real jobs that have higher pay than we wouldn't otherwise get if we didn't have these free-trade agreements and if we aren't able to get TPA passed. I suspect we will get this passed in large measure. I think, with the distinguished chairman of the committee, my friend who has just spoken, will be one of the main reasons why we do.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. PORTMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to ask my good friend from Ohio if he could expand on what I think is a very important point, and it is namely this: With the world becoming more competitive and with globalization, it is evermore important for the United States of America to strive ahead and to keep working to develop good products, good high-technology products, and to compete in the world. I believe, frankly, when we are treading water, we are sinking. We have to keep moving ahead if we are going to make products and boost incomes and help the American people.

That leads me to another point. If the Senator could tell us a little more and explain to, frankly, some people who may not realize this, what is involved in TPP. What is TPP? Of course, we need trade promotion authority in order to get TPP.

Isn't it important, isn't it critical, isn't it crucial that the United States include a strong Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement not only for economic reasons but also for geopolitical reasons to show to the world, to show to Asian countries that are wondering where the United States is—is the United States going to show up? Is the United States going to maintain its presence in Asia? What will happen if we don't pass trade promotion authority? How will that affect the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations, and what effect will that have on other countries in Asia and their perception of the United States?

My understanding is—and we know this better than anybody—that unfortunately President Obama was unable to travel to Southeast Asia to attend the ASEAN conference, and many people around the world are wondering whether the United States is going to show up anymore in Asia.

If the Senator could address how important is it that we engage countries in the Pacific as we negotiate a Trans-Pacific Partnership, including the economic reasons, but also if he could address the geopolitical issue, the degree to which it is important for the United States to negotiate a successful agreement and to be there, to show up.

Mr. PORTMAN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the question from my colleague from Montana. I will say just based on his question that we are going to miss his wisdom and his experience on the trade issue. He takes some political risks sometimes, I know, as he did in coming up with an agreement on trade promotion authority, because there are many on both sides of the aisle—especially his side of the aisle—who take a different view of this issue. He has been willing to help to educate them as to why this is in the interests of Montana farmers and ranchers and workers.

Senator HATCH spoke earlier about the impact of trade on the people he represents.

My colleague is absolutely right. The trade promotion authority enables us to take that step toward things such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, called TPP—a lot of alphabet soup here with TPA to TPP. That is important, as the Senator just said, because this is the fastest growing region of the world—these are the Pacific countries, countries in South American but also in Asia; it is where the majority of the global GDP is now; and it is an area where, frankly, because of China's strong interest in trade, other countries in the region are looking to the United States to provide not only a market but also to help them with regard to their own markets; therefore, more U.S. exports, more of that, as my colleague said. The best technology in the world is in the United States, the best products in the world that are made here—to be able to export to those countries. So they want to have this relationship with us.

As a future Ambassador to China, I will stipulate that I think the Senator from Montana understands this issue very well. But what this Trans-Pacific Partnership does is two things.

No. 1, it expands trade in an area of the world that again is the fastest growing part of our globe and a place where the tariffs and nontariff barriers are higher, relatively speaking, than they are here. In other words, by lowering barriers we get a relative advantage.

This agreement also, I hope, will deal with the currency issue, as my colleagues have negotiated in this trade promotion authority, which I support. This is pioneering work they have done in this area. We have to ensure that currency levels are appropriate, that there are not unfair trade advantages being given by countries that depreciate their currency by interfering in it.

So I believe it is about trade, and that is very important for our workers and our farmers and our service providers, but, second, it does have this geopolitical element where those countries in the Asia Pacific area are allies of ours and are looking to us to develop a stronger relationship on the commercial side but also on the intergovernmental side to be able to ensure that the U.S. role continues in that area.

I think this TPA that these Senators have negotiated today that they are announcing is incredibly important because it is the first step toward the Trans-Pacific Partnership and other agreements we can complete, as we just have recently under the old TPA, with South Korea, with Panama, with Colombia—countries where we are seeing expansion of exports as well as a stronger relationship with key countries in the region.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, if I might ask one more question very briefly, and that is this. One more opportunity here with trade promotion authority—with trade promotion authority, clearly we are going to get a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, and without trade promotion authority, we won't. Other countries will go their ways in the Pacific and wonder, where is the United States?

There is another issue in addition to that. I wonder whether my good friend would agree with this. Not only does trade promotion authority enable our country to negotiate trade agreements with the Pacific—TPP—but isn't it also true that it allows the United States, with the passage of the TPA, to negotiate with European countries? And doesn't that mean that between Asia TPP and TTIP with the European countries, that it is about 70 percent of world trade and is an opportunity for the United States to lead in the harmonization of trade provisions and regulatory provisions not only in Asia and in the Pacific but also in Europe? It is an opportunity to lead? And if we don't pass TPA, is the United States squandering a huge opportunity to lead here in a way that would raise productivity and raise incomes not just in our country but in other countries of the world?

Mr. PORTMAN. Reclaiming my time, the Senator is absolutely right. The alternative is not to pass a trade promotion authority and to have continue to happen what has frankly been going on over the last 6 or 7 years, which is these other countries around the world are actively negotiating agreements, as the Senator from Montana says, using their own standards but also opening markets for their workers, their farmers, and their service providers, and cutting us out of market share.

So what has happened is the European Union, the Chinese, the Canadians, and others have been actively pursuing agreements while we have been on the sidelines because we have not had trade promotion authority. So not only does this give us an opportunity, with this possible agreement with the European Union—which would be an agreement not like a free trade agreement but would be a partnership on investment, on standards, on being sure there is a harmonization that is more like the beneficial metrics that we use in this country that can help both in our economy and, as the Senator says, globally—none of this can happen without us being able to say we are going to have the possibility of taking trade agreements to the Congress for an up-or-down vote—a fair vote. Every one of these agreements will have to be voted on separately because in these other countries they will not put that last, best offer on the table until they know that. They are not going to be nickeled and dimed and amended to death as they get to the Congress. That is just reality.

We have to get off the sidelines. We have to get reengaged. We have to help our economy, our workers to get their fair share, to get their market share. Right now we are losing that market share, as literally over 100 trade agreements have been negotiated while we have been sitting on the sidelines without having trade promotion authority on both bilateral and regional agreements.

So the Senator is absolutely correct. This is a great opportunity for us to, frankly, take this anemic economy and give it a little shot in the arm. It is part of an overall effort we ought to be doing to provide the kind of economic opportunity we all want for the people we represent.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think we should all be listening to this man, this Senator from Ohio, who has had a wealth of experience not just in budget matters but also especially in these trade matters.

There are 11 countries in the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and we would like to come to an agreement on it. There are 28 different countries in the European agreement on TTIP that we would like to bring to fruition, and you can go on from there.

Having said that, I cannot compliment my friend from Ohio enough. But I also want to pay tribute to our chairman of the committee. He is willing to do this. He believes in it. He has had plenty of witness that this is the way to do good trade, and he is willing to stand up and see that it is done. I cannot think of a better sendoff to China as the new Ambassador—as soon as we finally finish these confirmation proceedings—than having passed TPA, which enables us to do free trade agreements all over the world and enables our fellow countries to realize that we can get it done.

I want to pay tribute to the chairman, as well as my colleague from Ohio, for their work in this area, and to say that this country will be much the better once we pass TPA and then get these trade agreements done so the United States resumes its role in the world as the world's chief economic competitor, and doing it in a way that would benefit the whole world but, more importantly, benefit this country.

So I want to thank my colleague from Montana, and my colleague from Ohio as well. My colleague from Montana is going to be here at least a little bit longer, and hopefully we can get this passed in his honor. I think he deserves that honor. I know the distinguished Senator from Ohio and myself will do everything in our power to assist in this matter.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2627. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2628. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2629. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2630. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2631. Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1845, supra.

SA 2632. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra.

SA 2633. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1845, supra.

SA 2634. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2633 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1845, supra.

SA 2635. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2634 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2633 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1845, supra.

SA 2636. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2637. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2638. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID, of NV to the resolution S. Res. 312, urging the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in this case of Robert Levinson, one of the longest held Unites States civilians in our Nation's history.

SA 2639. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID, of NV to the resolution S. Res. 312, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2627. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.

(a) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS.—Paragraph (2)(E) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''by 120'' and inserting ''by 174''.

(b) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—Paragraph (4)(A) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''30 hours'' and inserting ''40 hours''.

SA 2628. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE II—WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. STEERING FEDERAL TRAINING DOLLARS TOWARD SKILLS NEEDED BY INDUSTRY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(54) CREDENTIAL.—

''(A) INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED.—The term 'industry-recognized', used with respect to a credential, means a credential that is sought or accepted by employers within the industry sector involved as recognized, preferred, or required for recruitment, screening, hiring, or advancement. If a credential is not yet available for a certain skill that is so sought or accepted, completion of an industry-recognized training program shall be considered to be an industry-recognized credential, for the purposes of this paragraph.

''(B) NATIONALLY PORTABLE.—The term 'nationally portable,' used with respect to credential, means a credential that is sought or accepted as described in subparagraph (A) across multiple States.

''(C) REGIONALLY RELEVANT.—The term 'regionally relevant,' used with respect to a credential, means a credential that is determined by the Governor and the head of the State workforce agency to be sought or accepted as described in subparagraph (A) in that State and neighboring States.

''(55) STATE WORKFORCE AGENCY.—The term 'State workforce agency' means the lead State agency with responsibility for workforce investment activities carried out under subtitle B.''.

(b) YOUTH ACTIVITIES.—Section 129(c)(1)(C) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2854(c)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (iv) as clauses (iii) through (v), respectively; and

(2) inserting after clause (i) the following:

''(ii) training, with priority consideration given, after consultation with the Governor and the head of the State workforce agency and beginning not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act,

to programs that lead to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential, if the local board determines that such programs are available and appropriate;''.

(c) GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Section 134(d)(4)(F) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)(F)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) PRIORITY FOR PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE AN INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED, NATIONALLY PORTABLE, AND REGIONALLY RELEVANT CREDENTIAL.—In selecting and approving programs of training services under this section, a one-stop operator and employees of a one-stop center referred to in subsection (c) shall, after consultation with the Governor and the head of the State workforce agency and beginning not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, give priority consideration to programs (approved by the appropriate State agency and local board in conjunction with section 122) that lead to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential.

''(v) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (iv) or section 129(c)(1)(C) shall be construed to require an entity with responsibility for selecting or approving a workforce investment activities program to select a program that leads to a credential specified in clause (iv).''.

(d) STATE ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Section 122(b)(2)(D) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2842(b)(2)(D)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) in the case of a provider of a program of training services that leads to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential, that the program leading to the credential meets such quality criteria (which may be accreditation by a State-recognized, third party accrediting agency) as the Governor (in consultation with representatives of the relevant industry sectors and labor groups) shall establish not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act.''.

(2) YOUTH ACTIVITIES.—Section 123 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2843) is amended by inserting ''(including such quality criteria (which may be accreditation by a State-recognized, third party accrediting agency) as the Governor (in consultation with representatives of the relevant industry sectors and labor groups) shall establish not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act for a training program that leads to an industry-recognized, nationally portable, and regionally relevant credential)'' after ''plan''.

(e) REPORT ON INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIALS.—Section 122 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2842) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) REPORT ON INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIALS.—

''(1) DATA COLLECTION.—Each State shall submit to the Secretary data on programs determined, under section 129(c)(1)(C) or 134(d)(4)(F)(iv), to lead to industry-recognized and regionally relevant credentials, and on the need of that State for such credentials.

''(2) REPORT.—Based on data provided by the States under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall annually compile the data and prepare a report identifying industry-recognized credentials that are regionally relevant or nationally portable. The report shall include information on the needs of each State and of the Nation for such credentials.

''(3) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the report available and easily searchable on a website.

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as an official endorsement of a credential by the Department of Labor.''.

SEC. 202. ESTABLISHING INCENTIVES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) PROGRAM.—Subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 is amended by inserting after section 112 (29 U.S.C. 2822) the following:

''SEC. 112A. PAY FOR PERFORMANCE PILOT PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish a Pay for Performance pilot program. The Secretary shall select not fewer than 5 States, including at least 1 rural State and at least 1 non-rural State, to participate in the pilot program by carrying out a Pay for Performance State program.

''(2) VOLUNTARY NATURE OF PROGRAM.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to require a State to participate in the pilot program without the State's consent.

''(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'rural State' means a State that has a population density of 52 or fewer persons per square mile, or a State in which the largest county has fewer than 150,000 people, as determined on the basis of the most recent decennial census of population conducted pursuant to section 141 of title 13, United States Code.

''(b) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—To be eligible to participate in the pilot program, a State shall submit to the Secretary and obtain approval of a Pay for Performance plan described in section 112(e) as a supplement to the State plan described in section 112. The State shall submit the supplement in accordance with such process as the Secretary may specify after consultation with States.

''(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In a State that carries out a Pay for Performance State program, the State shall reserve and the local areas shall use the amount described in paragraph (2) to provide a portion of the training services authorized under section 134(d)(4) (referred to in this section as 'training services') under the State's Pay for Performance plan, in addition to the other requirements of this Act.

''(2) AMOUNT.—The amount reserved under paragraph (1) shall be—

''(A) a portion of not more than 25 percent, as determined by the State, of the funds available to be allocated under section 133(b) within the State, and estimated by the State to be available for training services, for the fiscal year involved; and

''(B) a portion of not more than 17.5 percent, as determined by the State, of the grant funds awarded under section 211(b) for the State (which portion shall be taken from the funds described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 222(a)) for the fiscal year involved.

''(d) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide, by grant or contract, training and technical assistance to States, and local areas in States, carrying out a Pay for Performance State program.

''(e) STATE REPORTS.—Each State carrying out a Pay for Performance State program shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report regarding the performance of the State on the outcome measures described in section 112(e)(2)(C).

''(f) EVALUATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the conclusion of the transition period described in section 112(e)(2)(H), the Secretary shall enter into an arrangement for an entity to carry out an independent evaluation of Pay for Performance State programs carried out under this subtitle.

''(2) CONTENTS.—For each Pay for Performance State program, the entity shall evaluate the program design and performance on the outcome measures, evaluate (wherever possible) the level of satisfaction with the program among employers and employees benefiting from the program, and estimate public returns on investment, including such returns as reduced dependence on public assistance, reduced unemployment, and increased tax revenue paid by participants exiting the program for employment.

''(3) REPORT.—The entity shall prepare a report containing the results of the evaluation, and submit the report to the Secretary, not later than 18 months after the conclusion of the transition period.

''(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 months after the submission of the report described in subsection (f)(3), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the evaluations described in subsection (f) and recommendations. The recommendation shall include the Secretary's opinions concerning whether the pilot program should be continued and whether the pay for performance model should be expanded within this Act, and related considerations.

''(h) PERFORMANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), section 136 of this Act shall not apply to a State, or a local area in a State, with respect to activities carried out through a Pay for Performance State program.

''(2) FISCAL AND MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—Section 136(f)(1) shall apply with respect to reporting and monitoring of the use of funds under this section for activities described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) PAY FOR PERFORMANCE PLAN.—Section 112 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2822) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PAY FOR PERFORMANCE PLANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For a State seeking to carry out a Pay for Performance State program (referred to in this subsection as a 'State program') under the pilot program described in section 112A, the State plan shall include a plan supplement, consisting of a Pay for Performance plan developed by the State and local areas in the State.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The Pay for Performance plan shall, with respect to the State program—

''(A) provide for technical support to local areas and providers in order to carry out a pay for performance model, which shall at a minimum provide assistance with data collection and data entry requirements;

''(B) specify target populations who are eligible to receive training services authorized under section 134(d)(4) (referred to in this subsection as 'training services') through the State program, with appropriate consideration of and participation targets for special participant populations that face multiple barriers to employment, as defined in section 134(d)(4)(G)(iv);

''(C) specify employment placement, employment retention, and earnings outcome measures and timetables for each target population;

''(D) provide for curricula in terms of competencies required for education and career advancement that are, where feasible, tied to industry-recognized credentials and related standards (where the quality of the program leading to the credential or standard is recognized by the State or local area involved), or State licensing requirements;

''(E) describe how the State or local areas will provide information to participants in the State program about appropriate support services, where feasible, including career assessment and counseling, case management, child care, transportation, financial aid, and job placement services;

''(F) specify a fixed amount that, except as provided in subparagraph (H), local areas in the State will pay to providers of training services in the State program, for each eligible participant who achieves the applicable outcome measures or is an excepted participant described in subparagraph (G)(i), according to the timetables described in subparagraph (C), which amount—

''(i) shall represent 115 percent of the historical cost of providing training services to a participant under this subtitle, as established by the State or local area involved; and

''(ii) may vary by target population;

''(G) provide assurances that—

''(i) no funds reserved for the State program will be paid to a provider for a participant who does not achieve the outcome measures according to the timetables, except for a participant who does not achieve the outcome measures through no fault of the provider, as determined by the Governor in consultation with the head of the State board, relevant local boards, and at least 1 representative of the State's providers of training services; and

''(ii) each local area in the State will reallocate funds not paid to a provider, because the achievement described in clause (i) did not occur, for further activities under the State program in the local area; and

''(H) specify a transition period of not more than 1 year during which the reserved funds may be paid to providers of training services based on the previous year's performance on the core indicators of performance described in 136(b)(2)(A)(i), in order to enable the providers to begin to provide services under the State program and adjust to a pay for performance model, including adjusting by—

''(i) developing partnerships with local employers; and

''(ii) seeking financial support and volunteer services from private sector sources.

''(3) APPROVAL.—In determining whether to approve the plan supplement, the Secretary shall consider the quality of the data system the State will use to track performance on outcome measures in carrying out a Pay for Performance plan.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 211(b)(2) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9211(b)(2)) is amended by inserting ''or training services in accordance with section 112A(c)'' before the period at the end.

(2) FUNDING.—Section 223(a) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9223(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (12), and moving that paragraph to the end of that section 223(a); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) Providing training services in accordance with section 112A(c).''.

SA 2629. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.

Section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(E), by striking ''by 120'' and inserting ''by 174''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(A) by striking ''30 hours'' and inserting ''40 hours''.

SA 2630. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. _____. REDUCTION IN SHARE OF CROP INSURANCE PREMIUM PAID BY FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 508(e)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''67'' and inserting ''55'';

(2) in subparagraph (E)(i), by striking ''55'' and inserting ''24'';

(3) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking ''48'' and inserting ''17'';

(4) in subparagraph (G)(i), by striking ''38'' and inserting ''13'';

(5) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (G) as subparagraphs (G) through (K), respectively; and

(6) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 55 percent, but less than 60 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 46 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.

''(D) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 60 percent, but less than 65 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 38 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.

''(E) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 65 percent, but less than 70 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 42 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.

''(F) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 70 percent, but less than 75 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 32 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.''.

(b) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this section, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SA 2631. Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike sections 2 through 6 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 4007(a)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''November 16, 2014''.

(b) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO WEEKS OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN FIRST TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by inserting '', AND WEEKS ENDING BEFORE DECEMBER 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', and before December 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ESTABLISHED IN AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), in the case of any account established as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '80 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '20 times'.''.

(2) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN SECOND TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ADDED TO AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), if augmentation under this subsection occurs as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '54 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '14 times'.''.

(c) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act;''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 3. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXTENDED BENEFIT PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(1) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''November 15, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''May 15, 2015''.

(b) EXTENSION OF MATCHING FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.—Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''May 15, 2015''.

(c) EXTENSION OF MODIFICATION OF INDICATORS UNDER THE EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAM.—Section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''November 15, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''November 15, 2014''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND REEMPLOYMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4004(c)(2)(A) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''through fiscal year 2014'' and inserting ''through August 15 of fiscal year 2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2(c)(2)(D)(iii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(iii)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''June 30, 2013'' and inserting ''May 15, 2014''; and

(2) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''November 15, 2014''.

(b) CLARIFICATION ON AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under either the first or second sentence of clause (iv) of section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act shall be available to cover the cost of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) as well as to cover the cost of such benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATION.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Railroad Retirement Board $250,000 for administrative expenses associated with the payment of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a), to remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. FLEXIBILITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENTS.

(a) FLEXIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall not apply with respect to a State that has enacted a law before December 1, 2013, that, upon taking effect, would violate such subsection.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) is effective with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2013.

(b) PERMITTING A SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENT.—Nothing in title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall preclude a State whose agreement under such title was terminated from entering into a subsequent agreement under such title on or after the date of the enactment of this Act if the State, taking into account the application of subsection (a), would otherwise meet the requirements for an agreement under such title.

SEC. 7. REDUCTION IN BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 224 the following new section:

''REDUCTION IN BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

''SEC. 224A (a)(1) If for any month prior to the month in which an individual attains retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))—

''(A) such individual is entitled to benefits under section 223, and

''(B) such individual is entitled for such month to unemployment compensation,

the total of the individual's benefits under section 223 for such month and of any benefits under section 202 for such month based on the individual's wages and self-employment income shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the total amount of unemployment compensation received by such individual for such month.

''(2) The reduction of benefits under paragraph (1) shall apply to any past-due benefits under section 223 for any month in which the individual was entitled to—

''(A) benefits under such section, and

''(B) unemployment compensation.

''(b) If any unemployment compensation is payable to an individual on other than a monthly basis (including a benefit payable as a lump sum to the extent that it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, such periodic compensation), the reduction under this section shall be made at such time or times and in such amounts as the Commissioner of Social Security (referred to in this section as the 'Commissioner') determines will approximate as nearly as practicable the reduction prescribed by subsection (a).

''(c) Reduction of benefits under this section shall be made after any applicable reductions under section 203(a) and section 224, but before any other applicable deductions under section 203.

''(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), if the Commissioner determines that an individual may be eligible for unemployment compensation which would give rise to a reduction of benefits under this section, the Commissioner may require, as a condition of certification for payment of any benefits under section 223 to any individual for any month and of any benefits under section 202 for such month based on such individual's wages and self-employment income, that such individual certify—

''(A) whether the individual has filed or intends to file any claim for unemployment compensation, and

''(B) if the individual has filed a claim, whether there has been a decision on such claim.

''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the Commissioner may, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, rely upon a certification by the individual that the individual has not filed and does not intend to file such a claim, or that the individual has so filed and no final decision thereon has been made, in certifying benefits for payment pursuant to section 205(i).

''(e) Whenever a reduction in total benefits based on an individual's wages and self-employment income is made under this section for any month, each benefit, except the disability insurance benefit, shall first be proportionately decreased, and any excess of such reduction over the sum of all such benefits other than the disability insurance benefit shall then be applied to such disability insurance benefit.

''(f)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of any Federal agency shall provide such information within its possession as the Commissioner may require for purposes of making a timely determination of the amount of the reduction, if any, required by this section in benefits payable under this title, or verifying other information necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section.

''(2) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with States, political subdivisions, and other organizations that administer unemployment compensation, in order to obtain such information as the Commissioner may require to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(g) For purposes of this section, the term 'unemployment compensation' has the meaning given that term in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the total amount of unemployment compensation to which an individual is entitled shall be determined prior to any applicable reduction under State law based on the receipt of benefits under section 202 or 223.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 224(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 424a(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the age of 65'' and inserting ''retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to benefits payable for months beginning on or after the date that is 12 months after the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 8. EXTENSION OF DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

Section 251A(6)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(B)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''for fiscal year 2022 and for fiscal year 2023'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2022, 2023, and 2024''.

SEC. 9. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered

on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SA 2632. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 2633. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 2634. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2633 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

SA 2635. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2634 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2633 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4 days'' and insert ''5 days''.

SA 2636. Mr. PRYOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 7. REQUIREMENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC SERVICE AS A CONDITION FOR RECEIPT OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to approval of State unemployment compensation laws) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (18), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (19) as paragraph (20); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (18) the following new paragraph:

''(19) extended compensation, including any such compensation under a temporary program, shall not be payable to an individual for any week in which such individual does not perform at least 10 hours of public service (as described in subsection (g)); and''; and

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

''(g) PUBLIC SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(19), the term 'public service' means unpaid service by an individual to a Federal, State, or local agency (as permitted in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local law), with tangible evidence to be provided to the State agency by the individual on a weekly basis demonstrating that the individual has performed such service during the previous week.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—For purposes of the public service requirement under subsection (a)(19), an individual shall be deemed to have satisfied such requirement for that week if the individual—

''(A) provides tangible evidence to the State agency demonstrating that such individual was unable to perform the required public service for that week due to an illness or family emergency;

''(B) is a parent of a qualifying child (as defined in section 152(c)) and provides tangible evidence to the State agency demonstrating an inability to perform the required number of hours of public service due to responsibility for child care; or

''(C) provides tangible evidence of a bona fide attempt to perform public service and, pursuant to such criteria as is determined appropriate by the State agency, is determined to be unable to perform such service due to a lack of available public service opportunities in the area in which the individual resides.

''(3) PERFORMANCE OF WORK ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The total number of hours of public service required under subsection (a)(19) shall be reduced by 1 hour for each hour during that week that an individual performs work activities.

''(B) DEFINITION OF WORK ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'work activities' has the same meaning as provided under subsection (d) of section 407 of the Social Security Act, except that such activities shall not include job searching, as described in paragraph (6) of such subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—In the case of a State which the Secretary of Labor determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the State law to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by subsection (a), the State law shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of section 3304(a)(19) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by such amendments, solely on the basis of the failure of the State law to meet such additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the close of the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SA 2637. Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

TITLE II—SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE AND INVESTING IN LIFELONG SKILLS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act'' or the ''SKILLS Act''.

SEC. 202. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.).

SEC. 203. APPLICATION TO FISCAL YEARS.

Except as otherwise provided, this title and the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2015 and succeeding fiscal years.

Subtitle A—Amendment to the Workforce Investment Act of 1998

CHAPTER 1—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT DEFINITIONS

SEC. 206. DEFINITIONS.

Section 101 (29 U.S.C. 2801) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.—The term 'adult education and family literacy education activities' has the meaning given the term in section 203.'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (13) and (24);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (12) as paragraphs (3) through (14), and paragraphs (14) through (23) as paragraphs (15) through (24), respectively;

(4) by striking paragraphs (52) and (53);

(5) by inserting after ''In this title:'' the following new paragraphs:

''(1) ACCRUED EXPENDITURES.—The term 'accrued expenditures' means—

''(A) charges incurred by recipients of funds under this title for a given period requiring the provision of funds for goods or other tangible property received;

''(B) charges incurred for services performed by employees, contractors, subgrantees, subcontractors, and other payees; and

''(C) other amounts becoming owed, under programs assisted under this title, for which no current services or performance is required, such as amounts for annuities, insurance claims, and other benefit payments.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The term 'administrative costs' means expenditures incurred by State boards and local boards, direct recipients (including State grant recipients under subtitle B and recipients of awards under subtitles C and D), local grant recipients, local fiscal agents or local grant subrecipients, and one-stop operators in the performance of administrative functions and in carrying out activities under this title that are not related to the direct provision of workforce investment activities (including services to participants and employers). Such costs include both personnel and nonpersonnel expenditures and both direct and indirect expenditures.'';

(6) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking ''Except in sections 127 and 132, the'' and inserting ''The'';

(7) by amending paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

''(5) AREA CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.—The term 'area career and technical education school' has the meaning given the term in section 3(3) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(3)).'';

(8) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''(or such other level as the Governor may establish)'' after ''8th grade level'';

(9) in paragraph (10)(C) (as so redesignated), by striking ''not less than 50 percent of the cost of the training'' and inserting ''a significant portion of the cost of training, as determined by the local board involved (or, in the case of an employer in multiple local areas in the State, as determined by the Governor), taking into account the size of the employer and such other factors as the

local board or Governor, respectively, determines to be appropriate'';

(10) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), by striking ''section 134(c)'' and inserting ''section 121(e)'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii)—

(i) by striking ''134(d)(4)'' and inserting ''134(c)(4)''; and

(ii) by striking ''intensive services described in section 134(d)(3)'' and inserting ''work ready services described in section 134(c)(2)'';

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(E)(i) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty for a period of more than 30 days (as defined in section 101(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code) who has experienced a loss of employment as a direct result of relocation to accommodate a permanent change in duty station of such member; or

''(ii) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty (as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code) who meets the criteria described in paragraph (12)(B).'';

(11) in paragraph (12)(A) (as redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon and inserting ''or'';

(B) by striking ''(A)'' and inserting ''(A)(i)''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty for a period of more than 30 days (as defined in section 101(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code) whose family income is significantly reduced because of a deployment (as defined in section 991(b) of title 10, United States Code, or pursuant to paragraph (4) of such section), a call or order to active duty pursuant to a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code, a permanent change of station, or the service-connected (as defined in section 101(16) of title 38, United States Code) death or disability of the member; and'';

(12) in paragraph (13) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''or regional'' after ''local'' each place it appears;

(13) in paragraph (14) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 122(e)(3)'' and inserting ''section 122'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (B), and inserting the following:

''(B) work ready services, means a provider who is identified or awarded a contract as described in section 117(d)(5)(C); or'';

(C) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(14) in paragraph (15) (as so redesignated), by striking ''adult or dislocated worker'' and inserting ''individual'';

(15) in paragraph (20), by striking ''The'' and inserting ''Subject to section 116(a)(1)(E), the'';

(16) in paragraph (25)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''higher of—'' and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting ''poverty line for an equivalent period;'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) receives or is eligible to receive a free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.);'';

(17) in paragraph (32), by striking ''the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia,'';

(18) by amending paragraph (33) to read as follows:

''(33) OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.—The term 'out-of-school youth' means—

''(A) an at-risk youth who is a school dropout; or

''(B) an at-risk youth who has received a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent but is basic skills deficient, unemployed, or underemployed.'';

(19) in paragraph (38), by striking ''134(a)(1)(A)'' and inserting ''134(a)(1)(B)'';

(20) in paragraph (41), by striking '', and the term means such Secretary for purposes of section 503'';

(21) in paragraph (43), by striking ''clause (iii) or (v) of section 136(b)(3)(A)'' and inserting ''section 136(b)(3)(A)(iii)'';

(22) by amending paragraph (49) to read as follows:

''(49) VETERAN.—The term 'veteran' has the same meaning given the term in section 2108(1) of title 5, United States Code.'';

(23) by amending paragraph (50) to read as follows:

''(50) CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.—The term 'career and technical education' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302).'';

(24) in paragraph (51), by striking '', and a youth activity''; and

(25) by adding at the end the following:

''(52) AT-RISK YOUTH.—Except as provided in subtitle C, the term 'at-risk youth' means an individual who—

''(A) is not less than age 16 and not more than age 24;

''(B) is a low-income individual; and

''(C) is an individual who is one or more of the following:

''(i) A secondary school dropout.

''(ii) A youth in foster care (including youth aging out of foster care).

''(iii) A youth offender.

''(iv) A youth who is an individual with a disability.

''(v) A migrant youth.

''(53) INDUSTRY OR SECTOR PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'industry or sector partnership' means a partnership of—

''(A) a State board or local board; and

''(B) one or more industry or sector organizations, and other entities, that have the capability to help the State board or local board determine the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries or sectors and other occupations important to the State or local economy, respectively.

''(54) INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIAL.—The term 'industry-recognized credential' means a credential that is sought or accepted by companies within the industry sector involved, across multiple States, as recognized, preferred, or required for recruitment, screening, or hiring and is awarded for completion of a program listed or identified under subsection (d) or (i) of section 122, for the local area involved.

''(55) PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE CONTRACT STRATEGY.—The term 'pay-for-performance contract strategy' means a strategy in which a pay-for-performance contract to provide a program of employment and training activities incorporates provisions regarding—

''(A) the core indicators of performance described in subclauses (I) through (IV) and (VI) of section 136(b)(2)(A)(i);

''(B) a fixed amount that will be paid to an eligible provider of such employment and training activities for each program participant who, within a defined timetable, achieves the agreed-to levels of performance based upon the core indicators of performance described in subparagraph (A), and may include a bonus payment to such provider, which may be used to expand the capacity of such provider;

''(C) the ability for an eligible provider to recoup the costs of providing the activities for a program participant who has not achieved those levels, but for whom the provider is able to demonstrate that such participant gained specific competencies required for education and career advancement that are, where feasible, tied to industry-recognized credentials and related standards, or State licensing requirements; and

''(D) the ability for an eligible provider that does not meet the requirements under section 122(a)(2) to participate in such pay-for-performance contract and to not be required to report on the performance and cost information required under section 122(d).

''(56) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.—The term 'recognized postsecondary credential' means a credential awarded by a provider of training services or postsecondary educational institution based on completion of all requirements for a program of study, including coursework or tests or other performance evaluations. The term means an industry-recognized credential, a certificate of completion of a registered apprenticeship program, or an associate or baccalaureate degree from an institution described in section 122(a)(2)(A)(i).

''(57) REGISTERED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM.—The term 'registered apprenticeship program' means a program described in section 122(a)(2)(B).''.

CHAPTER 2—STATEWIDE AND LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEMS

SEC. 211. PURPOSE.

Section 106 (29 U.S.C. 2811) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''It is also the purpose of this subtitle to provide workforce investment activities in a manner that enhances employer engagement, promotes customer choices in the selection of training services, and ensures accountability in the use of taxpayer funds.''.

SEC. 212. STATE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS.

Section 111 (29 U.S.C. 2821) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by amending clause (i)(I), by striking ''section 117(b)(2)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''section 117(b)(2)(A)'';

(II) by amending clause (i)(II) to read as follows:

''(II) represent businesses, including large and small businesses, each of which has immediate and long-term employment opportunities in an in-demand industry or other occupation important to the State economy; and'';

(III) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) a State agency official responsible for economic development; and'';

(IV) by striking clauses (iv) through (vi);

(V) by amending clause (vii) to read as follows:

''(vii) such other representatives and State agency officials as the Governor may designate, including—

''(I) members of the State legislature;

''(II) representatives of individuals and organizations that have experience with respect to youth activities;

''(III) representatives of individuals and organizations that have experience and expertise in the delivery of workforce investment activities, including chief executive officers

of community colleges and community-based organizations within the State;

''(IV) representatives of the lead State agency officials with responsibility for the programs and activities that are described in section 121(b) and carried out by one-stop partners; or

''(V) representatives of veterans service organizations.''; and

(VI) by redesignating clause (vii) (as so amended) as clause (iv); and

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) MAJORITY.—A ⅔ majority of the members of the board shall be representatives described in paragraph (1)(B)(i).'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''(b)(1)(C)(i)'' and inserting ''(b)(1)(B)(i)'';

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) FUNCTIONS.—The State board shall assist the Governor of the State as follows:

''(1) STATE PLAN.—Consistent with section 112, the State board shall develop a State plan.

''(2) STATEWIDE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM.—The State board shall review and develop statewide policies and programs in the State in a manner that supports a comprehensive statewide workforce development system that will result in meeting the workforce needs of the State and its local areas. Such review shall include determining whether the State should consolidate additional amounts for additional activities or programs into the Workforce Investment Fund in accordance with section 501(e).

''(3) WORKFORCE AND LABOR MARKET INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The State board shall develop a statewide workforce and labor market information system described in section 15(e) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2(e)), which may include using information collected under Federal law other than this Act by the State economic development entity or a related entity in developing such system.

''(4) EMPLOYER ENGAGEMENT.—The State board shall develop strategies, across local areas, that meet the needs of employers and support economic growth in the State by enhancing communication, coordination, and collaboration among employers, economic development entities, and service providers.

''(5) DESIGNATION OF LOCAL AREAS.—The State board shall designate local areas as required under section 116.

''(6) ONE-STOP DELIVERY SYSTEM.—The State board shall identify and disseminate information on best practices for effective operation of one-stop centers, including use of innovative business outreach, partnerships, and service delivery strategies.

''(7) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT.—The State board shall conduct the following program oversight:

''(A) Reviewing and approving local plans under section 118.

''(B) Ensuring the appropriate use and management of the funds provided for State employment and training activities authorized under section 134.

''(C) Preparing an annual report to the Secretary described in section 136(d).

''(8) DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The State board shall develop and ensure continuous improvement of comprehensive State performance measures, including State adjusted levels of performance, as described under section 136(b).'';

(4) by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e);

(5) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''or participate in any action taken'' after ''vote'';

(6) by inserting after subsection (e) (as so redesignated), the following:

''(f) STAFF.—The State board may employ staff to assist in carrying out the functions described in subsection (d).''; and

(7) in subsection (g), by inserting ''electronic means and'' after ''on a regular basis through''.

SEC. 213. STATE PLAN.

Section 112 (29 U.S.C. 2822)—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''127 or''; and

(B) by striking ''5-year strategy'' and inserting ''3-year strategy'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

''(4) information describing—

''(A) the economic conditions in the State;

''(B) the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries, small businesses, and other occupations important to the State economy;

''(C) the knowledge and skills of the workforce in the State; and

''(D) workforce development activities (including education and training) in the State;'';

(B) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

''(7) a description of the State criteria for determining the eligibility of training services providers in accordance with section 122, including how the State will take into account the performance of providers and whether the training services relate to in-demand industries and other occupations important to the State economy;'';

(C) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

''(8)(A) a description of the procedures that will be taken by the State to assure coordination of, and avoid duplication among, the programs and activities identified under section 501(b)(2); and

''(B) a description of and an assurance regarding common data collection and reporting processes used for the programs and activities described in subparagraph (A), which are carried out by one-stop partners, including—

''(i) an assurance that such processes use quarterly wage records for performance measures described in section 136(b)(2)(A) that are applicable to such programs or activities; or

''(ii) if such wage records are not being used for the performance measures, an identification of the barriers to using such wage records and a description of how the State will address such barriers within 1 year of the approval of the plan;'';

(D) in paragraph (9), by striking '', including comment by representatives of businesses and representatives of labor organizations,'';

(E) in paragraph (11), by striking ''under sections 127 and 132'' and inserting ''under section 132'';

(F) by striking paragraph (12);

(G) by redesignating paragraphs (13) through (18) as paragraphs (12) through (17), respectively;

(H) in paragraph (12) (as so redesignated), by striking ''111(f)'' and inserting ''111(e)'';

(I) in paragraph (13) (as so redesignated), by striking ''134(c)'' and inserting ''121(e)'';

(J) in paragraph (14) (as so redesignated), by striking ''116(a)(5)'' and inserting ''116(a)(3)'';

(K) in paragraph (16) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by striking ''to dislocated workers''; and

(bb) by inserting ''and additional assistance'' after ''rapid response activities'';

(II) in clause (iii), by striking ''134(d)(4)'' and inserting ''134(c)(4)'';

(III) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (iii);

(IV) by amending clause (iv) to read as follows:

''(iv) how the State will serve the employment and training needs of dislocated workers (including displaced homemakers), low-income individuals (including recipients of public assistance such as supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits pursuant to the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)), long-term unemployed individuals (including individuals who have exhausted entitlement to Federal and State unemployment compensation), English learners, homeless individuals, individuals training for nontraditional employment, youth (including out-of-school youth and at-risk youth), older workers, ex-offenders, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, refugees and entrants, veterans (including disabled and homeless veterans), and Native Americans; and''; and

(V) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(v) how the State will—

''(I) consistent with section 188 and Executive Order No. 13217 (42 U.S.C. 12131 note), serve the employment and training needs of individuals with disabilities; and

''(II) consistent with sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794, 794d), include the provision of outreach, intake, assessments, and service delivery, the development of performance measures, the training of staff, and other aspects of accessibility for individuals with disabilities to programs and services under this subtitle;''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''to the extent practicable'' and inserting ''in accordance with the requirements of the Jobs for Veterans Act (Public Law 107–288) and the amendments made by such Act''; and

(L) by striking paragraph (17) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

''(17) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the State—

''(A) to more fully engage employers, including small businesses and employers in in-demand industries and occupations important to the State economy;

''(B) to meet the needs of employers in the State; and

''(C) to better coordinate workforce development programs with economic development activities;

''(18) a description of how the State board will convene (or help to convene) industry or sector partnerships that lead to collaborative planning, resource alignment, and training efforts across a targeted cluster of multiple firms for a range of workers employed or potentially employed by the industry or sector—

''(A) to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement in the industry or sector;

''(B) to address the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries, small businesses, and other occupations important to the State economy; and

''(C) to address critical skill gaps within and across industries and sectors;

''(19) a description of how the State will utilize technology, to facilitate access to services in remote areas, which may be used throughout the State;

''(20) a description of the State strategy and assistance to be provided by the State for encouraging regional cooperation within the State and across State borders, as appropriate;

''(21) a description of the actions that will be taken by the State to foster communication, coordination, and partnerships with

nonprofit organizations (including public libraries, community, faith-based, and philanthropic organizations) that provide employment-related, training, and complementary services, to enhance the quality and comprehensiveness of services available to participants under this title;

''(22) a description of the process and methodology for determining—

''(A) one-stop partner program contributions for the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers under section 121(h)(1); and

''(B) the formula for allocating such infrastructure funds to local areas under section 121(h)(3);

''(23) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the State to assist at-risk youth and out-of-school youth in acquiring the education and skills, credentials (including recognized postsecondary credentials, such as industry-recognized credentials), and employment experience to succeed in the labor market, including—

''(A) training and internships in in-demand industries or occupations important to the State and local economy;

''(B) dropout recovery activities that are designed to lead to the attainment of a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or other State-recognized equivalent (including recognized alternative standards for individuals with disabilities); and

''(C) activities combining remediation of academic skills, work readiness training, and work experience, and including linkages to postsecondary education and training and career-ladder employment; and

''(24) a description of—

''(A) how the State will furnish employment, training, including training in advanced manufacturing, supportive, and placement services to veterans, including disabled and homeless veterans;

''(B) the strategies and services that will be used in the State to assist in and expedite reintegration of homeless veterans into the labor force; and

''(C) the veterans population to be served in the State.'';

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''period, that—'' and all that follows through paragraph (2) and inserting ''period, that the plan is inconsistent with the provisions of this title.''; and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking ''5-year'' and inserting ''3-year''.

SEC. 214. LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREAS.

Section 116 (29 U.S.C. 2831) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) PROCESS.—In order to receive an allotment under section 132, a State, through the State board, shall establish a process to designate local workforce investment areas within the State. Such process shall—

''(i) support the statewide workforce development system developed under section 111(d)(2), enabling the system to meet the workforce needs of the State and its local areas;

''(ii) include consultation, prior to the designation, with chief elected officials;

''(iii) include consideration of comments received on the designation through the public comment process as described in section 112(b)(9); and

''(iv) require the submission of an application for approval under subparagraph (B).

''(B) APPLICATION.—To obtain designation of a local area under this paragraph, a local or regional board (or consortia of local or regional boards) seeking to take responsibility for the area under this Act shall submit an application to a State board at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the State board may require, including—

''(i) a description of the local area, including the population that will be served by the local area, and the education and training needs of its employers and workers;

''(ii) a description of how the local area is consistent or aligned with—

''(I) service delivery areas (as determined by the State);

''(II) labor market areas; and

''(III) economic development regions;

''(iii) a description of the eligible providers of education and training, including postsecondary educational institutions such as community colleges, located in the local area and available to meet the needs of the local workforce;

''(iv) a description of the distance that individuals will need to travel to receive services provided in such local area; and

''(v) any other criteria that the State board may require.

''(C) PRIORITY.—In designating local areas under this paragraph, a State board shall give priority consideration to an area proposed by an applicant demonstrating that a designation as a local area under this paragraph will result in the reduction of overlapping service delivery areas, local market areas, or economic development regions.

''(D) ALIGNMENT WITH LOCAL PLAN.—A State may designate an area proposed by an applicant as a local area under this paragraph for a period not to exceed 3 years.

''(E) REFERENCES.—For purposes of this Act, a reference to a local area—

''(i) used with respect to a geographic area, refers to an area designated under this paragraph; and

''(ii) used with respect to an entity, refers to the applicant.'';

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall, if requested by the Governor of a State, provide the State with technical assistance in making the determinations required under paragraph (1). The Secretary shall not issue regulations governing determinations to be made under paragraph (1).'';

(C) by striking paragraph (3);

(D) by striking paragraph (4);

(E) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3); and

(F) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking ''(2) or (3)'' both places it appears and inserting ''(1)'';

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) SINGLE STATES.—Consistent with subsection (a), the State board of a State may designate the State as a single State local area for the purposes of this title.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: ''The State may require the local boards for the designated region to prepare a single regional plan that incorporates the elements of the local plan under section 118 and that is submitted and approved in lieu of separate local plans under such section.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''employment statistics'' and inserting ''workforce and labor market information''.

SEC. 215. LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS.

Section 117 (29 U.S.C. 2832) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''include—'' and all that follows through ''representatives'' and inserting ''include representatives'';

(II) by striking clauses (ii) through (vi);

(III) by redesignating subclauses (I) through (III) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively (and by moving the margins of such clauses 2 ems to the left);

(IV) by striking clause (ii) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

''(ii) represent businesses, including large and small businesses, each of which has immediate and long-term employment opportunities in an in-demand industry or other occupation important to the local economy; and''; and

(V) by striking the semicolon at the end of clause (iii) (as so redesignated) and inserting ''; and''; and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) may include such other individuals or representatives of entities as the chief elected official in the local area may determine to be appropriate, including—

''(i) the superintendent or other employee of the local educational agency who has primary responsibility for secondary education, the presidents or chief executive officers of postsecondary educational institutions (including a community college, where such an entity exists), or administrators of local entities providing adult education and family literacy education activities;

''(ii) representatives of community-based organizations (including organizations representing individuals with disabilities and veterans, for a local area in which such organizations are present); or

''(iii) representatives of veterans service organizations.'';

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''A majority'' and inserting ''A ⅔ majority''; and

(ii) by striking ''(2)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''(2)(A)''; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''(2)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''(2)(A)'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (C); and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking ''paragraphs (1) through (7)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1) through (8)'';

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) FUNCTIONS OF LOCAL BOARD.—The functions of the local board shall include the following:

''(1) LOCAL PLAN.—Consistent with section 118, each local board, in partnership with the chief elected official for the local area involved, shall develop and submit a local plan to the Governor.

''(2) WORKFORCE RESEARCH AND REGIONAL LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The local board shall—

''(i) conduct, and regularly update, an analysis of—

''(I) the economic conditions in the local area;

''(II) the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries and other occupations important to the local economy;

''(III) the knowledge and skills of the workforce in the local area; and

''(IV) workforce development activities (including education and training) in the local area; and

''(ii) assist the Governor in developing the statewide workforce and labor market information system described in section 15(e) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2(e)).

''(B) EXISTING ANALYSIS.—In carrying out requirements of subparagraph (A)(i), a local board shall use an existing analysis, if any, by the local economic development entity or related entity.

''(3) EMPLOYER ENGAGEMENT.—The local board shall meet the needs of employers and support economic growth in the local area by

enhancing communication, coordination, and collaboration among employers, economic development entities, and service providers.

''(4) BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION.—

''(A) BUDGET.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The local board shall develop a budget for the activities of the local board in the local area, consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

''(ii) TRAINING RESERVATION.—In developing a budget under clause (i), the local board shall reserve a percentage of funds to carry out the activities specified in section 134(c)(4). The local board shall use the analysis conducted under paragraph (2)(A)(i) to determine the appropriate percentage of funds to reserve under this clause.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(i) GRANT RECIPIENT.—The chief elected official in a local area shall serve as the local grant recipient for, and shall be liable for any misuse of, the grant funds allocated to the local area under section 133, unless the chief elected official reaches an agreement with the Governor for the Governor to act as the local grant recipient and bear such liability.

''(ii) DESIGNATION.—In order to assist in administration of the grant funds, the chief elected official or the Governor, where the Governor serves as the local grant recipient for a local area, may designate an entity to serve as a local grant subrecipient for such funds or as a local fiscal agent. Such designation shall not relieve the chief elected official or the Governor of the liability for any misuse of grant funds as described in clause (i).

''(iii) DISBURSAL.—The local grant recipient or an entity designated under clause (ii) shall disburse the grant funds for workforce investment activities at the direction of the local board, pursuant to the requirements of this title. The local grant recipient or entity designated under clause (ii) shall disburse the funds immediately on receiving such direction from the local board.

''(C) STAFF.—The local board may employ staff to assist in carrying out the functions described in this subsection.

''(D) GRANTS AND DONATIONS.—The local board may solicit and accept grants and donations from sources other than Federal funds made available under this Act.

''(5) SELECTION OF OPERATORS AND PROVIDERS.—

''(A) SELECTION OF ONE-STOP OPERATORS.—Consistent with section 121(d), the local board, with the agreement of the chief elected official—

''(i) shall designate or certify one-stop operators as described in section 121(d)(2)(A); and

''(ii) may terminate for cause the eligibility of such operators.

''(B) IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE TRAINING SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Consistent with this subtitle, the local board shall identify eligible providers of training services described in section 134(c)(4) in the local area, annually review the outcomes of such eligible providers using the criteria under section 122(b)(2), and designate such eligible providers in the local area who have demonstrated the highest level of success with respect to such criteria as priority eligible providers for the program year following the review.

''(C) IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS OF WORK READY SERVICES.—If the one-stop operator does not provide the services described in section 134(c)(2) in the local area, the local board shall identify eligible providers of such services in the local area by awarding contracts.

''(6) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT.—The local board, in partnership with the chief elected official, shall be responsible for—

''(A) ensuring the appropriate use and management of the funds provided for local employment and training activities authorized under section 134(b); and

''(B) conducting oversight of the one-stop delivery system, in the local area, authorized under section 121.

''(7) NEGOTIATION OF LOCAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The local board, the chief elected official, and the Governor shall negotiate and reach agreement on local performance measures as described in section 136(c).

''(8) TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS.—The local board shall develop strategies for technology improvements to facilitate access to services authorized under this subtitle and carried out in the local area, including access in remote areas.'';

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting ''electronic means and'' after ''regular basis through''; and

(B) by striking ''and the award of grants or contracts to eligible providers of youth activities,'';

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''section 134(d)(4)'' and inserting ''section 134(c)(4)''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) WORK READY SERVICES; DESIGNATION OR CERTIFICATION AS ONE-STOP OPERATORS.—A local board may provide work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) through a one-stop delivery system described in section 121 or be designated or certified as a one-stop operator only with the agreement of the chief elected official and the Governor.'';

(6) in subsection (g)(1), by inserting ''or participate in any action taken'' after ''vote''; and

(7) by striking subsections (h) and (i).

SEC. 216. LOCAL PLAN.

Section 118 (29 U.S.C. 2833) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''5-year'' and inserting ''3-year'';

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) CONTENTS.—The local plan shall include—

''(1) a description of the analysis of the local area's economic and workforce conditions conducted under subclauses (I) through (IV) of section 117(d)(2)(A)(i), and an assurance that the local board will use such analysis to carry out the activities under this subtitle;

''(2) a description of the one-stop delivery system in the local area, including—

''(A) a description of how the local board will ensure—

''(i) the continuous improvement of eligible providers of services through the system; and

''(ii) that such providers meet the employment needs of local businesses and participants; and

''(B) a description of how the local board will facilitate access to services described in section 117(d)(8) and provided through the one-stop delivery system consistent with section 117(d)(8);

''(3) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the local area—

''(A) to more fully engage employers, including small businesses and employers in in-demand industries and occupations important to the local economy;

''(B) to meet the needs of employers in the local area;

''(C) to better coordinate workforce development programs with economic development activities; and

''(D) to better coordinate workforce development programs with employment, training, and literacy services carried out by nonprofit organizations, including public libraries, as appropriate;

''(4) a description of how the local board will convene (or help to convene) industry or sector partnerships that lead to collaborative planning, resource alignment, and training efforts across multiple firms for a range of workers employed or potentially employed by a targeted industry or sector—

''(A) to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement in the targeted industry or sector;

''(B) to address the immediate and long-term skilled workforce needs of in-demand industries, small businesses, and other occupations important to the local economy; and

''(C) to address critical skill gaps within and across industries and sectors;

''(5) a description of how the funds reserved under section 117(d)(4)(A)(ii) will be used to carry out activities described in section 134(c)(4);

''(6) a description of how the local board will coordinate workforce investment activities carried out in the local area with statewide workforce investment activities, as appropriate;

''(7) a description of how the local area will—

''(A) coordinate activities with the local area's disability community, and with transition services (as defined under section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401)) provided under that Act by local educational agencies serving such local area, to make available comprehensive, high-quality services to individuals with disabilities;

''(B) consistent with section 188 and Executive Order No. 13217 (42 U.S.C. 12131 note), serve the employment and training needs of individuals with disabilities, with a focus on employment that fosters independence and integration into the workplace; and

''(C) consistent with sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794, 794d), include the provision of outreach, intake, assessments, and service delivery, the development of performance measures, the training of staff, and other aspects of accessibility for individuals with disabilities to programs and services under this subtitle;

''(8) a description of the local levels of performance negotiated with the Governor and chief elected official pursuant to section 136(c), to be—

''(A) used to measure the performance of the local area; and

''(B) used by the local board for measuring performance of the local fiscal agent (where appropriate), eligible providers, and the one-stop delivery system, in the local area;

''(9) a description of the process used by the local board, consistent with subsection (c), to provide an opportunity for public comment prior to submission of the plan;

''(10) a description of how the local area will serve the employment and training needs of dislocated workers (including displaced homemakers), low-income individuals (including recipients of public assistance such as supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits pursuant to the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)), long-term unemployed individuals (including individuals who have exhausted entitlement to Federal and State unemployment compensation), English learners, homeless individuals, individuals training for nontraditional employment, youth (including out-of-school youth and at-risk youth), older workers, ex-offenders, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, refugees and entrants, veterans (including disabled veterans and homeless veterans), and Native Americans;

''(11) an identification of the entity responsible for the disbursal of grant funds described in section 117(d)(4)(B)(iii), as determined by the chief elected official or the Governor under such section;

''(12) a description of the strategies and services that will be used in the local area to assist at-risk youth and out-of-school youth in acquiring the education and skills, credentials (including recognized postsecondary credentials, such as industry-recognized credentials), and employment experience to succeed in the labor market, including—

''(A) training and internships in in-demand industries or occupations important to the local economy;

''(B) dropout recovery activities that are designed to lead to the attainment of a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or other State-recognized equivalent (including recognized alternative standards for individuals with disabilities); and

''(C) activities combining remediation of academic skills, work readiness training, and work experience, and including linkages to postsecondary education and training and career-ladder employment;

''(13) a description of—

''(A) how the local area will furnish employment, training, including training in advanced manufacturing, supportive, and placement services to veterans, including disabled and homeless veterans;

''(B) the strategies and services that will be used in the local area to assist in and expedite reintegration of homeless veterans into the labor force; and

''(C) the veteran population to be served in the local area;

''(14) a description of—

''(A) the duties assigned to the veteran employment specialist consistent with the requirements of section 134(f);

''(B) the manner in which the veteran employment specialist is integrated into the one-stop career system described in section 121;

''(C) the date on which the veteran employment specialist was assigned; and

''(D) whether the veteran employment specialist has satisfactorily completed related training by the National Veterans' Employment and Training Services Institute; and

''(15) such other information as the Governor may require.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''such means'' and inserting ''electronic means and such means''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking '', including representatives of business and representatives of labor organizations,''.

SEC. 217. ESTABLISHMENT OF ONE-STOP DELIVERY SYSTEM.

Section 121 (29 U.S.C. 2841) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(A) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ONE-STOP PARTNERS.—Each entity that carries out a program or activities described in subparagraph (B) shall—

''(i) provide access through a one-stop delivery system to the program or activities carried out by the entity, including making the work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) that are applicable to the program or activities of the entity available at one-stop centers (in addition to any other appropriate locations);

''(ii) use a portion of the funds available to the program or activities of the entity to maintain the one-stop delivery system, including payment of the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers in accordance with subsection (h);

''(iii) enter into a local memorandum of understanding with the local board, relating to the operation of the one-stop delivery system, that meets the requirements of subsection (c); and

''(iv) participate in the operation of the one-stop delivery system consistent with the terms of the memorandum of understanding, the requirements of this title, and the requirements of the Federal laws authorizing the program or activities carried out by the entity.'';

(B) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking clauses (ii), (v), and (vi);

(ii) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively;

(iii) by redesignating clauses (vii) through (xii) as clauses (iv) through (ix), respectively;

(iv) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking ''adult education and literacy activities'' and inserting ''adult education and family literacy education activities''

(v) in clause (viii), as so redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end;

(vi) in clause (ix), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

''(x) subject to subparagraph (C), programs authorized under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).'';

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1)(B) the following:

''(C) DETERMINATION BY THE GOVERNOR.—Each entity carrying out a program described in subparagraph (B)(x) shall be considered to be a one-stop partner under this title and carry out the required partner activities described in subparagraph (A) unless the Governor of the State in which the local area is located provides the Secretary and Secretary of Health and Human Services written notice of a determination by the Governor that such an entity shall not be considered to be such a partner and shall not carry out such required partner activities.'';

and

(D) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''section 134(d)(2)'' and inserting ''section 134(c)(2)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clauses (i), (ii), and (v);

(II) in clause (iv), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(III) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) employment and training programs administered by the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration;

''(iv) employment and training programs carried out by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

''(v) employment, training, and literacy services carried out by public libraries; and

''(vi) other appropriate Federal, State, or local programs, including programs in the private sector.'';

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) provisions describing—

''(i) the services to be provided through the one-stop delivery system consistent with the requirements of this section, including the manner in which the services will be coordinated through such system;

''(ii) how the costs of such services and the operating costs of such system will be funded, through cash and in-kind contributions, to provide a stable and equitable funding stream for ongoing one-stop system operations, including the funding of the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers in accordance with subsection (h);

''(iii) methods of referral of individuals between the one-stop operator and the one-stop partners for appropriate services and activities, including referrals for training for nontraditional employment; and

''(iv) the duration of the memorandum of understanding and the procedures for amending the memorandum during the term of the memorandum, and assurances that such memorandum shall be reviewed not less than once every 3-year period to ensure appropriate funding and delivery of services under the memorandum; and'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the heading for paragraph (1), by striking ''DESIGNATION AND CERTIFICATION'' and inserting ''LOCAL DESIGNATION AND CERTIFICATION'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''section 134(c)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)'';

(ii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) shall be designated or certified as a one-stop operator through a competitive process; and''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking clause (ii) and redesignating clauses (iii) through (vi) as clauses (ii) through (v), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''vocational'' and inserting ''career and technical'';

(4) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF ONE-STOP DELIVERY SYSTEM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be established in a State that receives an allotment under section 132(b) a one-stop delivery system, which shall—

''(A) provide the work ready services described in section 134(c)(2);

''(B) provide access to training services as described in paragraph (4) of section 134(c), including serving as the point of access to career enhancement accounts for training services to participants in accordance with paragraph (4)(F) of such section;

''(C) provide access to the activities carried out under section 134(d), if any;

''(D) provide access to programs and activities carried out by one-stop partners that are described in subsection (b); and

''(E) provide access to the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 15(a)(1) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2(a)(1)).

''(2) ONE-STOP DELIVERY.—At a minimum, the one-stop delivery system—

''(A) shall make each of the programs, services, and activities described in paragraph (1) accessible at not less than one physical center in each local area of the State; and

''(B) may also make programs, services, and activities described in paragraph (1) available—

''(i) through a network of affiliated sites that can provide one or more of the programs, services, and activities to individuals; and

''(ii) through a network of eligible one-stop partners—

''(I) in which each partner provides one or more of the programs, services, and activities to such individuals and is accessible at an affiliated site that consists of a physical location or an electronically- or technologically-linked access point; and

''(II) that assures individuals that information on the availability of the work ready services will be available regardless of where the individuals initially enter the statewide workforce investment system, including information made available through an access point described in subclause (I).

''(3) SPECIALIZED CENTERS.—The centers and sites described in paragraph (2) may have a specialization in addressing special needs.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) CERTIFICATION OF ONE-STOP CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The State board shall establish objective procedures and criteria for certifying, at least once every 3 years, one-stop centers for the purpose of awarding the one-stop infrastructure funding described in subsection (h).

''(B) CRITERIA.—The criteria for certification of a one-stop center under this subsection shall include—

''(i) meeting the expected levels of performance for each of the corresponding core indicators of performance as outlined in the State plan under section 112;

''(ii) meeting minimum standards relating to the scope and degree of service integration achieved by the center, involving the programs provided by the one-stop partners; and

''(iii) meeting minimum standards relating to how the center ensures that eligible providers meet the employment needs of local employers and participants.

''(C) EFFECT OF CERTIFICATION.—One-stop centers certified under this subsection shall be eligible to receive the infrastructure funding authorized under subsection (h).

''(2) LOCAL BOARDS.—Consistent with the criteria developed by the State, the local board may develop, for certification referred to in paragraph (1)(A), additional criteria or higher standards on the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(B) to respond to local labor market and demographic conditions and trends.

''(h) ONE-STOP INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.—

''(1) PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(A) PROVISION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, as determined under subparagraph (B), a portion of the Federal funds provided to the State and areas within the State under the Federal laws authorizing the one-stop partner programs described in subsection (b)(1)(B) and participating additional partner programs described in subsection (b)(2)(B), for a fiscal year shall be provided to the Governor by such partners to carry out this subsection.

''(B) DETERMINATION OF GOVERNOR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Governor, in consultation with the State board, shall determine the portion of funds to be provided under subparagraph (A) by each one-stop partner and in making such determination shall consider the proportionate use of the one-stop centers in the State by each such partner, the costs of administration for purposes not related to one-stop centers for each such partner, and other relevant factors described in paragraph (3).

''(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—In those States where the State constitution places policy-making authority that is independent of the authority of the Governor in an entity or official with respect to the funds provided for adult education and family literacy education activities authorized under title II and for postsecondary career and technical education activities authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the determination described in clause (i) with respect to the corresponding 2 programs shall be made by the Governor with the appropriate entity or official with such independent policy-making authority.

''(iii) APPEAL BY ONE-STOP PARTNERS.—The Governor shall establish a procedure for the one-stop partner administering a program described in subsection (b) and subparagraph (A) to appeal a determination regarding the portion of funds to be provided under this paragraph on the basis that such determination is inconsistent with the requirements described in the State plan for the program or with the requirements of this paragraph. Such procedure shall ensure prompt resolution of the appeal.

''(C) LIMITATIONS.—

''(i) PROVISION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.—The funds provided under this paragraph by a one-stop partner shall be provided only from funds available for the costs of administration under the program administered by such partner, and shall be subject to the limitations with respect to the portion of funds under such program that may be used for administration.

''(ii) FEDERAL DIRECT SPENDING PROGRAMS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A program that provides Federal direct spending under section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(8)) shall not, for purposes of this paragraph, be required to provide more than the maximum amount determined under subclause (II).

''(II) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The maximum amount for the program is the amount that bears the same relationship to the costs referred to in paragraph (2) for the State as the use of the one-stop centers by such program bears to the use of such centers by all one-stop partner programs in the State.

''(2) ALLOCATION BY GOVERNOR.—From the funds provided under paragraph (1), the Governor shall allocate funds to local areas in accordance with the formula established under paragraph (3) for the purposes of assisting in paying the costs of infrastructure of one-stop centers certified under subsection (g).

''(3) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—The State board shall develop a formula to be used by the Governor to allocate the funds provided under paragraph (1) to local areas. The formula shall include such factors as the State board determines are appropriate, which may include factors such as the number of centers in a local area that have been certified, the population served by such centers, and the performance of such centers.

''(4) COSTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'costs of infrastructure' means the nonpersonnel costs that are necessary for the general operation of a one-stop center, including the rental costs of the facilities involved, and the costs of utilities and maintenance, and equipment (including assistive technology for individuals with disabilities).

''(i) OTHER FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the funds provided under subsection (h), a portion of funds made available under Federal law authorizing the one-stop partner programs described in subsection (b)(1)(B) and participating additional partner programs described in subsection (b)(2)(B), or the noncash resources available under such 2 types of programs, shall be used to pay the costs relating to the operation of the one-stop delivery system that are not paid for from the funds provided under subsection (h), to the extent not inconsistent with the Federal law involved. Such portion shall be used to pay for costs including—

''(A) costs of infrastructure (as defined in subsection (h)) that are in excess of the funds provided under subsection (h);

''(B) common costs that are in addition to the costs of infrastructure (as so defined); and

''(C) the costs of the provision of work ready services applicable to each program.

''(2) DETERMINATION AND STANDARDS.—The method for determining the appropriate portion of funds and noncash resources to be provided by each program under paragraph (1) shall be determined as part of the memorandum of understanding under subsection (c). The State board shall provide standards to facilitate the determination of appropriate allocation of the funds and noncash resources to local areas.''.

SEC. 218. IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS OF TRAINING SERVICES.

Section 122 (29 U.S.C. 2842) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 122. IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS OF TRAINING SERVICES.

''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Governor, after consultation with the State board, shall establish criteria and procedures regarding the eligibility of providers of training services described in section 134(c)(4) to receive funds provided under section 133(b) for the provision of such training services and be included on the list of eligible providers of training services described in subsection (d).

''(2) PROVIDERS.—Subject to the provisions of this section, to be eligible to receive the funds and be included on the list, the provider shall be—

''(A) a postsecondary educational institution that—

''(i) is eligible to receive Federal funds under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

''(ii) provides a program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential;

''(B) an entity that carries out programs under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the 'National Apprenticeship Act'; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.); or

''(C) another public or private provider of a program of training services.

''(3) INCLUSION IN LIST OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS.—A provider described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (2) shall comply with the criteria and procedures established under this subsection to be eligible to receive the funds and be included on the list. A provider described in paragraph (2)(B) shall be eligible to receive the funds and be included on the list with respect to programs described in paragraph (2)(B) for so long as the provider remains certified by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the programs.

''(b) CRITERIA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The criteria established by the Governor pursuant to subsection (a) shall take into account—

''(A) the performance of providers of training services with respect to the performance measures described in section 136, measures for other matters for which information is required under paragraph (2), and other appropriate measures of performance outcomes for those participants receiving training services under this subtitle;

''(B) whether the training programs of such providers relate to in-demand industries or occupations important to the local economy;

''(C) the need to ensure access to training services throughout the State, including in rural areas;

''(D) the ability of the providers to offer programs that lead to a recognized postsecondary credential, and the quality of such programs;

''(E) the performance of the providers as reflected in the information such providers are required to report to State agencies with respect to other Federal and State programs (other than the program carried out under this subtitle), including one-stop partner programs; and

''(F) such other factors as the Governor determines are appropriate.

''(2) INFORMATION.—The criteria established by the Governor shall require that a provider of training services submit appropriate, accurate, and timely information to the State for purposes of carrying out subsection (d), with respect to participants receiving training services under this subtitle in the applicable program, including—

''(A) information on recognized postsecondary credentials received by such participants;

''(B) information on costs of attendance for such participants;

''(C) information on the program completion rate for such participants; and

''(D) information on the performance of the provider with respect to the performance measures described in section 136 for such participants.

''(3) RENEWAL.—The criteria established by the Governor shall also provide for a review on the criteria every 3 years and renewal of eligibility under this section for providers of training services.

''(4) LOCAL CRITERIA.—A local board in the State may establish criteria in addition to the criteria established by the Governor, or may require higher levels of performance than required on the criteria established by the Governor, for purposes of determining the eligibility of providers of training services under this section in the local area involved.

''(5) LIMITATION.—In carrying out the requirements of this subsection, no entity may disclose personally identifiable information regarding a student, including a Social Security number, student identification number, or other identifier, without the prior written consent of the parent or student in compliance with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

''(c) PROCEDURES.—The procedures established under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) identify—

''(A) the application process for a provider of training services to become eligible under this section; and

''(B) the respective roles of the State and local areas in receiving and reviewing applications and in making determinations of eligibility based on the criteria established under this section; and

''(2) establish a process, for a provider of training services to appeal a denial or termination of eligibility under this section, that includes an opportunity for a hearing and prescribes appropriate time limits to ensure prompt resolution of the appeal.

''(d) INFORMATION TO ASSIST PARTICIPANTS IN CHOOSING PROVIDERS.—In order to facilitate and assist participants under chapter 5 in choosing providers of training services, the Governor shall ensure that an appropriate list of providers determined eligible under this section in the State, including information provided under subsection (b)(2) with respect to such providers, is provided to the local boards in the State and is made available to such participants and to members of the public through the one-stop delivery system in the State.

''(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The procedures established under this section shall provide the following:

''(A) INTENTIONALLY SUPPLYING INACCURATE INFORMATION.—Upon a determination, by an individual or entity specified in the procedures, that a provider of training services, or individual providing information on behalf of the provider, intentionally supplied inaccurate information under this section, the eligibility of such provider under this section shall be terminated for a period of time that is not less than 2 years.

''(B) SUBSTANTIAL VIOLATIONS.—Upon a determination, by an individual or entity specified in the procedures, that a provider of training services substantially violated any requirement under this title, the eligibility of such provider under this section shall be terminated for a period of time that is not less than 10 years.

''(C) REPAYMENT.—A provider of training services whose eligibility is terminated under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be liable for the repayment of funds received under chapter 5 during a period of noncompliance described in such subparagraph. For purposes of subparagraph (A), that period shall be considered to be the period beginning on the date on which the inaccurate information described in subparagraph (A) was supplied, and ending on the date of the termination described in subparagraph (A).

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (1) shall be construed to provide remedies and penalties that supplement, but do not supplant, other civil and criminal remedies and penalties.

''(f) AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER STATES.—A State may enter into an agreement with another State, on a reciprocal basis, to permit eligible providers of training services to accept career enhancement accounts provided in the other State.

''(g) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing the criteria (including requirements for related information) and procedures required under this section, the Governor shall solicit and take into consideration the recommendations of local boards and providers of training services within the State.

''(h) OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT COMMENTS.—During the development of the criteria and procedures, and the list of eligible providers required under this section, the Governor shall provide an opportunity for interested members of the public to submit comments regarding such criteria, procedures, and list.

''(i) ON-THE-JOB TRAINING OR CUSTOMIZED TRAINING EXCEPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Providers of on-the-job training or customized training shall not be subject to the requirements of subsections (a) through (d).

''(2) COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—A one-stop operator in a local area shall collect such performance information from on-the-job training and customized training providers as the Governor may require, determine whether the providers meet such performance criteria as the Governor may require, and disseminate information identifying providers that meet the criteria as eligible providers, and the performance information, through the one-stop delivery system. Providers determined to meet the criteria shall be considered to be identified as eligible under this section, to be providers of the training services involved.''.

SEC. 219. GENERAL AUTHORIZATION.

Chapter 5 of subtitle B of title I is amended—

(1) by striking the heading for chapter 5 and inserting the following: ''**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES**''; and

(2) in section 131 (29 U.S.C. 2861)—

(A) by striking ''paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(B) of''; and

(B) by striking ''adults, and dislocated workers,'' and inserting ''individuals''.

SEC. 220. STATE ALLOTMENTS.

Section 132 (29 U.S.C. 2862) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) reserve ½ of 1 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year, of which—

''(A) 50 percent shall be used to provide technical assistance under section 170; and

''(B) 50 percent shall be used for evaluations under section 172;

''(2) reserve 1 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year to make grants to, and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with Indian tribes, tribal organizations, Alaska Native entities, Indian-controlled organizations serving Indians, or Native Hawaiian organizations to carry out employment and training activities;

''(3) reserve not more than 25 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year to carry out the Jobs Corps program under subtitle C;

''(4) reserve not more than 3.5 percent of the total amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year to—

''(A) make grants to State boards or local boards to provide employment and training assistance to workers affected by major economic dislocations, such as plant closures, mass layoffs, or closures and realignments of military installations; and

''(B) provide assistance to Governors of States with an area that has suffered an emergency or a major disaster (as such terms are defined in paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, of section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)) to provide disaster relief employment in the area; and

''(5) from the remaining amount appropriated under section 137 for a fiscal year (after reserving funds under paragraphs (1) through (4)), make allotments in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.''; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT FUND.—

''(1) RESERVATION FOR OUTLYING AREAS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—From the amount made available under subsection (a)(5) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not more than ¼ of 1 percent to provide assistance to the outlying areas.

''(B) RESTRICTION.—The Republic of Palau shall cease to be eligible to receive funding under this paragraph upon entering into an agreement for extension of United States educational assistance under the Compact of Free Association (approved by the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–188) after the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act.

''(2) STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—After determining the amount to be reserved under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall allot the remainder of the amount referred to in subsection (a)(5) for a fiscal year to the States pursuant to subparagraph (B) for employment and training activities and statewide workforce investment activities.

''(B) FORMULA.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), of the remainder—

''(i) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in each State, compared to the total number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in all States;

''(ii) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of individuals in the civilian labor force in each State, compared to the total number of such individuals in all States;

''(iii) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of individuals in each State who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more, compared to the total number of individuals in all States who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more; and

''(iv) 25 percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of disadvantaged youth in each State, compared to the total number of disadvantaged youth in all States.

''(C) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM PERCENTAGES.—

''(i) MINIMUM PERCENTAGE.—The Secretary shall ensure that no State shall receive an allotment under this paragraph for—

''(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is less than 100 percent of the allotment percentage of the State for fiscal year 2013; and

''(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is less than 90 percent of the

allotment percentage of the State for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

''(ii) MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE.—Subject to clause (i), the Secretary shall ensure that no State shall receive an allotment under this paragraph for—

''(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is more than 130 percent of the allotment percentage of the State for fiscal year 2013; and

''(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is more than 130 percent of the allotment percentage of the State for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

''(D) SMALL STATE MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall ensure that no State shall receive an allotment under this paragraph for a fiscal year that is less than ⅕ of 1 percent of the remainder described in subparagraph (A) for the fiscal year.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of the formula specified in this paragraph:

''(i) ALLOTMENT PERCENTAGE.—The term 'allotment percentage'—

''(I) used with respect to fiscal year 2013, means the percentage of the amounts allotted to States under title I of this Act, title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.), the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), sections 4103A and 4104 of title 38, United States Code, and sections 1 through 14 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), as such provisions were in effect for fiscal year 2013, that is received under such provisions by the State involved for fiscal year 2013; and

''(II) used with respect to fiscal year 2017 or a succeeding fiscal year, means the percentage of the amounts allotted to States under this paragraph for the fiscal year, that is received under this paragraph by the State involved for the fiscal year.

''(ii) AREA OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT.—The term 'area of substantial unemployment' means any area that is of sufficient size and scope to sustain a program of workforce investment activities carried out under this subtitle and that has an average rate of unemployment of at least 7 percent for the most recent 12 months, as determined by the Secretary. For purposes of this clause, determinations of areas of substantial unemployment shall be made once each fiscal year.

''(iii) DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.—The term 'disadvantaged youth' means an individual who is not less than age 16 and not more than age 24 who receives an income, or is a member of a family that receives a total family income, that in relation to family size, does not exceed the higher of—

''(I) the poverty line; or

''(II) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level.

''(iv) INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'individual' means an individual who is age 16 or older.''.

SEC. 221. WITHIN STATE ALLOCATIONS.

Section 133 (29 U.S.C. 2863) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) RESERVATIONS FOR STATEWIDE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—The Governor of a State shall reserve not more than 15 percent of the total amount allotted to the State under section 132(b)(2) for a fiscal year to carry out the statewide activities described in section 134(a).

''(2) STATEWIDE RAPID RESPONSE ACTIVITIES AND ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Of the amount reserved under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Governor of the State shall reserve not more than 25 percent for statewide rapid response activities and additional assistance described in section 134(a)(4).

''(3) STATEWIDE GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT.—Of the amount reserved under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Governor of the State shall reserve 15 percent to carry out statewide activities described in section 134(a)(5).

''(4) STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COST LIMIT.—Not more than 5 percent of the funds reserved under paragraph (1) may be used by the Governor of the State for administrative costs of carrying out the statewide activities described in section 134(a).'';

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) WITHIN STATE ALLOCATION.—

''(1) METHODS.—The Governor, acting in accordance with the State plan, and after consulting with chief elected officials in the local areas in the State, shall—

''(A) allocate the funds that are allotted to the State under section 132(b)(2) and not reserved under subsection (a), in accordance with paragraph (2)(A); and

''(B) award the funds that are reserved by the State under subsection (a)(3) through competitive grants to eligible entities, in accordance with section 134(a)(1)(C).

''(2) FORMULA ALLOCATIONS FOR THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT FUND.—

''(A) ALLOCATION.—In allocating the funds described in paragraph (1)(A) to local areas, a State shall allocate—

''(i) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(i);

''(ii) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(ii);

''(iii) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(iii); and

''(iv) 25 percent on the basis described in section 132(b)(2)(B)(iv),

except that a reference in a section specified in any of clauses (i) through (iv) to 'each State' shall be considered to refer to each local area, and to 'all States' shall be considered to refer to all local areas.

''(B) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM PERCENTAGES.—

''(i) MINIMUM PERCENTAGE.—The State shall ensure that no local area shall receive an allocation under this paragraph for—

''(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is less than 100 percent of the allocation percentage of the local area for fiscal year 2013; and

''(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is less than 90 percent of the allocation percentage of the local area for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

''(ii) MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE.—Subject to clause (i), the State shall ensure that no local area shall receive an allocation for a fiscal year under this paragraph for—

''(I) each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, that is more than 130 percent of the allocation percentage of the local area for fiscal year 2013; and

''(II) fiscal year 2018 and each succeeding fiscal year, that is more than 130 percentage of the allocation percentage of the local area for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year involved.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of the formula specified in this paragraph, the term 'allocation percentage'—

''(i) used with respect to fiscal year 2013, means the percentage of the amounts allocated to local areas under title I of this Act, title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.), the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), sections 4103A and 4104 of title 38, United States Code, and sections 1 through 14 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), as such provisions were in effect for fiscal year 2013, that is received under such provisions by the local area involved for fiscal year 2013; and

''(ii) used with respect to fiscal year 2017 or a succeeding fiscal year, means the percentage of the amounts allocated to local areas under this paragraph for the fiscal year, that is received under this paragraph by the local area involved for the fiscal year.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Governor may, in accordance with this subsection, reallocate to eligible local areas within the State amounts that are allocated under subsection (b) for employment and training activities and that are available for reallocation.'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (2)(A) or (3) of subsection (b) for such activities'' and inserting ''subsection (b) for such activities'';

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) REALLOCATIONS.—In making reallocations to eligible local areas of amounts available pursuant to paragraph (2) for a program year, the Governor shall allocate to each eligible local area within the State an amount based on the relative amount allocated to such local area under subsection (b)(2) for such activities for such prior program year, as compared to the total amount allocated to all eligible local areas in the State under subsection (b)(2) for such activities for such prior program year.''; and

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking ''paragraph (2)(A) or (3) of''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE COST LIMIT.—Of the amount allocated to a local area under this section for a fiscal year, not more than 10 percent of the amount may be used by the local board involved for the administrative costs of carrying out local workforce investment activities in the local area under this chapter.''.

SEC. 222. USE OF FUNDS FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.

Section 134 (29 U.S.C. 2864) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) DISTRIBUTION OF STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES.—Funds reserved by a Governor for a State as described in section 133(a)(1) and not reserved under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 133(a)—

''(i) shall be used to carry out the statewide employment and training activities described in paragraph (2); and

''(ii) may be used to carry out any of the statewide employment and training activities described in paragraph (3).

''(B) STATEWIDE RAPID RESPONSE ACTIVITIES AND ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Funds reserved by a Governor for a State as described in section 133(a)(2) shall be used to provide the statewide rapid response activities and additional assistance described in paragraph (4).

''(C) STATEWIDE GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT.—Funds reserved by a Governor for a State as described in section 133(a)(3) shall be used to award statewide grants for individuals with barriers to employment on a competitive basis, and carry out other activities, as described in paragraph (5).

''(2) REQUIRED STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—A State shall use funds referred to in paragraph (1)(A) to carry out statewide employment and training activities, which shall include—

''(A) disseminating the State list of eligible providers of training services described

in section 122(d), information identifying eligible providers of on-the-job training and customized training described in section 122(i), and performance information and program cost information described in section 122(b)(2);

''(B) supporting the provision of work ready services described in subsection (c)(2) in the one-stop delivery system;

''(C) implementing strategies and services that will be used in the State to assist at-risk youth and out-of-school youth in acquiring the education and skills, recognized postsecondary credentials, and employment experience to succeed in the labor market;

''(D) conducting evaluations under section 136(e) of activities authorized under this chapter in coordination with evaluations carried out by the Secretary under section 172;

''(E) providing technical assistance to local areas that fail to meet local performance measures;

''(F) operating a fiscal and management accountability system under section 136(f); and

''(G) carrying out monitoring and oversight of activities carried out under this chapter.

''(3) ALLOWABLE STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—A State may use funds referred to in paragraph (1)(A) to carry out statewide employment and training activities which may include—

''(A) implementing innovative programs and strategies designed to meet the needs of all employers in the State, including small employers, which may include incumbent worker training programs, sectoral and industry cluster strategies and partnership initiatives, career ladder programs, micro-enterprise and entrepreneurial training and support programs, utilization of effective business intermediaries, activities to improve linkages between the one-stop delivery system in the State and all employers (including small employers) in the State, and other business services and strategies that better engage employers in workforce investment activities and make the workforce investment system more relevant to the needs of State and local businesses, consistent with the objectives of this title;

''(B) providing incentive grants to local areas—

''(i) for regional cooperation among local boards (including local boards in a designated region as described in section 116(c));

''(ii) for local coordination of activities carried out under this Act; and

''(iii) for exemplary performance by local areas on the local performance measures;

''(C) developing strategies for effectively integrating programs and services among one-stop partners;

''(D) carrying out activities to facilitate remote access to services provided through a one-stop delivery system, including facilitating access through the use of technology;

''(E) incorporating pay-for-performance contract strategies as an element in funding activities under this section and providing technical support to local areas and eligible providers in order to carry out such a strategy, which may involve providing assistance with data collection and data entry requirements;

''(F) carrying out the State option under subsection (f)(8); and

''(G) carrying out other activities authorized under this section that the State determines to be necessary to assist local areas in carrying out activities described in subsection (c) or (d) through the statewide workforce investment system.

''(4) STATEWIDE RAPID RESPONSE ACTIVITIES AND ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—A State shall use funds reserved as described in section 133(a)(2)—

''(A) to carry out statewide rapid response activities, which shall include provision of rapid response activities, carried out in local areas by the State or by an entity designated by the State, working in conjunction with the local boards and the chief elected officials in the local areas; and

''(B) to provide additional assistance to local areas that experience disasters, mass layoffs, or plant closings, or other events that precipitate substantial increases in the number of unemployed individuals, carried out in local areas by the State or by an entity designated by the State, working in conjunction with the local boards and the chief elected officials in the local areas.

''(5) STATEWIDE GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds reserved as described in section 133(a)(3), the Governor of a State—

''(i) may reserve up to 5 percent to provide technical assistance for, and conduct evaluations as described in section 136(e) of, the programs carried out under this paragraph; and

''(ii) using the remainder, shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities (that meet specific performance outcomes and criteria established by the Governor) described in subparagraph (B) to carry out employment and training programs authorized under this paragraph for individuals with barriers to employment.

''(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'eligible entity' means an entity that—

''(i) is a—

''(I) local board or a consortium of local boards;

''(II) nonprofit entity, for-profit entity, or a consortium of nonprofit or for-profit entities; or

''(III) consortium of the entities described in subclauses (I) and (II);

''(ii) has a demonstrated record of placing individuals into unsubsidized employment and serving hard-to-serve individuals; and

''(iii) agrees to be reimbursed primarily on the basis of meeting specified performance outcomes and criteria established by the Governor.

''(C) GRANT PERIOD.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this paragraph shall be awarded for a period of 1 year.

''(ii) GRANT RENEWAL.—A Governor of a State may renew, for up to 4 additional 1-year periods, a grant awarded under this paragraph.

''(D) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—To be eligible to participate in activities under this paragraph, an individual shall be a low-income individual age 16 or older.

''(E) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this paragraph shall use the grant funds for programs of activities that are designed to assist eligible participants in obtaining employment and acquiring the education and skills necessary to succeed in the labor market. To be eligible to receive a grant under this paragraph for an employment and training program, an eligible entity shall submit an application to a State at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the State may require, including—

''(i) a description of how the strategies and activities of the program will be aligned with the State plan submitted under section 112 and the local plan submitted under section 118, with respect to the area of the State that will be the focus of the program under this paragraph;

''(ii) a description of the educational and skills training programs and activities the eligible entity will provide to eligible participants under this paragraph;

''(iii) how the eligible entity will collaborate with State and local workforce investment systems established under this title in the provision of such programs and activities;

''(iv) a description of the programs of demonstrated effectiveness on which the provision of such educational and skills training programs and activities are based, and a description of how such programs and activities will improve education and skills training for eligible participants;

''(v) a description of the populations to be served and the skill needs of those populations, and the manner in which eligible participants will be recruited and selected as participants;

''(vi) a description of the private, public, local, and State resources that will be leveraged, with the grant funds provided, for the program under this paragraph, and how the entity will ensure the sustainability of such program after grant funds are no longer available;

''(vii) a description of the extent of the involvement of employers in such program;

''(viii) a description of the levels of performance the eligible entity expects to achieve with respect to the indicators of performance for all individuals specified in section 136(b)(2);

''(ix) a detailed budget and a description of the system of fiscal controls, and auditing and accountability procedures, that will be used to ensure fiscal soundness for the program provided under this paragraph; and

''(x) any other criteria the Governor may require.'';

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b)—

''(1) shall be used to carry out employment and training activities described in subsection (c); and

''(2) may be used to carry out employment and training activities described in subsection (d).'';

(3) by striking subsection (c);

(4) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e), as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(5) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b) shall be used—

''(A) to establish a one-stop delivery system as described in section 121(e);

''(B) to provide the work ready services described in paragraph (2) through the one-stop delivery system in accordance with such paragraph; and

''(C) to provide training services described in paragraph (4) in accordance with such paragraph.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''CORE SERVICES'' and inserting ''WORK READY SERVICES'';

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''(1)(A)'' and inserting ''(1)'';

(II) by striking ''core services'' and inserting ''work ready services''; and

(III) by striking ''who are adults or dislocated workers'';

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (K) as subparagraph (V);

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (J) as subparagraphs (C) through (K), respectively;

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) assistance in obtaining eligibility determinations under the other one-stop partner programs through activities, where appropriate and consistent with the authorizing statute of the one-stop partner program involved, such as assisting in—

''(i) the submission of applications;

''(ii) the provision of information on the results of such applications; and

''(iii) the provision of intake services and information;'';

(vi) by amending subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(E) labor exchange services, including—

''(i) job search and placement assistance, and where appropriate, career counseling;

''(ii) appropriate recruitment services for employers, including small employers, in the local area, which may include services described in this subsection, including provision of information and referral to specialized business services not traditionally offered through the one-stop delivery system; and

''(iii) reemployment services provided to unemployment claimants, including claimants identified as in need of such services under the worker profiling system established under section 303(j) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(j));'';

(vii) in subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, by striking ''employment statistics'' and inserting ''workforce and labor market'';

(viii) in subparagraph (G), as so redesignated, by striking ''and eligible providers of youth activities described in section 123,'';

(ix) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by inserting ''under section 136'' after ''local performance measures'';

(x) in subparagraph (J), as so redesignated, by inserting ''and information regarding the administration of the work test for the unemployment compensation system'' after ''compensation'';

(xi) by amending subparagraph (K), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(K) assistance in establishing eligibility for programs of financial aid assistance for education and training programs that are not funded under this Act and are available in the local area;''; and

(xii) by inserting the following new subparagraphs after subparagraph (K), as so redesignated:

''(L) the provision of information from official publications of the Internal Revenue Service regarding Federal tax credits, available to participants in employment and training activities, and relating to education, job training, and employment;

''(M) comprehensive and specialized assessments of the skill levels and service needs of workers, which may include—

''(i) diagnostic testing and use of other assessment tools; and

''(ii) in-depth interviewing and evaluation to identify employment barriers and appropriate employment goals;

''(N) development of an individual employment plan, to identify the employment goals, appropriate achievement objectives, and appropriate combination of services for the participant;

''(O) group counseling;

''(P) individual counseling and career planning;

''(Q) case management;

''(R) short-term pre-career services, including development of learning skills, communications skills, interviewing skills, punctuality, personal maintenance skills, and professional conduct, to prepare individuals for unsubsidized employment or training;

''(S) internships and work experience;

''(T) literacy activities relating to basic work readiness, information and communication technology literacy activities, and financial literacy activities, if the activities involved are not available to participants in the local area under programs administered under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (20 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.);

''(U) out-of-area job search assistance and relocation assistance; and''; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) DELIVERY OF SERVICES.—The work ready services described in paragraph (2) shall be provided through the one-stop delivery system and may be provided through contracts with public, private for-profit, and private nonprofit service providers, approved by the local board.'';

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds described in paragraph (1)(C) shall be used to provide training services to individuals who—

''(i) after an interview, evaluation, or assessment, and case management, have been determined by a one-stop operator or one-stop partner, as appropriate, to—

''(I) be in need of training services to obtain or retain employment; and

''(II) have the skills and qualifications to successfully participate in the selected program of training services;

''(ii) select programs of training services that are directly linked to the employment opportunities in the local area involved or in another area in which the individual receiving such services are willing to commute or relocate; and

''(iii) who meet the requirements of subparagraph (B).''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''Except'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding section 479B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087uu) and except'';

(iii) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

''(D) TRAINING SERVICES.—Training services authorized under this paragraph may include—

''(i) occupational skills training;

''(ii) on-the-job training;

''(iii) skill upgrading and retraining;

''(iv) entrepreneurial training;

''(v) education activities leading to a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent in combination with, concurrently or subsequently, occupational skills training;

''(vi) adult education and family literacy education activities provided in conjunction with other training services authorized under this subparagraph;

''(vii) workplace training combined with related instruction;

''(viii) occupational skills training that incorporates English language acquisition;

''(ix) customized training conducted with a commitment by an employer or group of employers to employ an individual upon successful completion of the training; and

''(x) training programs operated by the private sector.'';

(iv) by striking subparagraph (E) and redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; and

(v) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in clause (ii)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking ''subsection (c)'' and inserting ''section 121'';

(bb) in subclause (I), by striking ''section 122(e)'' and inserting ''section 122(d)'' and by striking ''section 122(h)'' and inserting ''section 122(i)''; and

(cc) in subclause (II), by striking ''subsections (e) and (h)'' and inserting ''subsections (d) and (i)''; and

(II) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) CAREER ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNTS.—An individual who seeks training services and who is eligible pursuant to subparagraph (A), may, in consultation with a case manager, select an eligible provider of training services from the list or identifying information for providers described in clause (ii)(I). Upon such selection, the one-stop operator involved shall, to the extent practicable, refer such individual to the eligible provider of training services, and arrange for payment for such services through a career enhancement account.

''(iv) COORDINATION.—Each local board may, through one-stop centers, coordinate career enhancement accounts with other Federal, State, local, or private job training programs or sources to assist the individual in obtaining training services from (notwithstanding any provision of this title) eligible providers for those programs and sources.

''(v) ASSISTANCE.—Each local board may, through one-stop centers, assist individuals receiving career enhancement accounts in obtaining funds (in addition to the funds provided under this section) from other programs and sources that will assist the individual in obtaining training services.''; and

(vi) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''INDIVIDUAL TRAINING ACCOUNTS'' and inserting ''CAREER ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNTS'';

(II) in clause (i), by striking ''individual training accounts'' and inserting ''career enhancement accounts'';

(III) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by striking ''an individual training account'' and inserting ''a career enhancement account'';

(bb) by striking ''subparagraph (F)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (E)'';

(cc) in subclause (II), by striking ''individual training accounts'' and inserting ''career enhancement accounts'';

(dd) in subclause (II), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(ee) in subclause (III), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(ff) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) the local board determines that it would be most appropriate to award a contract to a postsecondary educational institution that has been identified as a priority eligible provider under section 117(d)(5)(B) in order to facilitate the training of multiple individuals in in-demand industries or occupations important to the State or local economy, that such contract may be used to enable the expansion of programs provided by a priority eligible provider, and that such contract does not limit customer choice.'';

(IV) in clause (iii), by striking ''adult or dislocated worker'' and inserting ''individual''; and

(V) in clause (iv)—

(aa) by redesignating subclause (IV) as subclause (V); and

(bb) by inserting after subclause (III) the following:

''(IV) Individuals with disabilities.'';

(6) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) DISCRETIONARY ONE-STOP DELIVERY ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b)(2) may be used to provide, through the one-stop delivery system—

''(i) customized screening and referral of qualified participants in training services to employers;

''(ii) customized employment-related services to employers on a fee-for-service basis;

''(iii) customer supports, including transportation and child care, to navigate among multiple services and activities for special

participant populations that face multiple barriers to employment, including individuals with disabilities;

''(iv) employment and training assistance provided in coordination with child support enforcement activities of the State agency carrying out subtitle D of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 651 et seq.);

''(v) incorporation of pay-for-performance contract strategies as an element in funding activities under this section;

''(vi) activities to facilitate remote access to services provided through a one-stop delivery system, including facilitating access through the use of technology; and

''(vii) activities to carry out business services and strategies that meet the workforce investment needs of local area employers, as determined by the local board, consistent with the local plan under section 118.'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) INCUMBENT WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The local board may use funds allocated to a local area under section 133(b)(2) to carry out incumbent worker training programs in accordance with this paragraph.

''(B) TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—The training programs for incumbent workers under this paragraph shall be carried out by the local area in conjunction with the employers of such workers for the purpose of assisting such workers in obtaining the skills necessary to retain employment and avert layoffs.

''(C) EMPLOYER MATCH REQUIRED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Employers participating in programs under this paragraph shall be required to pay a proportion of the costs of providing the training to the incumbent workers of the employers. The local board shall establish the required payment toward such costs, which may include in-kind contributions.

''(ii) CALCULATION OF MATCH.—The wages paid by an employer to a worker while they are attending training may be included as part of the required payment of the employer.''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PRIORITY FOR PLACEMENT IN PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS.—In providing employment and training activities authorized under this section, the State board and local board shall give priority to placing participants in jobs in the private sector.

''(f) VETERAN EMPLOYMENT SPECIALIST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (8), a local board shall hire and employ one or more veteran employment specialists to carry out employment, training, supportive, and placement services under this subsection in the local area served by the local board.

''(2) PRINCIPAL DUTIES.—A veteran employment specialist in a local area shall—

''(A) conduct outreach to employers in the local area to assist veterans, including disabled veterans, in gaining employment, including—

''(i) conducting seminars for employers; and

''(ii) in conjunction with employers, conducting job search workshops, and establishing job search groups; and

''(B) facilitate the furnishing of employment, training, supportive, and placement services to veterans, including disabled and homeless veterans, in the local area.

''(3) HIRING PREFERENCE FOR VETERANS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH EXPERTISE IN SERVING VETERANS.—Subject to paragraph (8), a local board shall, to the maximum extent practicable, employ veterans or individuals with expertise in serving veterans to carry out the services described in paragraph (2) in the local area served by the local board. In hiring an individual to serve as a veteran employment specialist, a local board shall give preference to veterans and other individuals in the following order:

''(A) To service-connected disabled veterans.

''(B) If no veteran described in subparagraph (A) is available, to veterans.

''(C) If no veteran described in subparagraph (A) or (B) is available, to any member of the Armed Forces transitioning out of military service.

''(D) If no veteran or member described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) is available, to any spouse of a veteran or a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces transitioning out of military service.

''(E) If no veteran or member described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) is available and no spouse described in paragraph (D) is available, to any other individuals with expertise in serving veterans.

''(4) ADMINISTRATION AND REPORTING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each veteran employment specialist shall be administratively responsible to the one-stop operator of the one-stop center in the local area and shall provide, at a minimum, quarterly reports to the one-stop operator of such center and to the Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training for the State on the specialist's performance, and compliance by the specialist with Federal law (including regulations), with respect to the—

''(i) principal duties (including facilitating the furnishing of services) for veterans described in paragraph (2); and

''(ii) hiring preferences described in paragraph (3) for veterans and other individuals.

''(B) REPORT TO SECRETARY.—Each State shall submit to the Secretary an annual report on the qualifications used by each local board in the State in making hiring determinations for a veteran employment specialist and the salary structure under which such specialist is compensated.

''(C) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate an annual report summarizing the reports submitted under subparagraph (B), and including summaries of outcomes achieved by participating veterans, disaggregated by local areas.

''(5) PART-TIME EMPLOYEES.—A part-time veteran employment specialist shall perform the functions of a veteran employment specialist under this subsection on a halftime basis.

''(6) TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—Each veteran employment specialist described in paragraph (2) shall satisfactorily complete training provided by the National Veterans' Employment and Training Institute during the 3-year period that begins on the date on which the employee is so assigned.

''(7) SPECIALIST'S DUTIES.—A full-time veteran employment specialist shall perform only duties related to employment, training, supportive, and placement services under this subsection, and shall not perform other non-veteran-related duties if such duties detract from the specialist's ability to perform the specialist's duties related to employment, training, supportive, and placement services under this subsection.

''(8) STATE OPTION.—At the request of a local board, a State may opt to assume the duties assigned to the local board under paragraphs (1) and (3), including the hiring and employment of one or more veteran employment specialists for placement in the local area served by the local board.''.

SEC. 223. PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.

Section 136 (29 U.S.C. 2871) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraphs (1) and (2) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For each State, the State performance measures shall consist of—

''(A)(i) the core indicators of performance described in paragraph (2)(A); and

''(ii) additional indicators of performance (if any) identified by the State under paragraph (2)(B); and

''(B) a State adjusted level of performance for each indicator described in subparagraph (A).

''(2) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

''(A) CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The core indicators of performance for the program of employment and training activities authorized under sections 132(a)(2) and 134, the program of adult education and family literacy education activities authorized under title II, and the program authorized under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 720 et seq.), other than section 112 or part C of that title (29 U.S.C. 732, 741), shall consist of the following indicators of performance (with performance determined in the aggregate and as disaggregated by the populations identified in the State and local plan in each case):

''(I) The percentage and number of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second full calendar quarter after exit from the program.

''(II) The percentage and number of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth full calendar quarter after exit from the program.

''(III) The difference in the median earnings of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second full calendar quarter after exit from the program, compared to the median earnings of such participants prior to participation in such program.

''(IV) The percentage and number of program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential (such as an industry-recognized credential or a certificate from a registered apprenticeship program), or a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent (subject to clause (ii)), during participation in or within 1 year after exit from the program.

''(V) The percentage and number of program participants who, during a program year—

''(aa) are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential (such as an industry-recognized credential or a certificate from a registered apprenticeship program), a certificate from an on-the-job training program, a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or unsubsidized employment; and

''(bb) are achieving measurable basic skill gains toward such a credential, certificate, diploma, or employment.

''(VI) The percentage and number of program participants who obtain unsubsidized employment in the field relating to the training services described in section 134(c)(4) that such participants received.

''(ii) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), program participants who obtain a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted as meeting the criterion under such clause

only if such participants (in addition to obtaining such diploma or its recognized equivalent), within 1 year after exit from the program, have obtained or retained employment, have been removed from public assistance, or have begun an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential.

''(B) ADDITIONAL INDICATORS.—A State may identify in the State plan additional indicators for workforce investment activities authorized under this subtitle.''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the heading, by striking ''AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INDICATOR'';

(II) in clause (i), by striking ''and the customer satisfaction indicator described in paragraph (2)(B)'';

(III) in clause (ii), by striking ''and the customer satisfaction indicator of performance, for the first 3'' and inserting '', for all 3'';

(IV) in clause (iii)—

(aa) in the heading, by striking ''FOR FIRST 3 YEARS''; and

(bb) by striking ''and the customer satisfaction indicator of performance, for the first 3 program years'' and inserting ''for all 3 program years'';

(V) in clause (iv)—

(aa) by striking ''or (v)'';

(bb) by striking subclause (I) and redesignating subclauses (II) and (III) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively; and

(cc) in subclause (I) (as so redesignated)—

(AA) by inserting '', such as unemployment rates and job losses or gains in particular industries'' after ''economic conditions''; and

(BB) by inserting '', such as indicators of poor work experience, dislocation from high-wage employment, low levels of literacy or English proficiency, disability status (including disability status among veterans), and welfare dependency,'' after ''program'';

(VI) by striking clause (v) and redesignating clause (vi) as clause (v); and

(VII) in clause (v) (as so redesignated),

(aa) by striking ''described in clause (iv)(II)'' and inserting ''described in clause (iv)(I)''; and

(bb) by striking ''or (v)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''paragraph (2)(C)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)(B)'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending clause (i) of paragraph (1)(A) to read as follows:

''(i) the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(2)(A) for activities described in such subsection, other than statewide workforce investment activities; and'';

(B) in clause (ii) of paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''(b)(2)(C)'' and inserting ''(b)(2)(B)''; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) DETERMINATIONS.—In determining such local levels of performance, the local board, the chief elected official, and the Governor shall ensure such levels are adjusted based on the specific economic conditions (such as unemployment rates and job losses or gains in particular industries), or demographic characteristics or other characteristics of the population to be served, in the local area.'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''127 or'';

(ii) by striking ''and the customer satisfaction indicator'' each place it appears; and

(iii) in the last sentence, by inserting before the period the following: '', and on the amount and percentage of the State's annual allotment under section 132 the State spends on administrative costs and on the amount and percentage of its annual allocation under section 133 each local area in the State spends on administrative costs'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (A);

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (B);

(iv) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking ''(excluding participants who received only self-service and informational activities)''; and

(II) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(v) by striking subparagraph (F);

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) with respect to each local area in the State—

''(i) the number of individuals who received work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) and the number of individuals who received training services described in section 134(c)(4), during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 program years, disaggregated (for individuals who received work ready services) by the type of entity that provided the work ready services and disaggregated (for individuals who received training services) by the type of entity that provided the training services, and the amount of funds spent on each of the 2 types of services during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 fiscal years;

''(ii) the number of individuals who successfully exited out of work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) and the number of individuals who exited out of training services described in section 134(c)(4), during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 program years, disaggregated (for individuals who received work ready services) by the type of entity that provided the work ready services and disaggregated (for individuals who received training services) by the type of entity that provided the training services; and

''(iii) the average cost per participant of those individuals who received work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) and the average cost per participant of those individuals who received training services described in section 134(c)(4), during the most recent program year and fiscal year, and the preceding 5 program years, disaggregated (for individuals who received work ready services) by the type of entity that provided the work ready services and disaggregated (for individuals who received training services) by the type of entity that provided the training services; and

''(D) the amount of funds spent on training services and discretionary activities described in section 134(d), disaggregated by the populations identified under section 112(b)(16)(A)(iv) and section 118(b)(10).'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''through publication'' and inserting ''through electronic means''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) DATA VALIDATION.—In preparing the reports described in this subsection, each State shall establish procedures, consistent with guidelines issued by the Secretary, to ensure the information contained in the reports is valid and reliable.

''(5) STATE AND LOCAL POLICIES.—

''(A) STATE POLICIES.—Each State that receives an allotment under section 132 shall maintain a central repository of policies related to access, eligibility, availability of services, and other matters, and plans approved by the State board and make such repository available to the public, including by electronic means.

''(B) LOCAL POLICIES.—Each local area that receives an allotment under section 133 shall maintain a central repository of policies related to access, eligibility, availability of services, and other matters, and plans approved by the local board and make such repository available to the public, including by electronic means.'';

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or (B)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''may reduce by not more than 5 percent,'' and inserting ''shall reduce''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) FUNDS RESULTING FROM REDUCED ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall return to the Treasury the amount retained, as a result of a reduction in an allotment to a State made under paragraph (1)(B).'';

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or (B)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by amending the matter preceding clause (i) to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If such failure continues for a second consecutive year, the Governor shall take corrective actions, including the development of a reorganization plan. Such plan shall—'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following:

''(B) REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF GRANT.—If such failure continues for a third consecutive year, the Governor shall reduce the amount of the grant that would (in the absence of this subparagraph) be payable to the local area under such program for the program year after such third consecutive year. Such penalty shall be based on the degree of failure to meet local levels of performance.'';

(iv) in subparagraph (C)(i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''a reorganization plan under subparagraph (A) may, not later than 30 days after receiving notice of the reorganization plan, appeal to the Governor to rescind or revise such plan'' and inserting ''corrective action under subparagraph (A) or (B) may, not later than 30 days after receiving notice of the action, appeal to the Governor to rescind or revise such action''; and

(v) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subparagraph (B)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subparagraph (C)'';

(6) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''subsection (b)(2)(C)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)(B)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''(b)(3)(A)(vi)'' and inserting ''(b)(3)(A)(v)'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the activities described in section 502 concerning''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''described in paragraph (1) and in the activities described in section 502'' and inserting ''and activities described in this subsection''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(j) USE OF CORE INDICATORS FOR OTHER PROGRAMS.—Consistent with the requirements of the applicable authorizing laws, the Secretary shall use the core indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(2)(A) to assess the effectiveness of the programs described in section 121(b)(1)(B) (in addition to the programs carried out under chapter 5) that are carried out by the Secretary.

''(k) ESTABLISHING PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the discretion of the Governor of a State, a State may establish an incentive system for local boards to implement pay-for-performance contract strategies for the delivery of employment and training activities in the local areas served by the local boards.

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—A State that establishes a pay-for-performance incentive system shall reserve not more than 10 percent of the total amount allotted to the State under section 132(b)(2) for a fiscal year to provide funds to local areas in the State whose local boards have implemented a pay-for-performance contract strategy.

''(3) EVALUATIONS.—A State described in paragraph (2) shall use funds reserved by the State under section 133(a)(1) to evaluate the return on investment of pay-for-performance contract strategies implemented by local boards in the State.''.

SEC. 224. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 137 (29 U.S.C. 2872) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 137. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the activities described in section 132, $5,945,639,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.''.

CHAPTER 3—JOB CORPS

SEC. 226. JOB CORPS PURPOSES.

Paragraph (1) of section 141 (29 U.S.C. 2881(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) to maintain a national Job Corps program for at-risk youth, carried out in partnership with States and communities, to assist eligible youth to connect to the workforce by providing them with intensive academic, career and technical education, and service-learning opportunities, in residential and nonresidential centers, in order for such youth to obtain regular secondary school diplomas and recognized postsecondary credentials leading to successful careers in in-demand industries that will result in opportunities for advancement;''.

SEC. 227. JOB CORPS DEFINITIONS.

Section 142 (29 U.S.C. 2882) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''APPLICABLE ONE-STOP'' and inserting ''ONE-STOP'';

(B) by striking ''applicable'';

(C) by striking ''customer service''; and

(D) by striking ''intake'' and inserting ''assessment'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''before completing the requirements'' and all that follows and inserting ''prior to becoming a graduate.''; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking ''has completed the requirements'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''who, as a result of participation in the Job Corps program, has received a regular secondary school diploma, completed the requirements of a career and technical education and training program, or received, or is making satisfactory progress (as defined under section 484(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(c))) toward receiving, a recognized postsecondary credential (including an industry-recognized credential) that prepares individuals for employment leading to economic self-sufficiency.''.

SEC. 228. INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS.

Section 144 (29 U.S.C. 2884) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) not less than age 16 and not more than age 24 on the date of enrollment;'';

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by inserting ''secondary'' before ''school''; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(E), by striking ''vocational'' and inserting ''career and technical education and''.

SEC. 229. RECRUITMENT, SCREENING, SELECTION, AND ASSIGNMENT OF ENROLLEES.

Section 145 (29 U.S.C. 2885) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C)(i) by striking ''vocational'' and inserting ''career and technical education and training''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''To the extent practicable, the'' and inserting ''The'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''applicable''; and

(II) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon;

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C); and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) organizations that have a demonstrated record of effectiveness in placing at-risk youth into employment.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''and agrees to such rules'' after ''failure to observe the rules''; and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) the individual has passed a background check conducted in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, which shall include—

''(i) a search of the State criminal registry or repository in the State where the individual resides and each State where the individual previously resided;

''(ii) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases in the State where the individual resides and each State where the individual previously resided;

''(iii) a search of the National Crime Information Center;

''(iv) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

''(v) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.).''; and

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

''(3) INDIVIDUALS CONVICTED OF A CRIME.—An individual shall be ineligible for enrollment if the individual—

''(A) makes a false statement in connection with the criminal background check described in paragraph (1)(C);

''(B) is registered or is required to be registered on a State sex offender registry or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); or

''(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

''(i) homicide;

''(ii) child abuse or neglect;

''(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

''(iv) a crime involving rape or sexual assault; or

''(v) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed within the past 5 years.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''2 years'' and inserting ''year''; and

(ii) by striking ''an assignment'' and inserting ''a''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking '', every 2 years,'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by inserting ''the education and training'' after ''including''; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) the performance of the Job Corps center relating to the indicators described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in section 159(c), and whether any actions have been taken with respect to such center pursuant to section 159(f).''; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''is closest to the home of the enrollee, except that the'' and inserting ''offers the type of career and technical education and training selected by the individual and, among the centers that offer such education and training, is closest to the home of the individual. The'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''that offers the career and technical education and training desired by'' after ''home of the enrollee''.

SEC. 230. JOB CORPS CENTERS.

Section 147 (29 U.S.C. 2887) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''vocational'' both places it appears and inserting ''career and technical''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''subsections (c) and (d) of section 303 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253)'' and inserting ''subsections (a) and (b) of section 3304 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(II) by striking ''industry council'' and inserting ''workforce council'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(I) by amending subclause (II) to read as follows:

''(II) the ability of the entity to offer career and technical education and training that the workforce council proposes under section 154(c);'';

(II) in subclause (III), by striking ''is familiar with the surrounding communities, applicable'' and inserting ''demonstrates relationships with the surrounding communities, employers, workforce boards,'' and by striking ''and'' at the end;

(III) by amending subclause (IV) to read as follows:

''(IV) the performance of the entity, if any, relating to operating or providing activities described in this subtitle to a Job Corps center, including the entity's demonstrated effectiveness in assisting individuals in achieving the primary and secondary indicators of performance described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 159(c); and''; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

''(V) the ability of the entity to demonstrate a record of successfully assisting at-risk youth to connect to the workforce, including by providing them with intensive academic, and career and technical education and training.''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(I) by striking '', as appropriate''; and

(II) by striking ''through (IV)'' and inserting ''through (V)'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''In any year, no more than 20 percent of the individuals enrolled in the Job Corps may be nonresidential participants in the Job Corps.'';

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Job Corps centers may include Civilian Conservation Centers, operated under an agreement between the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture, that are located primarily in rural areas. Such centers shall adhere to all the provisions of this subtitle, and shall provide, in addition to education, career and technical education and training, and workforce preparation skills training described in section 148, programs of work experience to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to develop community projects in the public interest.

''(2) SELECTION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall select an entity that submits an application under subsection (d) to operate a Civilian Conservation Center on a competitive basis, as provided in subsection (a).''; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to operate a Job Corps center under this subtitle, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

''(1) a description of the program activities that will be offered at the center, including how the career and technical education and training reflect State and local employment opportunities, including in in-demand industries;

''(2) a description of the counseling, placement, and support activities that will be offered at the center, including a description of the strategies and procedures the entity will use to place graduates into unsubsidized employment upon completion of the program;

''(3) a description of the demonstrated record of effectiveness that the entity has in placing at-risk youth into employment, including past performance of operating a Job Corps center under this subtitle;

''(4) a description of the relationships that the entity has developed with State and local workforce boards, employers, State and local educational agencies, and the surrounding communities in an effort to promote a comprehensive statewide workforce investment system;

''(5) a description of the strong fiscal controls the entity has in place to ensure proper accounting of Federal funds, and a description of how the entity will meet the requirements of section 159(a);

''(6) a description of the strategies and policies the entity will utilize to reduce participant costs;

''(7) a description of the steps taken to control costs in accordance with section 159(a)(3);

''(8) a detailed budget of the activities that will be supported using funds under this subtitle;

''(9) a detailed budget of the activities that will be supported using funds from non-Federal resources;

''(10) an assurance the entity will comply with the administrative cost limitation included in section 151(c);

''(11) an assurance the entity is licensed to operate in the State in which the center is located; and

''(12) an assurance the entity will comply with and meet basic health and safety codes, including those measures described in section 152(b).

''(e) LENGTH OF AGREEMENT.—The agreement described in subsection (a)(1)(A) shall be for not longer than a 2-year period. The Secretary may renew the agreement for 3 1-year periods if the entity meets the requirements of subsection (f).

''(f) RENEWAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may renew the terms of an agreement described in subsection (a)(1)(A) for an entity to operate a Job Corps center if the center meets or exceeds each of the indicators of performance described in section 159(c)(1).

''(2) RECOMPETITION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary shall not renew the terms of the agreement for an entity to operate a Job Corps center if such center is ranked in the bottom quintile of centers described in section 159(f)(2) for any program year. Such entity may submit a new application under subsection (d) only if such center has shown significant improvement on the indicators of performance described in section 159(c)(1) over the last program year.

''(B) VIOLATIONS.—The Secretary shall not select an entity to operate a Job Corps center if such entity or such center has been found to have a systemic or substantial material failure that involves—

''(i) a threat to the health, safety, or civil rights of program participants or staff;

''(ii) the misuse of funds received under this subtitle;

''(iii) loss of legal status or financial viability, loss of permits, debarment from receiving Federal grants or contracts, or the improper use of Federal funds;

''(iv) failure to meet any other Federal or State requirement that the entity has shown an unwillingness or inability to correct, after notice from the Secretary, within the period specified; or

''(v) an unresolved area of noncompliance.

''(g) CURRENT GRANTEES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act and notwithstanding any previous grant award or renewals of such award under this subtitle, the Secretary shall require all entities operating a Job Corps center under this subtitle to submit an application under subsection (d) to carry out the requirements of this section.''.

SEC. 231. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.

Section 148 (29 U.S.C. 2888) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) ACTIVITIES PROVIDED THROUGH JOB CORPS CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Job Corps center shall provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized, and supervised program of education, career and technical education and training, work experience, recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. Each Job Corps center shall provide enrollees assigned to the center with access to work ready services described in section 134(c)(2).

''(2) RELATIONSHIP TO OPPORTUNITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The activities provided under this subsection shall be targeted to helping enrollees, on completion of their enrollment—

''(i) secure and maintain meaningful unsubsidized employment;

''(ii) complete secondary education and obtain a regular secondary school diploma;

''(iii) enroll in and complete postsecondary education or training programs, including obtaining recognized postsecondary credentials (such as industry-recognized credentials and certificates from registered apprenticeship programs); or

''(iv) satisfy Armed Forces requirements.

''(B) LINK TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.—The career and technical education and training provided shall be linked to the employment opportunities in in-demand industries in the State in which the Job Corps center is located.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL'' and inserting ''ACADEMIC AND CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND'';

(B) by striking ''may'' after ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(C) by striking ''vocational'' each place it appears and inserting ''career and technical''; and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) of subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(3) DEMONSTRATION.—Each year, any operator seeking to enroll additional enrollees in an advanced career training program shall demonstrate, before the operator may carry out such additional enrollment, that—

''(A) participants in such program have achieved a satisfactory rate of completion and placement in training-related jobs; and

''(B) such operator has met or exceeded the indicators of performance described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 159(c) for the previous year.''.

SEC. 232. COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT.

Section 149 (29 U.S.C. 2889) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''vocational'' and inserting ''career and technical education and'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''make every effort to arrange to''; and

(B) by striking ''to assist'' and inserting ''assist''; and

(3) by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 233. SUPPORT.

Subsection (b) of section 150 (29 U.S.C. 2890) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) TRANSITION ALLOWANCES AND SUPPORT FOR GRADUATES.—The Secretary shall arrange for a transition allowance to be paid to graduates. The transition allowance shall be incentive-based to reflect a graduate's completion of academic, career and technical education or training, and attainment of a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential.''.

SEC. 234. OPERATIONS.

Section 151 (29 U.S.C. 2891) is amended—

(1) in the header, by striking ''**OPERATING PLAN**.'' and inserting ''**OPERATIONS**.'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''IN GENERAL.—'' and inserting ''OPERATING PLAN.—'';

(3) by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(4) by amending subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading by inserting ''OF OPERATING PLAN'' after ''AVAILABILITY''; and

(B) by striking ''subsections (a) and (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 10 percent of the funds allotted under section 147 to an entity selected to operate a Job Corps center may be used by the entity for administrative costs under this subtitle.''.

SEC. 235. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.

Section 153 (29 U.S.C. 2893) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 153. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.

''The director of each Job Corps center shall encourage and cooperate in activities to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers in the State and nearby communities. Such activities may include the use of any local workforce development boards established under section 117 to provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest.''.

SEC. 236. WORKFORCE COUNCILS.

Section 154 (29 U.S.C. 2894) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 154. WORKFORCE COUNCILS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each Job Corps center shall have a workforce council appointed by

the Governor of the State in which the Job Corps center is located.

''(b) WORKFORCE COUNCIL COMPOSITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A workforce council shall be comprised of—

''(A) business members of the State board described in section 111(b)(1)(B)(i);

''(B) business members of the local boards described in section 117(b)(2)(A) located in the State;

''(C) a representative of the State board described in section 111(f); and

''(D) such other representatives and State agency officials as the Governor may designate.

''(2) MAJORITY.—A ⅔ majority of the members of the workforce council shall be representatives described in paragraph (1)(A).

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the workforce council shall be—

''(1) to review all the relevant labor market information, including related information in the State plan described in section 112, to—

''(A) determine the in-demand industries in the State in which enrollees intend to seek employment after graduation;

''(B) determine the skills and education that are necessary to obtain the employment opportunities described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) determine the type or types of career and technical education and training that will be implemented at the center to enable the enrollees to obtain the employment opportunities; and

''(2) to meet at least once a year to reevaluate the labor market information, and other relevant information, to determine any necessary changes in the career and technical education and training provided at the center.''.

SEC. 237. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 156 (29 U.S.C. 2896) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 156. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO CENTERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—From the funds reserved under section 132(a)(3), the Secretary shall provide, directly or through grants, contracts, or other agreements or arrangements as the Secretary considers appropriate, technical assistance and training for the Job Corps program for the purposes of improving program quality.

''(b) ACTIVITIES.—In providing training and technical assistance and for allocating resources for such assistance, the Secretary shall—

''(1) assist entities, including those entities not currently operating a Job Corps center, in developing the application described in section 147(d);

''(2) assist Job Corps centers and programs in correcting deficiencies and violations under this subtitle;

''(3) assist Job Corps centers and programs in meeting or exceeding the indicators of performance described in paragraph (1) and (2) of section 159(c); and

''(4) assist Job Corps centers and programs in the development of sound management practices, including financial management procedures.''.

SEC. 238. SPECIAL PROVISIONS.

Section 158(c)(1) (29 U.S.C. 2989(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481 et seq.)'' and inserting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

SEC. 239. PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY MANAGEMENT.

Section 159 (29 U.S.C. 2899) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**MANAGEMENT INFORMATION**'' and inserting ''**PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY AND MANAGEMENT**'';

(2) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', or operating costs for such centers result in a budgetary shortfall'';

(3) by striking subsections (c) through (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

''(1) PRIMARY INDICATORS.—The annual primary indicators of performance for Job Corps centers shall include—

''(A) the percentage and number of enrollees who graduate from the Job Corps center;

''(B) the percentage and number of graduates who entered unsubsidized employment related to the career and technical education and training received through the Job Corps center, except that such calculation shall not include enrollment in education, the military, or volunteer service;

''(C) the percentage and number of graduates who obtained a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential or a certificate from a registered apprenticeship program; and

''(D) the cost per successful performance outcome, which is calculated by comparing the number of graduates who were placed in unsubsidized employment or obtained a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential, to total program costs, including all operations, construction, and administration costs at each Job Corps center.

''(2) SECONDARY INDICATORS.—The annual secondary indicators of performance for Job Corps centers shall include—

''(A) the percentage and number of graduates who entered unsubsidized employment not related to the career and technical education and training received through the Job Corps center;

''(B) the percentage and number of graduates who entered into postsecondary education;

''(C) the percentage and number of graduates who entered into the military;

''(D) the average wage of graduates who are in unsubsidized employment—

''(i) on the first day of employment; and

''(ii) 6 months after the first day;

''(E) the number and percentage of graduates who entered unsubsidized employment and were retained in the unsubsidized employment—

''(i) 6 months after the first day of employment; and

''(ii) 12 months after the first day of employment;

''(F) the percentage and number of enrollees compared to the percentage and number of enrollees the Secretary has established as targets in section 145(c)(1);

''(G) the cost per training slot, which is calculated by comparing the program's maximum number of enrollees that can be enrolled in a Job Corps center at any given time during the program year to the number of enrollees in the same program year; and

''(H) the number and percentage of former enrollees, including the number dismissed under the zero tolerance policy described in section 152(b).

''(3) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE FOR RECRUITERS.—The annual indicators of performance for recruiters shall include the measurements described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H) of paragraph (2).

''(4) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE OF CAREER TRANSITION SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The annual indicators of performance of career transition service providers shall include the measurements described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) and subparagraphs, (B), (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (2).

''(d) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall collect, and submit in the report described in subsection (f), information on the performance of each Job Corps center, and the Job Corps program, regarding—

''(1) the number and percentage of former enrollees who obtained a regular secondary school diploma;

''(2) the number and percentage of former enrollees who entered unsubsidized employment;

''(3) the number and percentage of former enrollees who obtained a recognized postsecondary credential, including an industry-recognized credential;

''(4) the number and percentage of former enrollees who entered into military service; and

''(5) any additional information required by the Secretary.

''(e) METHODS.—The Secretary shall collect the information described in subsections (c) and (d), using methods described in section 136(f)(2) and consistent with State law, by entering into agreements with the States to access such data for Job Corps enrollees, former enrollees, and graduates.

''(f) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—

''(1) REPORT.—The Secretary shall collect and annually submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, and make available to the public by electronic means, a report containing—

''(A) information on the performance of each Job Corps center, and the Job Corps program, on the performance indicators described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c);

''(B) a comparison of each Job Corps center, by rank, on the performance indicators described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c);

''(C) a comparison of each Job Corps center, by rank, on the average performance of all primary indicators described in paragraph (1) of subsection (c);

''(D) information on the performance of the service providers described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c) on the performance indicators established under such paragraphs; and

''(E) a comparison of each service provider, by rank, on the performance of all service providers described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c) on the performance indicators established under such paragraphs.

''(2) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an annual assessment of the performance of each Job Corps center which shall include information on the Job Corps centers that—

''(A) are ranked in the bottom 10 percent on the performance indicator described in paragraph (1)(C); or

''(B) have failed a safety and health code review described in subsection (g).

''(3) PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT.—With respect to a Job Corps center that is identified under paragraph (2) or reports less than 50 percent on the performance indicators described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (c)(1), the Secretary shall develop and implement a 1 year performance improvement plan. Such a plan shall require action including—

''(A) providing technical assistance to the center;

''(B) changing the management staff of the center;

''(C) replacing the operator of the center;

''(D) reducing the capacity of the center; or

''(E) closing the center.

''(4) CLOSURE OF JOB CORPS CENTERS.—Job Corps centers that have been identified under paragraph (2) for more than 4 consecutive years shall be closed. The Secretary shall ensure—

''(A) that the proposed decision to close the center is announced in advance to the

general public through publication in the Federal Register and other appropriate means; and

''(B) the establishment of a reasonable comment period, not to exceed 30 days, for interested individuals to submit written comments to the Secretary.

''(g) PARTICIPANT HEALTH AND SAFETY.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the General Services Administration or the appropriate State agency responsible for inspecting public buildings and safeguarding the health of disadvantaged students, to conduct an in-person review of the physical condition and health-related activities of each Job Corps center annually. Such review shall include a passing rate of occupancy under Federal and State ordinances.''.

CHAPTER 4—NATIONAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 241. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 170 (29 U.S.C. 2915) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) by striking:

''(a) GENERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—'';

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subsections (a), (b), and (c) respectively, and moving such subsections 2 ems to the left, and conforming the casing style of the headings of such subsections to the casing style of the heading of subsection (d), as added by paragraph (7) of this section;

(4) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by inserting ''the training of staff providing rapid response services and additional assistance, the training of other staff of recipients of funds under this title, assistance regarding accounting and program operation practices (when such assistance would not be duplicative to assistance provided by the State), technical assistance to States that do not meet State performance measures described in section 136,'' after ''localities,''; and

(B) by striking ''from carrying out activities'' and all that follows up to the period and inserting ''to implement the amendments made by the SKILLS Act'';

(5) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)'';

(B) by striking '', or recipient of financial assistance under any of sections 166 through 169,''; and

(C) by striking ''or grant recipient'';

(6) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(7) by inserting, after subsection (c) (as so redesignated), the following:

''(d) BEST PRACTICES COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) establish a system through which States may share information regarding best practices with regard to the operation of workforce investment activities under this Act; and

''(2) evaluate and disseminate information regarding best practices and identify knowledge gaps.''.

SEC. 242. EVALUATIONS.

Section 172 (29 U.S.C. 2917) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''the Secretary shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs and activities, including those programs and activities carried out under section 171'' and inserting ''the Secretary, through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, shall conduct, at least once every 5 years, an independent evaluation of the programs and activities funded under this Act'';

(2) by amending subsection (a)(4) to read as follows:

''(4) the impact of receiving services and not receiving services under such programs and activities on the community, businesses, and individuals;'';

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) TECHNIQUES.—Evaluations conducted under this section shall utilize appropriate and rigorous methodology and research designs, including the use of control groups chosen by scientific random assignment methodologies, quasi-experimental methods, impact analysis and the use of administrative data. The Secretary shall conduct an impact analysis, as described in subsection (a)(4), of the formula grant program under subtitle B not later than 2016, and thereafter shall conduct such an analysis not less than once every 4 years.'';

(4) in subsection (e), by striking ''the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate'' and inserting ''the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate'';

(5) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR LATE REPORTING.—If a report required to be transmitted to Congress under this section is not transmitted on or before the time period specified for that report, amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title shall be reduced by 10 percent for the fiscal year that begins after the date on which the final report required under this section is required to be transmitted and reduced by an additional 10 percent each subsequent fiscal year until each such report is transmitted to Congress.''; and

(6) by adding at the end, the following:

''(h) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The results of the evaluations conducted under this section shall be made publicly available, including by posting such results on the Department's website.''.

CHAPTER 5—ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 246. REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS.

Section 181 (29 U.S.C. 2931) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6), by striking '', including representatives of businesses and of labor organizations,'';

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''may'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking ''training for'' and inserting ''the entry into employment, retention in employment, or increases in earnings of''; and

(B) by striking ''subtitle B'' and inserting ''this Act'';

(4) in subsection (f)(4), by striking ''134(a)(3)(B)'' and inserting ''133(a)(4)''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) SALARY AND BONUS LIMITATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds provided under this title shall be used by a recipient or subrecipient of such funds to pay the salary and bonuses of an individual, either as direct costs or indirect costs, at a rate in excess of the rate prescribed in level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) VENDORS.—The limitation described in paragraph (1) shall not apply to vendors providing goods and services as defined in OMB Circular A–133.

''(3) LOWER LIMIT.—In a case in which a State is a recipient of such funds, the State may establish a lower limit than is provided in paragraph (1) for salaries and bonuses of those receiving salaries and bonuses from a subrecipient of such funds, taking into account factors including the relative cost of living in the State, the compensation levels for comparable State or local government employees, and the size of the organizations that administer the Federal programs involved.

''(h) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor (referred to in this Act as the 'Administration') shall administer all programs authorized under title I and the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.). The Administration shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Except for title II and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), the Administration shall be the principal agency, and the Assistant Secretary shall be the principal officer, of such Department for carrying out this Act.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Assistant Secretary shall be an individual with substantial experience in workforce development and in workforce development management. The Assistant Secretary shall also, to the maximum extent possible, possess knowledge and have worked in or with the State or local workforce investment system or have been a member of the business community.

''(3) FUNCTIONS.—In the performance of the functions of the office, the Assistant Secretary shall be directly responsible to the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of Labor, as determined by the Secretary. The functions of the Assistant Secretary shall not be delegated to any officer not directly responsible, both with respect to program operation and administration, to the Assistant Secretary. Any reference in this Act to duties to be carried out by the Assistant Secretary shall be considered to be a reference to duties to be carried out by the Secretary acting through the Assistant Secretary.''.

SEC. 247. PROMPT ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

Section 182 (29 U.S.C. 2932) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''127 or''; and

(B) by striking '', except that'' and all that follows and inserting a period; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking ''sections 128 and 133'' and inserting ''section 133''; and

(B) by striking ''127 or''.

SEC. 248. FISCAL CONTROLS; SANCTIONS.

Section 184(a)(2) (29 U.S.C. 2934(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A)'' and all that follows through ''Each'' and inserting ''Each''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

SEC. 249. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 185 (29 U.S.C. 2935) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) shall have the option to submit or disseminate electronically any reports, records, plans, or other data that are required to be collected or disseminated under this title.''; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by inserting ''and the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate,'' after ''Secretary,''.

SEC. 250. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

Section 189 (29 U.S.C. 2939) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations for any fiscal year for programs and activities carried out under this title shall be available for obligation only on the basis of a program year. The program year shall begin on October 1 in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''each State'' and inserting ''each recipient (except

as otherwise provided in this paragraph)''; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking ''171 or'';

(2) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2);

(C) by amending paragraph (2)(A), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period at the end;

(ii) by striking ''requirements of subparagraph (B)'' and all that follows through ''any of the statutory or regulatory requirements of subtitle B'' and inserting ''requirements of subparagraph (B) or (D), any of the statutory or regulatory requirements of subtitle B''; and

(iii) by striking clause (ii); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) EXPEDITED PROCESS FOR EXTENDING APPROVED WAIVERS TO ADDITIONAL STATES.—The Secretary may establish an expedited procedure for the purpose of extending to additional States the waiver of statutory or regulatory requirements that have been approved for a State pursuant to a request under subparagraph (B), in lieu of requiring the additional States to meet the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C). Such procedure shall ensure that the extension of such a waiver to additional States is accompanied by appropriate conditions relating to the implementation of such waiver.

''(E) EXTERNAL CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall not require or impose new or additional requirements, that are not specified under this Act, on a State in exchange for providing a waiver to the State or a local area in the State under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 251. STATE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY.

Section 191(a) (29 U.S.C. 2941(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''consistent with the provisions of this title'' and inserting ''consistent with State law and the provisions of this title''; and

(2) by striking ''consistent with the terms and conditions required under this title'' and inserting ''consistent with State law and the terms and conditions required under this title''.

SEC. 252. GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 195 (29 U.S.C. 2945) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by inserting at the end the following:

''(D) Funds received under a program by a public or private nonprofit entity that are not described in subparagraph (B), such as funds privately raised from philanthropic foundations, businesses, or other private entities, shall not be considered to be income under this title and shall not be subject to the requirements of this paragraph.'';

(2) by striking paragraph (9);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (13) as paragraphs (9) through (12), respectively;

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(13) Funds provided under this title shall not be used to establish or operate standalone fee-for-service enterprises that compete with private sector employment agencies within the meaning of section 701(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(c)), except that for purposes of this paragraph, such an enterprise does not include a one-stop center.

''(14) Any report required to be submitted to Congress, or to a Committee of Congress, under this title shall be submitted to both the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.''.

SEC. 253. FEDERAL AGENCY STAFF AND RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL AND LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

Subtitle E of title I (29 U.S.C. 2931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

''SEC. 196. FEDERAL AGENCY STAFF.

''The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

''(1) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the SKILLS Act—

''(A) identify the number of Federal government employees who, on the day before the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act, worked on or administered each of the programs and activities that were authorized under this Act or were authorized under a provision listed in section 401 of the SKILLS Act; and

''(B) identify the number of full-time equivalent employees who on the day before that date of enactment, worked on or administered each of the programs and activities described in subparagraph (A), on functions for which the authorizing provision has been repealed, or for which an amount has been consolidated (if such employee is in a duplicate position), on or after such date of enactment;

''(2) not later than 90 after such date of enactment, publish the information described in paragraph (1) on the Office of Management and Budget website; and

''(3) not later than 1 year after such date of enactment—

''(A) reduce the workforce of the Federal Government by the number of full-time equivalent employees identified under paragraph (1)(B); and

''(B) submit to Congress a report on how the Director carried out the requirements of subparagraph (A).

''SEC. 197. RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

''(a) LOBBYING RESTRICTIONS.—

''(1) PUBLICITY RESTRICTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), no funds provided under this Act shall be used or proposed for use, for—

''(i) publicity or propaganda purposes; or

''(ii) the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, electronic communication, radio, television, or video presentation designed to support or defeat the enactment of legislation before the Congress or any State or local legislature or legislative body.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to—

''(i) normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships;

''(ii) the preparation, distribution, or use of the materials described in subparagraph (A)(ii) in presentation to the Congress or any State or local legislature or legislative body (except that this subparagraph does not apply with respect to such preparation, distribution, or use in presentation to the executive branch of any State or local government); or

''(iii) such preparation, distribution, or use of such materials, that are designed to support or defeat any proposed or pending regulation, administrative action, or order issued by the executive branch of any State or local government.

''(2) SALARY PAYMENT RESTRICTION.—No funds provided under this Act shall be used, or proposed for use, to pay the salary or expenses of any grant or contract recipient, or agent acting for such recipient, related to any activity designed to influence the enactment or issuance of legislation, appropriations, regulations, administrative action, or an executive order proposed or pending before the Congress or any State government, or a State or local legislature or legislative body, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships or participation by an agency or officer of a State, local, or tribal government in policymaking and administrative processes within the executive branch of that government.

''(b) POLITICAL RESTRICTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds received by a participant of a program or activity under this Act shall be used for—

''(A) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in an election for public or party office; or

''(B) any activity to provide voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election.

''(2) RESTRICTION ON VOTER REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES.—No funds under this Act shall be used to conduct voter registration activities.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'participant' includes any State, local area, or government, nonprofit, or for-profit entity receiving funds under this Act.''.

CHAPTER 6—STATE UNIFIED PLAN

SEC. 256. STATE UNIFIED PLAN.

Section 501 (20 U.S.C. 9271) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall receive and approve State unified plans developed and submitted in accordance with this section.'';

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) STATE UNIFIED PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may develop and submit to the Secretary a State unified plan for 2 or more of the activities or programs set forth in paragraph (2). The State unified plan shall cover one or more of the activities or programs set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) and shall cover one or more of the activities or programs set forth in subparagraphs (C) through (N) of paragraph (2).

''(2) ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'activity or program' means any 1 of the following 14 activities or programs:

''(A) Activities and programs authorized under title I.

''(B) Activities and programs authorized under title II.

''(C) Programs authorized under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 710 et seq.).

''(D) Secondary career and technical education programs authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

''(E) Postsecondary career and technical education programs authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

''(F) Activities and programs authorized under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).

''(G) Programs and activities authorized under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the 'National Apprenticeship Act'; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.).

''(H) Programs authorized under the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.).

''(I) Programs authorized under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

''(J) Programs authorized under State unemployment compensation laws (in accordance with applicable Federal law).

''(K) Work programs authorized under section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)).

''(L) Activities and programs authorized under title I of the Housing and Community

Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

''(M) Activities and programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.).

''(N) Activities authorized under chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code.'';

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) APPROVAL.—

''(1) JURISDICTION.—In approving a State unified plan under this section, the Secretary shall—

''(A) submit the portion of the State unified plan covering an activity or program described in subsection (b)(2) to the head of the Federal agency who exercises administrative authority over the activity or program for the approval of such portion by such Federal agency head; or

''(B) coordinate approval of the portion of the State unified plan covering an activity or program described in subsection (b)(2) with the head of the Federal agency who exercises administrative authority over the activity or program.

''(2) TIMELINE.—A State unified plan shall be considered to be approved by the Secretary at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the day the Secretary receives the plan, unless the Secretary makes a written determination, during the 90-day period, that details how the plan is not consistent with the requirements of the Federal statute authorizing an activity or program described in subsection (b)(2) and covered under the plan or how the plan is not consistent with the requirements of subsection (c)(3).

''(3) SCOPE OF PORTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the portion of the State unified plan covering an activity or program shall be considered to include the plan described in subsection (c)(3) and any proposal described in subsection (e)(2), as that part and proposal relate to the activity or program.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ADDITIONAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING FUNDS.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subsection to reduce inefficiencies in the administration of federally funded State and local employment and training programs.

''(2) IN GENERAL.—In developing a State unified plan for the activities or programs described in subsection (b)(2), and subject to paragraph (4) and to the State plan approval process under subsection (d), a State may propose to consolidate the amount, in whole or part, provided for the activities or programs covered by the plan into the Workforce Investment Fund under section 132(b) to improve the administration of State and local employment and training programs.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS.—A State that has a State unified plan approved under subsection (d) with a proposal for consolidation under paragraph (2), and that is carrying out such consolidation, shall—

''(A) in providing an activity or program for which an amount is consolidated into the Workforce Investment Fund—

''(i) continue to meet the program requirements, limitations, and prohibitions of any Federal statute authorizing the activity or program; and

''(ii) meet the intent and purpose for the activity or program; and

''(B) continue to make reservations and allotments under subsections (a) and (b) of section 133.

''(4) EXCEPTIONS.—A State may not consolidate an amount under paragraph (2) that is allocated to the State under—

''(A) the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); or

''(B) title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 710 et seq.).''.

Subtitle B—Adult Education and Family Literacy Education

SEC. 261. AMENDMENT.

Title II (20 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''TITLE II—ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION

''SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

''This title may be cited as the 'Adult Education and Family Literacy Education Act'.

''SEC. 202. PURPOSE.

''It is the purpose of this title to provide instructional opportunities for adults seeking to improve their literacy skills, including their basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills, and support States and local communities in providing, on a voluntary basis, adult education and family literacy education programs, in order to—

''(1) increase the literacy of adults, including the basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills, to a level of proficiency necessary for adults to obtain employment and self-sufficiency and to successfully advance in the workforce;

''(2) assist adults in the completion of a secondary school education (or its equivalent) and the transition to a postsecondary educational institution;

''(3) assist adults who are parents to enable them to support the educational development of their children and make informed choices regarding their children's education including, through instruction in basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills; and

''(4) assist adults who are not proficient in English in improving their reading, writing, speaking, listening, comprehension, and mathematics skills.

''SEC. 203. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—The term 'adult education and family literacy education programs' means a sequence of academic instruction and educational services below the postsecondary level that increase an individual's ability to read, write, and speak English and perform mathematical computations leading to a level of proficiency equivalent to at least a secondary school completion that is provided for individuals—

''(A) who are at least 16 years of age;

''(B) who are not enrolled or required to be enrolled in secondary school under State law; and

''(C) who—

''(i) lack sufficient mastery of basic reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills to enable the individuals to function effectively in society;

''(ii) do not have a secondary school diploma or its equivalent and have not achieved an equivalent level of education; or

''(iii) are English learners.

''(2) ELIGIBLE AGENCY.—The term 'eligible agency'—

''(A) means the primary entity or agency in a State or an outlying area responsible for administering or supervising policy for adult education and family literacy education programs in the State or outlying area, respectively, consistent with the law of the State or outlying area, respectively; and

''(B) may be the State educational agency, the State agency responsible for administering workforce investment activities, or the State agency responsible for administering community or technical colleges.

''(3) ELIGIBLE PROVIDER.—The term 'eligible provider' means an organization of demonstrated effectiveness that is—

''(A) a local educational agency;

''(B) a community-based or faith-based organization;

''(C) a volunteer literacy organization;

''(D) an institution of higher education;

''(E) a public or private educational agency;

''(F) a library;

''(G) a public housing authority;

''(H) an institution that is not described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (G) and has the ability to provide adult education, basic skills, and family literacy education programs to adults and families; or

''(I) a consortium of the agencies, organizations, institutions, libraries, or authorities described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (H).

''(4) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term 'English language acquisition program' means a program of instruction—

''(A) designed to help English learners achieve competence in reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension of the English language; and

''(B) that may lead to—

''(i) attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent;

''(ii) transition to success in postsecondary education and training; and

''(iii) employment or career advancement.

''(5) FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The term 'family literacy education program' means an educational program that—

''(A) assists parents and students, on a voluntary basis, in achieving the purpose of this title as described in section 202; and

''(B) is of sufficient intensity in terms of hours and of sufficient quality to make sustainable changes in a family, is evidence-based, and, for the purpose of substantially increasing the ability of parents and children to read, write, and speak English, integrates—

''(i) interactive literacy activities between parents and their children;

''(ii) training for parents regarding how to be the primary teacher for their children and full partners in the education of their children;

''(iii) parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency; and

''(iv) an age-appropriate education to prepare children for success in school and life experiences.

''(6) GOVERNOR.—The term 'Governor' means the chief executive officer of a State or outlying area.

''(7) INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'individual with a disability' means an individual with any disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990).

''(B) INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—The term 'individuals with disabilities' means more than one individual with a disability.

''(8) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term 'English learner' means an adult or out-of-school youth who has limited ability in reading, writing, speaking, or understanding the English language, and—

''(A) whose native language is a language other than English; or

''(B) who lives in a family or community environment where a language other than English is the dominant language.

''(9) INTEGRATED EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—The term 'integrated education and training' means services that provide adult education and literacy activities contextually and concurrently with workforce preparation activities and workforce training for a specific occupation or occupational cluster. Such services may include offering adult education services concurrent with

postsecondary education and training, including through co-instruction.

''(10) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

''(11) LITERACY.—The term 'literacy' means an individual's ability to read, write, and speak in English, compute, and solve problems at a level of proficiency necessary to obtain employment and to successfully make the transition to postsecondary education.

''(12) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'local educational agency' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

''(13) OUTLYING AREA.—The term 'outlying area' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of this Act.

''(14) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'postsecondary educational institution' means—

''(A) an institution of higher education that provides not less than a 2-year program of instruction that is acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree;

''(B) a tribally controlled community college; or

''(C) a nonprofit educational institution offering certificate or apprenticeship programs at the postsecondary level.

''(15) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Education.

''(16) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

''(17) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'State educational agency' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

''(18) WORKPLACE LITERACY PROGRAM.—The term 'workplace literacy program' means an educational program that is offered in collaboration between eligible providers and employers or employee organizations for the purpose of improving the productivity of the workforce through the improvement of reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills.

"SEC. 204. HOME SCHOOLS.

''Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect home schools, whether or not a home school is treated as a home school or a private school under State law, or to compel a parent engaged in home schooling to participate in adult education and family literacy education activities under this title.

"SEC. 205. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, $606,294,933 for fiscal year 2015 and for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.

"Subtitle A—Federal Provisions

"SEC. 211. RESERVATION OF FUNDS; GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE AGENCIES; ALLOTMENTS.

''(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—From the sums appropriated under section 205 for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 2.0 percent to carry out section 242.

''(b) GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From the sums appropriated under section 205 and not reserved under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall award a grant to each eligible agency having a State plan approved under section 224 in an amount equal to the sum of the initial allotment under subsection (c)(1) and the additional allotment under subsection (c)(2) for the eligible agency for the fiscal year, subject to subsections (f) and (g).

''(2) PURPOSE OF GRANTS.—The Secretary may award a grant under paragraph (1) only if the eligible agency involved agrees to expend the grant in accordance with the provisions of this title.

''(c) ALLOTMENTS.—

''(1) INITIAL ALLOTMENTS.—From the sums appropriated under section 205 and not reserved under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each eligible agency having a State plan approved under section 224—

''(A) $100,000, in the case of an eligible agency serving an outlying area; and

''(B) $250,000, in the case of any other eligible agency.

''(2) ADDITIONAL ALLOTMENTS.—From the sums appropriated under section 205, not reserved under subsection (a), and not allotted under paragraph (1), for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each eligible agency that receives an initial allotment under paragraph (1) an additional amount that bears the same relationship to such sums as the number of qualifying adults in the State or outlying area served by the eligible agency bears to the number of such adults in all States and outlying areas.

''(d) QUALIFYING ADULT.—For the purpose of subsection (c)(2), the term 'qualifying adult' means an adult who—

''(1) is at least 16 years of age;

''(2) is beyond the age of compulsory school attendance under the law of the State or outlying area;

''(3) does not have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent; and

''(4) is not enrolled in secondary school.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (c) for the Republic of Palau, the Secretary shall award grants to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or the Republic of Palau to carry out activities described in this title in accordance with the provisions of this title as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Republic of Palau shall be eligible to receive a grant under this title until an agreement for the extension of United States education assistance under the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau becomes effective.

''(f) HOLD-HARMLESS PROVISIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (c) and subject to paragraph (2), for—

''(A) fiscal year 2015, no eligible agency shall receive an allotment under this title that is less than 90 percent of the allotment the eligible agency received for fiscal year 2012 under this title; and

''(B) fiscal year 2016 and each succeeding fiscal year, no eligible agency shall receive an allotment under this title that is less than 90 percent of the allotment the eligible agency received for the preceding fiscal year under this title.

''(2) RATABLE REDUCTION.—If, for any fiscal year the amount available for allotment under this title is insufficient to satisfy the provisions of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ratable reduce the payments to all eligible agencies, as necessary.

''(g) REALLOTMENT.—The portion of any eligible agency's allotment under this title for a fiscal year that the Secretary determines will not be required for the period such allotment is available for carrying out activities under this title, shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Secretary shall fix, to other eligible agencies in proportion to the original allotments to such agencies under this title for such year.

"SEC. 212. PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.

''Programs and activities authorized under this title are subject to the performance accountability provisions described in paragraph (2)(A) and (3) of section 136(b) and may, at a State's discretion, include additional indicators identified in the State plan approved under section 224.

"Subtitle B—State Provisions

"SEC. 221. STATE ADMINISTRATION.

''Each eligible agency shall be responsible for the following activities under this title:

''(1) The development, submission, implementation, and monitoring of the State plan.

''(2) Consultation with other appropriate agencies, groups, and individuals that are involved in, or interested in, the development and implementation of activities assisted under this title.

''(3) Coordination and avoidance of duplication with other Federal and State education, training, corrections, public housing, and social service programs.

"SEC. 222. STATE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS; MATCHING REQUIREMENT.

''(a) STATE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—Each eligible agency receiving a grant under this title for a fiscal year—

''(1) shall use not less than 82.5 percent of the grant funds to award grants and contracts under section 231 and to carry out section 225, of which not more than 10 percent of such amount shall be available to carry out section 225;

''(2) shall use not more than 12.5 percent of the grant funds to carry out State leadership activities under section 223; and

''(3) shall use not more than 5 percent of the grant funds, or $65,000, whichever is greater, for the administrative expenses of the eligible agency.

''(b) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to receive a grant from the Secretary under section 211(b), each eligible agency shall provide, for the costs to be incurred by the eligible agency in carrying out the adult education and family literacy education programs for which the grant is awarded, a non-Federal contribution in an amount that is not less than—

''(A) in the case of an eligible agency serving an outlying area, 12 percent of the total amount of funds expended for adult education and family literacy education programs in the outlying area, except that the Secretary may decrease the amount of funds required under this subparagraph for an eligible agency; and

''(B) in the case of an eligible agency serving a State, 25 percent of the total amount of funds expended for adult education and family literacy education programs in the State.

''(2) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.—An eligible agency's non-Federal contribution required under paragraph (1) may be provided in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, and shall include only non-Federal funds that are used for adult education and family literacy education programs in a manner that is consistent with the purpose of this title.

"SEC. 223. STATE LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible agency may use funds made available under section 222(a)(2) for any of the following adult education and family literacy education programs:

''(1) The establishment or operation of professional development programs to improve the quality of instruction provided pursuant to local activities required under section 231(b).

''(2) The provision of technical assistance to eligible providers of adult education and family literacy education programs, including for the development and dissemination of evidence based research instructional practices in reading, writing, speaking, mathematics, and English language acquisition programs.

''(3) The provision of assistance to eligible providers in developing, implementing, and reporting measurable progress in achieving the objectives of this title.

''(4) The monitoring and evaluation of the quality of, and the improvement in, adult education and literacy activities.

''(5) The provision of technology assistance, including staff training, to eligible providers of adult education and family literacy education programs, including distance education activities, to enable the eligible providers to improve the quality of such activities.

''(6) The development and implementation of technology applications or distance education, including professional development to support the use of instructional technology.

''(7) Coordination with other public programs, including programs under title I of this Act, and other welfare-to-work, workforce development, and job training programs.

''(8) Coordination with existing support services, such as transportation, child care, and other assistance designed to increase rates of enrollment in, and successful completion of, adult education and family literacy education programs, for adults enrolled in such activities.

''(9) The development and implementation of a system to assist in the transition from adult basic education to postsecondary education.

''(10) Activities to promote workplace literacy programs.

''(11) Other activities of statewide significance, including assisting eligible providers in achieving progress in improving the skill levels of adults who participate in programs under this title.

''(12) Integration of literacy, instructional, and occupational skill training and promotion of linkages with employees.

''(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, eligible agencies shall coordinate where possible, and avoid duplicating efforts, in order to maximize the impact of the activities described in subsection (a).

''(c) STATE-IMPOSED REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever a State or outlying area implements any rule or policy relating to the administration or operation of a program authorized under this title that has the effect of imposing a requirement that is not imposed under Federal law (including any rule or policy based on a State or outlying area interpretation of a Federal statute, regulation, or guideline), the State or outlying area shall identify, to eligible providers, the rule or policy as being imposed by the State or outlying area.

''SEC. 224. STATE PLAN.

''(a) 3-YEAR PLANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible agency desiring a grant under this title for any fiscal year shall submit to, or have on file with, the Secretary a 3-year State plan.

''(2) STATE UNIFIED PLAN.—The eligible agency may submit the State plan as part of a State unified plan described in section 501.

''(b) PLAN CONTENTS.—The eligible agency shall include in the State plan or any revisions to the State plan—

''(1) an objective assessment of the needs of individuals in the State or outlying area for adult education and family literacy education programs, including individuals most in need or hardest to serve;

''(2) a description of the adult education and family literacy education programs that will be carried out with funds received under this title;

''(3) an assurance that the funds received under this title will not be expended for any purpose other than for activities under this title;

''(4) a description of how the eligible agency will annually evaluate and measure the effectiveness and improvement of the adult education and family literacy education programs funded under this title using the indicators of performance described in section 136, including how the eligible agency will conduct such annual evaluations and measures for each grant received under this title;

''(5) a description of how the eligible agency will fund local activities in accordance with the measurable goals described in section 231(d);

''(6) an assurance that the eligible agency will expend the funds under this title only in a manner consistent with fiscal requirements in section 241;

''(7) a description of the process that will be used for public participation and comment with respect to the State plan, which—

''(A) shall include consultation with the State workforce investment board, the State board responsible for administering community or technical colleges, the Governor, the State educational agency, the State board or agency responsible for administering block grants for temporary assistance to needy families under title IV of the Social Security Act, the State council on disabilities, the State vocational rehabilitation agency, and other State agencies that promote the improvement of adult education and family literacy education programs, and direct providers of such programs; and

''(B) may include consultation with the State agency on higher education, institutions responsible for professional development of adult education and family literacy education programs instructors, representatives of business and industry, refugee assistance programs, and faith-based organizations;

''(8) a description of the eligible agency's strategies for serving populations that include, at a minimum—

''(A) low-income individuals;

''(B) individuals with disabilities;

''(C) the unemployed;

''(D) the underemployed; and

''(E) individuals with multiple barriers to educational enhancement, including English learners;

''(9) a description of how the adult education and family literacy education programs that will be carried out with any funds received under this title will be integrated with other adult education, career development, and employment and training activities in the State or outlying area served by the eligible agency;

''(10) a description of the steps the eligible agency will take to ensure direct and equitable access, as required in section 231(c)(1), including—

''(A) how the State will build the capacity of community-based and faith-based organizations to provide adult education and family literacy education programs; and

''(B) how the State will increase the participation of business and industry in adult education and family literacy education programs;

''(11) an assessment of the adequacy of the system of the State or outlying area to ensure teacher quality and a description of how the State or outlying area will use funds received under this subtitle to improve teacher quality, including evidence-based professional development to improve instruction; and

''(12) a description of how the eligible agency will consult with any State agency responsible for postsecondary education to develop adult education that prepares students to enter postsecondary education without the need for remediation upon completion of secondary school equivalency programs.

''(c) PLAN REVISIONS.—When changes in conditions or other factors require substantial revisions to an approved State plan, the eligible agency shall submit the revisions of the State plan to the Secretary.

''(d) CONSULTATION.—The eligible agency shall—

''(1) submit the State plan, and any revisions to the State plan, to the Governor, the chief State school officer, or the State officer responsible for administering community or technical colleges, or outlying area for review and comment; and

''(2) ensure that any comments regarding the State plan by the Governor, the chief State school officer, or the State officer responsible for administering community or technical colleges, and any revision to the State plan, are submitted to the Secretary.

''(e) PLAN APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) approve a State plan within 90 days after receiving the plan unless the Secretary makes a written determination within 30 days after receiving the plan that the plan does not meet the requirements of this section or is inconsistent with specific provisions of this subtitle; and

''(2) not finally disapprove of a State plan before offering the eligible agency the opportunity, prior to the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the eligible agency received the written determination described in paragraph (1), to review the plan and providing technical assistance in order to assist the eligible agency in meeting the requirements of this subtitle.

''SEC. 225. PROGRAMS FOR CORRECTIONS EDUCATION AND OTHER INSTITUTIONALIZED INDIVIDUALS.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—From funds made available under section 222(a)(1) for a fiscal year, each eligible agency shall carry out corrections education and education for other institutionalized individuals.

''(b) USES OF FUNDS.—The funds described in subsection (a) shall be used for the cost of educational programs for criminal offenders in correctional institutions and for other institutionalized individuals, including academic programs for—

''(1) basic skills education;

''(2) special education programs as determined by the eligible agency;

''(3) reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics programs;

''(4) secondary school credit or diploma programs or their recognized equivalent; and

''(5) integrated education and training.

''(c) PRIORITY.—Each eligible agency that is using assistance provided under this section to carry out a program for criminal offenders within a correctional institution shall give priority to serving individuals who are likely to leave the correctional institution within 5 years of participation in the program.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'correctional institution' means any—

''(A) prison;

''(B) jail;

''(C) reformatory;

''(D) work farm;

''(E) detention center; or

''(F) halfway house, community-based rehabilitation center, or any other similar institution designed for the confinement or rehabilitation of criminal offenders.

''(2) CRIMINAL OFFENDER.—The term 'criminal offender' means any individual who is charged with, or convicted of, any criminal offense.

''Subtitle C—Local Provisions

''SEC. 231. GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS.

''(a) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—From grant funds made available under section 222(a)(1),

each eligible agency shall award multi-year grants or contracts, on a competitive basis, to eligible providers within the State or outlying area that meet the conditions and requirements of this title to enable the eligible providers to develop, implement, and improve adult education and family literacy education programs within the State.

''(b) LOCAL ACTIVITIES.—The eligible agency shall require eligible providers receiving a grant or contract under subsection (a) to establish or operate—

''(1) programs that provide adult education and literacy activities;

''(2) programs that provide integrated education and training activities; or

''(3) credit-bearing postsecondary coursework.

''(c) DIRECT AND EQUITABLE ACCESS; SAME PROCESS.—Each eligible agency receiving funds under this title shall ensure that—

''(1) all eligible providers have direct and equitable access to apply for grants or contracts under this section; and

''(2) the same grant or contract announcement process and application process is used for all eligible providers in the State or outlying area.

''(d) MEASURABLE GOALS.—The eligible agency shall require eligible providers receiving a grant or contract under subsection (a) to demonstrate—

''(1) the eligible provider's measurable goals for participant outcomes to be achieved annually on the core indicators of performance described in section 136(b)(2)(A);

''(2) the past effectiveness of the eligible provider in improving the basic academic skills of adults and, for eligible providers receiving grants in the prior year, the success of the eligible provider receiving funding under this title in exceeding its performance goals in the prior year;

''(3) the commitment of the eligible provider to serve individuals in the community who are the most in need of basic academic skills instruction services, including individuals with disabilities and individuals who are low-income or have minimal reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics skills, or are English learners;

''(4) the program is of sufficient intensity and quality for participants to achieve substantial learning gains;

''(5) educational practices are evidence-based;

''(6) the activities of the eligible provider effectively employ advances in technology, and delivery systems including distance education;

''(7) the activities provide instruction in real-life contexts, including integrated education and training when appropriate, to ensure that an individual has the skills needed to compete in the workplace and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship;

''(8) the activities are staffed by well-trained instructors, counselors, and administrators who meet minimum qualifications established by the State;

''(9) the activities are coordinated with other available resources in the community, such as through strong links with elementary schools and secondary schools, postsecondary educational institutions, local workforce investment boards, one-stop centers, job training programs, community-based and faith-based organizations, and social service agencies;

''(10) the activities offer flexible schedules and support services (such as child care and transportation) that are necessary to enable individuals, including individuals with disabilities or other special needs, to attend and complete programs;

''(11) the activities include a high-quality information management system that has the capacity to report measurable participant outcomes (consistent with section 136) and to monitor program performance;

''(12) the local communities have a demonstrated need for additional English language acquisition programs, and integrated education and training programs;

''(13) the capacity of the eligible provider to produce valid information on performance results, including enrollments and measurable participant outcomes;

''(14) adult education and family literacy education programs offer rigorous reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics content that are evidence based; and

''(15) applications of technology, and services to be provided by the eligible providers, are of sufficient intensity and duration to increase the amount and quality of learning and lead to measurable learning gains within specified time periods.

''(e) SPECIAL RULE.—Eligible providers may use grant funds under this title to serve children participating in family literacy programs assisted under this part, provided that other sources of funds available to provide similar services for such children are used first.

''SEC. 232. LOCAL APPLICATION.

''Each eligible provider desiring a grant or contract under this title shall submit an application to the eligible agency containing such information and assurances as the eligible agency may require, including—

''(1) a description of how funds awarded under this title will be spent consistent with the requirements of this title;

''(2) a description of any cooperative arrangements the eligible provider has with other agencies, institutions, or organizations for the delivery of adult education and family literacy education programs; and

''(3) each of the demonstrations required by section 231(d).

''SEC. 233. LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE COST LIMITS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), of the amount that is made available under this title to an eligible provider—

''(1) at least 95 percent shall be expended for carrying out adult education and family literacy education programs; and

''(2) the remaining amount shall be used for planning, administration, personnel and professional development, development of measurable goals in reading, writing, speaking, and mathematics, and interagency coordination.

''(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In cases where the cost limits described in subsection (a) are too restrictive to allow for adequate planning, administration, personnel development, and interagency coordination, the eligible provider may negotiate with the eligible agency in order to determine an adequate level of funds to be used for noninstructional purposes.

''Subtitle D—General Provisions

''SEC. 241. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

''Funds made available for adult education and family literacy education programs under this title shall supplement and not supplant other State or local public funds expended for adult education and family literacy education programs.

''SEC. 242. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

''The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program of national activities that may include the following:

''(1) Providing technical assistance to eligible entities, on request, to—

''(A) improve their fiscal management, research-based instruction, and reporting requirements to carry out the requirements of this title;

''(B) improve its performance on the core indicators of performance described in section 136;

''(C) provide adult education professional development; and

''(D) use distance education and improve the application of technology in the classroom, including instruction in English language acquisition for English learners.

''(2) Providing for the conduct of research on national literacy basic skill acquisition levels among adults, including the number of adult English learners functioning at different levels of reading proficiency.

''(3) Improving the coordination, efficiency, and effectiveness of adult education and workforce development services at the national, State, and local levels.

''(4) Determining how participation in adult education, English language acquisition, and family literacy education programs prepares individuals for entry into and success in postsecondary education and employment, and in the case of prison-based services, the effect on recidivism.

''(5) Evaluating how different types of providers, including community and faith-based organizations or private for-profit agencies measurably improve the skills of participants in adult education, English language acquisition, and family literacy education programs.

''(6) Identifying model integrated basic and workplace skills education programs, including programs for English learners coordinated literacy and employment services, and effective strategies for serving adults with disabilities.

''(7) Initiating other activities designed to improve the measurable quality and effectiveness of adult education, English language acquisition, and family literacy education programs nationwide.''.

Subtitle C—Amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act

SEC. 266. AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSER ACT.

Section 15 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 15. WORKFORCE AND LABOR MARKET INFORMATION SYSTEM.

''(a) SYSTEM CONTENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor (referred to in this section as the 'Secretary'), in accordance with the provisions of this section, shall oversee the development, maintenance, and continuous improvement of a nationwide workforce and labor market information system that includes—

''(A) statistical data from cooperative statistical survey and projection programs and data from administrative reporting systems that, taken together, enumerate, estimate, and project employment opportunities and conditions at national, State, and local levels in a timely manner, including statistics on—

''(i) employment and unemployment status of national, State, and local populations, including self-employed, part-time, and seasonal workers;

''(ii) industrial distribution of occupations, as well as current and projected employment opportunities, wages, benefits (where data is available), and skill trends by occupation and industry, with particular attention paid to State and local conditions;

''(iii) the incidence of, industrial and geographical location of, and number of workers displaced by, permanent layoffs and plant closings; and

''(iv) employment and earnings information maintained in a longitudinal manner to be used for research and program evaluation;

''(B) information on State and local employment opportunities, and other appropriate statistical data related to labor market dynamics, which—

''(i) shall be current and comprehensive;

''(ii) shall meet the needs identified through the consultations described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (e)(1); and

''(iii) shall meet the needs for the information identified in section 121(e)(1)(E) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841(e)(1)(E));

''(C) technical standards (which the Secretary shall publish annually) for data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) that, at a minimum, meet the criteria of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code;

''(D) procedures to ensure compatibility and additivity of the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) from national, State, and local levels;

''(E) procedures to support standardization and aggregation of data from administrative reporting systems described in subparagraph (A) of employment-related programs;

''(F) analysis of data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) for uses such as—

''(i) national, State, and local policymaking;

''(ii) implementation of Federal policies (including allocation formulas);

''(iii) program planning and evaluation; and

''(iv) researching labor market dynamics;

''(G) wide dissemination of such data, information, and analysis in a user-friendly manner and voluntary technical standards for dissemination mechanisms; and

''(H) programs of—

''(i) training for effective data dissemination;

''(ii) research and demonstration; and

''(iii) programs and technical assistance.

''(2) INFORMATION TO BE CONFIDENTIAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No officer or employee of the Federal Government or agent of the Federal Government may—

''(i) use any submission that is furnished for exclusively statistical purposes under the provisions of this section for any purpose other than the statistical purposes for which the submission is furnished;

''(ii) disclose to the public any publication or media transmittal of the data contained in the submission described in clause (i) that permits information concerning an individual subject to be reasonably inferred by either direct or indirect means; or

''(iii) permit anyone other than a sworn officer, employee, or agent of any Federal department or agency, or a contractor (including an employee of a contractor) of such department or agency, to examine an individual submission described in clause (i),

without the consent of the individual, agency, or other person who is the subject of the submission or provides that submission.

''(B) IMMUNITY FROM LEGAL PROCESS.—Any submission (including any data derived from the submission) that is collected and retained by a Federal department or agency, or an officer, employee, agent, or contractor of such a department or agency, for exclusively statistical purposes under this section shall be immune from the legal process and shall not, without the consent of the individual, agency, or other person who is the subject of the submission or provides that submission, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide immunity from the legal process for such submission (including any data derived from the submission) if the submission is in the possession of any person, agency, or entity other than the Federal Government or an officer, employee, agent, or contractor of the Federal Government, or if the submission is independently collected, retained, or produced for purposes other than the purposes of this Act.

''(b) SYSTEM RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a) shall be planned, administered, overseen, and evaluated through a cooperative governance structure involving the Federal Government and States.

''(2) DUTIES.—The Secretary, with respect to data collection, analysis, and dissemination of workforce and labor market information for the system, shall carry out the following duties:

''(A) Assign responsibilities within the Department of Labor for elements of the workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a) to ensure that all statistical and administrative data collected is consistent with appropriate Bureau of Labor Statistics standards and definitions.

''(B) Actively seek the cooperation of other Federal agencies to establish and maintain mechanisms for ensuring complementarity and nonduplication in the development and operation of statistical and administrative data collection activities.

''(C) Eliminate gaps and duplication in statistical undertakings, with the systemization of wage surveys as an early priority.

''(D) In collaboration with the Bureau of Labor Statistics and States, develop and maintain the elements of the workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a), including the development of consistent procedures and definitions for use by the States in collecting the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1).

''(E) Establish procedures for the system to ensure that—

''(i) such data and information are timely;

''(ii) paperwork and reporting for the system are reduced to a minimum; and

''(iii) States and localities are fully involved in the development and continuous improvement of the system at all levels.

''(c) NATIONAL ELECTRONIC TOOLS TO PROVIDE SERVICES.—The Secretary is authorized to assist in the development of national electronic tools that may be used to facilitate the delivery of work ready services described in section 134(c)(2) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(c)(2)) and to provide workforce and labor market information to individuals through the one-stop delivery systems described in section 121 and through other appropriate delivery systems.

''(d) COORDINATION WITH THE STATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, working through the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Employment and Training Administration, shall regularly consult with representatives of State agencies carrying out workforce information activities regarding strategies for improving the workforce and labor market information system.

''(2) FORMAL CONSULTATIONS.—At least twice each year, the Secretary, working through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shall conduct formal consultations regarding programs carried out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with representatives of each of the Federal regions of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, elected (pursuant to a process established by the Secretary) from the State directors affiliated with State agencies that perform the duties described in subsection (e)(1).

''(e) STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to receive Federal financial assistance under this section, the Governor of a State shall—

''(A) be responsible for the management of the portions of the workforce and labor market information system described in subsection (a) that comprise a statewide workforce and labor market information system;

''(B) establish a process for the oversight of such system;

''(C) consult with State and local employers, participants, and local workforce investment boards about the labor market relevance of the data to be collected and disseminated through the statewide workforce and labor market information system;

''(D) consult with State educational agencies and local educational agencies concerning the provision of workforce and labor market information in order to meet the needs of secondary school and postsecondary school students who seek such information;

''(E) collect and disseminate for the system, on behalf of the State and localities in the State, the information and data described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1);

''(F) maintain and continuously improve the statewide workforce and labor market information system in accordance with this section;

''(G) perform contract and grant responsibilities for data collection, analysis, and dissemination for such system;

''(H) conduct such other data collection, analysis, and dissemination activities as will ensure an effective statewide workforce and labor market information system;

''(I) actively seek the participation of other State and local agencies in data collection, analysis, and dissemination activities in order to ensure complementarity, compatibility, and usefulness of data;

''(J) participate in the development of, and submit to the Secretary, an annual plan to carry out the requirements and authorities of this subsection; and

''(K) utilize the quarterly records described in section 136(f)(2) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(f)(2)) to assist the State and other States in measuring State progress on State performance measures.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the ability of a Governor to conduct additional data collection, analysis, and dissemination activities with State funds or with Federal funds from sources other than this section.

''(f) NONDUPLICATION REQUIREMENT.—None of the functions and activities carried out pursuant to this section shall duplicate the functions and activities carried out under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $60,153,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.''.

Subtitle D—Repeals and Conforming Amendments

SEC. 271. REPEALS.

The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Chapter 4 of subtitle B of title I, and sections 123, 155, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 173, 173A, 174, 192, 194, 502, 503, and 506 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the SKILLS Act.

(2) Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.).

(3) Sections 1 through 14 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.).

(4) The Twenty-First Century Workforce Commission Act (29 U.S.C. 2701 note).

(5) Public Law 91–378, 16 U.S.C. 1701 et seq. (popularly known as the ''Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970'').

(6) Section 821 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 1151).

(7) The Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

(8) Sections 4103A and 4104 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 272. AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS.

Section 104(k)(6)(A) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(6)(A)) is amended by striking ''training, research, and'' and inserting ''research and''.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2008.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 3(t) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(t)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''means (1) the agency'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) the agency'';

(B) by striking ''programs, and (2) the tribal'' and inserting the following: ''programs;

''(B) the tribal'';

(C) by striking ''this Act.'' and inserting the following: ''this Act; and

''(C) in the context of employment and training activities under section 6(d)(4), a State board as defined in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801).''.

(2) ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(14) by striking ''section 6(d)(4)(I)'' and inserting ''section 6(d)(4)(C)'', and

(B) in subsection (g)(3), in the first sentence, by striking ''constitutes adequate participation in an employment and training program under section 6(d)'' and inserting ''allows the individual to participate in employment and training activities under section 6(d)(4)''.

(3) ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS.—Section 6(d)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(D) EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.—

''(i) IMPLEMENTATION.—Each State agency shall provide employment and training services authorized under section 134 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864) to eligible members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in gaining skills, training, work, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment.

''(ii) STATEWIDE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM.—Consistent with subparagraph (A), employment and training services shall be provided through the statewide workforce development system, including the one-stop delivery system authorized by the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.).

''(iii) REIMBURSEMENTS.—

''(I) ACTUAL COSTS.—The State agency shall provide payments or reimbursement to participants served under this paragraph for—

''(aa) the actual costs of transportation and other actual costs (other than dependent care costs) that are reasonably necessary and directly related to the individual participating in employment and training activities; and

''(bb) the actual costs of such dependent care expenses as are determined by the State agency to be necessary for the individual to participate in employment and training activities (other than an individual who is the caretaker relative of a dependent in a family receiving benefits under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in a local area where an employment, training, or education program under title IV of that Act is in operation), except that no such payment or reimbursement shall exceed the applicable local market rate.

''(II) SERVICE CONTRACTS AND VOUCHERS.—In lieu of providing reimbursements or payments for dependent care expenses under clause (i), a State agency may, at the option of the State agency, arrange for dependent care through providers by the use of purchase of service contracts or vouchers or by providing vouchers to the household.

''(III) VALUE OF REIMBURSEMENTS.—The value of any dependent care services provided for or arranged under clause (ii), or any amount received as a payment or reimbursement under clause (i), shall—

''(aa) not be treated as income for the purposes of any other Federal or federally assisted program that bases eligibility for, or the amount of benefits on, need; and

''(bb) not be claimed as an employment-related expense for the purposes of the credit provided under section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 21).''.

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 11(e)(19) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(11) is amended to read as follows:

''(S) the plans of the State agency for providing employment and training services under section 6(d)(4);''.

(5) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING AND QUALITY CONTROL.—Section 16(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''carry out employment and training programs'' and inserting ''provide employment and training services to eligible households under section 6(d)(4)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''operating an employment and training program'' and inserting ''providing employment and training services consistent with section 6(d)(4)'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''participation in an employment and training program'' and inserting ''the individual participating in employment and training activities''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 6(d)(4)(I)(i)(II)'' and inserting ''section 6(d)(4)(C)(i)(II)'';

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''for operating an employment and training program'' and inserting ''to provide employment and training services''; and

(D) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(E) MONITORING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor, shall monitor each State agency responsible for administering employment and training services under section 6(d)(4) to ensure funds are being spent effectively and efficiently.

''(ii) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Each program of employment and training receiving funds under section 6(d)(4) shall be subject to the requirements of the performance accountability system, including having to meet the State performance measures described in section 136 of the Workforce Investment Act (29 U.S.C. 2871).''.

(6) RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATIONS.—Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B)(iv)(III)(dd), by striking '', (4)(F)(i), or (4)(K)'' and inserting ''or (4)''; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in subsection (g), in the first sentence in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''programs established'' and inserting ''activities provided to eligible households''; and

(ii) by inserting '', in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor,'' after ''Secretary''.

(7) MINNESOTA FAMILY INVESTMENT PROJECT.—Section 22(b)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(b)(4)) is amended by striking ''equivalent to those offered under the employment and training program''.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 412 OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—

(1) CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS.—Section 412(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''make available sufficient resources for employment training and placement'' and inserting ''provide refugees with the opportunity to access employment and training services, including job placement,''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''services;'' and inserting ''services provided through the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.);'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(C)(iii)(II), by inserting ''and training'' after ''employment'';

(C) in paragraph (6)(A)(ii)—

(i) by striking ''insure'' and inserting ''ensure'';

(ii) by inserting ''and training'' after ''employment''; and

(iii) by inserting after ''available'' the following: ''through the one-stop delivery system under section 121 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841)''; and

(D) in paragraph (9), by inserting ''the Secretary of Labor,'' after ''Education,''.

(2) PROGRAM OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT.—Section 412(b)(2) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(b)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''orientation, instruction'' and inserting ''orientation and instruction''; and

(B) by striking '', and job training for refugees, and such other education and training of refugees, as facilitates'' and inserting ''for refugees to facilitate''.

(3) PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR SERVICES FOR REFUGEES.—Section 412(c) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting ''and training'' after ''employment''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''paragraph—'' and all that follows through ''in a manner'' and inserting ''paragraph in a manner''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) In carrying out this section, the Director shall ensure that employment and training services are provided through the statewide workforce development system, as appropriate, authorized by the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.). Such action may include—

''(i) making employment and training activities described in section 134 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2864) available to refugees; and

''(ii) providing refugees with access to a one-stop delivery system established under section 121 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841).''.

(4) CASH ASSISTANCE AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES.—Section 412(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A)(i), by inserting ''and training'' after ''providing employment''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''The'' and inserting ''Consistent with subsection (c)(3), the''.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE SECOND CHANCE ACT OF 2007.—

(1) FEDERAL PRISONER REENTRY INITIATIVE.—Section 231 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17541) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(E)—

(i) by inserting ''the Department of Labor and'' before ''other Federal agencies''; and

(ii) by inserting ''State and local workforce investment boards,'' after ''community-based organizations,'';

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking at the end ''and'';

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking at the end the period and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(D) to coordinate reentry programs with the employment and training services provided through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.).''; and

(C) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(F) INTERACTION WITH THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEM.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall ensure that employment and training services, including such employment and services offered through reentry programs, are provided, as appropriate, through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), which may include—

''(I) making employment and training services available to prisoners prior to and immediately following the release of such prisoners; or

''(II) providing prisoners with access by remote means to a one-stop delivery system under section 121 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2841) in the State in which the prison involved is located.

''(ii) SERVICE DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'employment and training services' means those services described in section 134 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864) offered by the Bureau of Prisons, including—

''(I) the skills assessment described in subsection (a)(1)(A);

''(II) the skills development plan described in subsection (a)(1)(B); and

''(III) the enhancement, development, and implementation of reentry and skills development programs.''.

(2) DUTIES OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS.—Section 4042(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E), as added by section 231(d)(1)(C) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199; 122 Stat. 685), as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(B) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly;

(C) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking ''Employment'' and inserting ''Employment and training services (as defined in paragraph (6) of section 231(d) of the Second Chance Act of 2007), including basic skills attainment, consistent with such paragraph'';

(ii) by striking clause (iii); and

(D) by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), (iv), (v), (vi), and (vii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), and (F), respectively, and adjusting the margin accordingly.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968.—Section 2976 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''vocational'' and inserting ''career and technical education (as defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)) and training'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(D) coordinating employment and training services provided through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), including a one-stop delivery system under section 121 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841), for offenders upon release from prison, jail, or a juvenile facility, as appropriate;'';

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting '', including local workforce investment boards established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2832),'' after ''nonprofit organizations'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''victims services, and employment services'' and inserting ''and victim services'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(D) provides employment and training services through the statewide workforce investment system under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.), including a one-stop delivery system under section 121 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2841);''; and

(4) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting '', in accordance with paragraph (2)'' after ''under this section'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(B) EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.—The Attorney General shall require each grantee under this section to measure the core indicators of performance as described in section 136(b)(2)(A) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(b)(2)(A)) with respect to the program of such grantee funded with a grant under this section.''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3672(d)(1), by striking ''disabled veterans' outreach program specialists under section 4103A'' and inserting ''veteran employment specialists appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998'';

(2) in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41, by striking the items relating to sections 4103A and 4104;

(3) in section 4102A—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (5), (6), and (7); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (5);

(B) by striking subsections (c) and (h);

(C) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f); and

(D) in subsection (e)(1) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking '', including disabled veterans' outreach program specialists and local veterans' employment representatives providing employment, training, and placement services under this chapter in a State''; and

(ii) by striking ''for purposes of subsection (c)'';

(4) in section 4104A—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(i) the appropriate veteran employment specialist (in carrying out the functions described in section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998);''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(i) collaborate with the appropriate veteran employment specialist (as described in section 134(f)) and the appropriate State boards and local boards (as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801));'';

(5) in section 4109—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''disabled veterans' outreach program specialists and local veterans' employment representative'' and inserting ''veteran employment specialists appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''disabled veterans' outreach program specialists and local veterans' employment representatives'' and inserting ''veteran employment specialists appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998''; and

(6) in section 4112(d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''disabled veterans' outreach program specialist'' and inserting ''veteran employment specialist appointed under section 134(f) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

SEC. 273. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

''Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

''TITLE I—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SYSTEMS

''Subtitle A—Workforce Investment Definitions

''Sec. 101. Definitions.

''Subtitle B—Statewide and Local Workforce Investment Systems

''Sec. 106. Purpose.

''CHAPTER 1—STATE PROVISIONS

''Sec. 111. State workforce investment boards.

''Sec. 112. State plan.

''CHAPTER 2—LOCAL PROVISIONS

''Sec. 116. Local workforce investment areas.

''Sec. 117. Local workforce investment boards.

''Sec. 118. Local plan.

''CHAPTER 3—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES PROVIDERS

''Sec. 121. Establishment of one-stop delivery systems.

''Sec. 122. Identification of eligible providers of training services.

''CHAPTER 5—EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

''Sec. 131. General authorization.

''Sec. 132. State allotments.

''Sec. 133. Within State allocations.

''Sec. 134. Use of funds for employment and training activities.

''CHAPTER 6—GENERAL PROVISIONS

''Sec. 136. Performance accountability system.

''Sec. 137. Authorization of appropriations.

''Subtitle C—Job Corps

''Sec. 141. Purposes.

''Sec. 142. Definitions.

''Sec. 143. Establishment.

''Sec. 144. Individuals eligible for the Job Corps.

''Sec. 145. Recruitment, screening, selection, and assignment of enrollees.

''Sec. 146. Enrollment.

''Sec. 147. Job Corps centers.

''Sec. 148. Program activities.

''Sec. 149. Counseling and job placement.

''Sec. 150. Support.

''Sec. 151. Operations.

''Sec. 152. Standards of conduct.

''Sec. 153. Community participation.

''Sec. 154. Workforce councils.

''Sec. 156. Technical assistance to centers.
''Sec. 157. Application of provisions of Federal law.
''Sec. 158. Special provisions.
''Sec. 159. Performance accountability and management.
''Sec. 160. General provisions.
''Sec. 161. Authorization of appropriations.
''Subtitle D—National Programs
''Sec. 170. Technical assistance.
''Sec. 172. Evaluations.
''Subtitle E—Administration
''Sec. 181. Requirements and restrictions.
''Sec. 182. Prompt allocation of funds.
''Sec. 183. Monitoring.
''Sec. 184. Fiscal controls; sanctions.
''Sec. 185. Reports; recordkeeping; investigations.
''Sec. 186. Administrative adjudication.
''Sec. 187. Judicial review.
''Sec. 188. Nondiscrimination.
''Sec. 189. Administrative provisions.
''Sec. 190. References.
''Sec. 191. State legislative authority.
''Sec. 193. Transfer of Federal equity in State employment security real property to the States.
''Sec. 195. General program requirements.
''Sec. 196. Federal agency staff.
''Sec. 197. Restrictions on lobbying and political activities.
''Subtitle F—Repeals and Conforming Amendments
''Sec. 199. Repeals.
''Sec. 199A. Conforming amendments.
''TITLE II—ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY EDUCATION
''Sec. 201. Short title.
''Sec. 202. Purpose.
''Sec. 203. Definitions.
''Sec. 204. Home schools.
''Sec. 205. Authorization of appropriations.
''Subtitle A—Federal Provisions
''Sec. 211. Reservation of funds; grants to eligible agencies; allotments.
''Sec. 212. Performance accountability system.
''Subtitle B—State Provisions
''Sec. 221. State administration.
''Sec. 222. State distribution of funds; matching requirement.
''Sec. 223. State leadership activities.
''Sec. 224. State plan.
''Sec. 225. Programs for corrections education and other institutionalized individuals.
''Subtitle C—Local Provisions
''Sec. 231. Grants and contracts for eligible providers.
''Sec. 232. Local application.
''Sec. 233. Local administrative cost limits.
''Subtitle D—General Provisions
''Sec. 241. Administrative provisions.
''Sec. 242. National activities.
''TITLE III—WORKFORCE INVESTMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES
''Subtitle A—Wagner-Peyser Act
''Sec. 301. Definitions.
''Sec. 302. Functions.
''Sec. 303. Designation of State agencies.
''Sec. 304. Appropriations.
''Sec. 305. Disposition of allotted funds.
''Sec. 306. State plans.
''Sec. 307. Repeal of Federal advisory council.
''Sec. 308. Regulations.
''Sec. 309. Employment statistics.
''Sec. 310. Technical amendments.
''Sec. 311. Effective date.
''Subtitle B—Linkages With Other Programs
''Sec. 321. Trade Act of 1974.
''Sec. 322. Veterans' employment programs.
''Sec. 323. Older Americans Act of 1965.
''Subtitle D—Application of Civil Rights and Labor-Management Laws to the Smithsonian Institution
''Sec. 341. Application of civil rights and labor-management laws to the Smithsonian Institution.
''TITLE IV—REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1998
''Sec. 401. Short title.
''Sec. 402. Title.
''Sec. 403. General provisions.
''Sec. 404. Vocational rehabilitation services.
''Sec. 405. Research and training.
''Sec. 406. Professional development and special projects and demonstrations.
''Sec. 407. National Council on Disability.
''Sec. 408. Rights and advocacy.
''Sec. 409. Employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities.
''Sec. 410. Independent living services and centers for independent living.
''Sec. 411. Repeal.
''Sec. 412. Helen Keller National Center Act.
''Sec. 413. President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities.
''Sec. 414. Conforming amendments.
''TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS
''Sec. 501. State unified plan.
''Sec. 504. Privacy.
''Sec. 505. Buy-American requirements.
''Sec. 507. Effective date.''.

Subtitle E—Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

SEC. 276. FINDINGS.

Section 2(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) there is a substantial need to improve and expand services for students with disabilities under this Act.''.

SEC. 277. REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.

(a) REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(a) (29 U.S.C. 702(a))—

(A) by striking ''Office of the Secretary'' and inserting ''Department of Education'';

(B) by striking ''President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate'' and inserting ''Secretary''; and

(C) by striking '', and the Commissioner shall be the principal officer,'';

(2) by striking ''Commissioner'' each place it appears (except in section 21) and inserting ''Director'';

(3) in section 12(c) (29 U.S.C. 709(c)), by striking ''Commissioner's'' and inserting ''Director's'';

(4) in section 21 (29 U.S.C. 718)—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) by striking ''Commissioner'' the first place it appears and inserting ''Director of the Rehabilitation Services Administration'';

(ii) by striking ''(referred to in this subsection as the 'Director')''; and

(iii) by striking ''The Commissioner and the Director'' and inserting ''Both such Directors''; and

(B) by striking ''the Commissioner and the Director'' each place it appears and inserting ''both such Directors'';

(5) in the heading for subparagraph (B) of section 100(d)(2) (29 U.S.C. 720(d)(2)), by striking ''COMMISSIONER'' and inserting ''DIRECTOR'';

(6) in section 401(a)(1) (29 U.S.C. 781(a)(1)), by inserting ''of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research'' after ''Director'';

(7) in the heading for section 706 (29 U.S.C. 796d–1), by striking ''**COMMISSIONER**'' and inserting ''**DIRECTOR**''; and

(8) in the heading for paragraph (3) of section 723(a) (29 U.S.C. 796f–2(a)), by striking ''COMMISSIONER'' and inserting ''DIRECTOR''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply with respect to the appointments of Directors of the Rehabilitation Services Administration made on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and the Directors so appointed.

SEC. 278. DEFINITIONS.

Section 7 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 705) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (35) through (39) as paragraphs (36) through (40), respectively;

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii) of paragraph (36) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)), by striking ''paragraph (36)(C)'' and inserting ''paragraph (37)(C)''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (34) the following:

''(35)(A) The term 'student with a disability' means an individual with a disability who—

''(i) is not younger than 16 and not older than 21;

''(ii) has been determined to be eligible under section 102(a) for assistance under this title; and

''(iii)(I) is eligible for, and is receiving, special education under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.); or

''(II) is an individual with a disability, for purposes of section 504.

''(B) The term 'students with disabilities' means more than 1 student with a disability.''.

SEC. 279. CARRYOVER.

Section 19(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 716(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''part B of title VI,''.

SEC. 280. TRADITIONALLY UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.

Section 21 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 718) is amended, in paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of subsection (b), and in subsection (c), by striking ''VI,''.

SEC. 281. STATE PLAN.

Section 101(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 721(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''on the eligible individuals'' and all that follows and inserting ''of information necessary to assess the State's performance on the core indicators of performance described in section 136(b)(2)(A) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(b)(2)(A)).''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by striking '', to the extent the measures are applicable to individuals with disabilities'';

(2) in paragraph (11)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', which may be provided using alternative means of meeting participation (such as participation through video conferences and conference calls)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) COORDINATION WITH ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—The State plan shall include an assurance that the designated State unit and the lead agency or implementing entity responsible for carrying out duties under the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) have developed working relationships and coordinate their activities.'';

(3) in paragraph (15)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in subclause (II), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(II) in subclause (III), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) students with disabilities, including their need for transition services;'';

(ii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

''(ii) include an assessment of the transition services provided under this Act, and coordinated with transition services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), about the extent to which those 2 types of services meet the needs of individuals with disabilities;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''and under part B of title VI'';

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by redesignating clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) the methods to be used to improve and expand vocational rehabilitation services for students with disabilities, including the coordination of services designed to facilitate the transition of such students from the receipt of educational services in school to the receipt of vocational rehabilitation services under this title or to postsecondary education or employment;''; and

(iii) in clause (v), as redesignated by clause (i) of this subparagraph, by striking ''evaluation standards'' and inserting ''performance standards'';

(4) in paragraph (22)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''STATE PLAN SUPPLEMENT'';

(B) by striking ''carrying out part B of title VI, including''; and

(C) by striking ''that part to supplement funds made available under part B of'';

(5) in paragraph (24)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''CONTRACTS'' and inserting ''GRANTS''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''CONTRACTS'' and inserting ''GRANTS''; and

(ii) by striking ''part A of title VI'' and inserting ''section 109A''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(25) COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY.—The State plan shall describe how the designated State agency will carry out the provisions of section 109A, including—

''(A) the criteria such agency will use to award grants under such section; and

''(B) how the activities carried out under such grants will be coordinated with other services provided under this title.

''(26) SERVICES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES.—The State plan shall provide an assurance satisfactory to the Secretary that the State—

''(A) has developed and implemented strategies to address the needs identified in the assessments described in paragraph (15), and achieve the goals and priorities identified by the State in that paragraph, to improve and expand vocational rehabilitation services for students with disabilities on a statewide basis in accordance with paragraph (15); and

''(B) from funds reserved under section 110A, shall carry out programs or activities designed to improve and expand vocational rehabilitation services for students with disabilities that—

''(i) facilitate the transition of students with disabilities from the receipt of educational services in school, to the receipt of vocational rehabilitation services under this title, including, at a minimum, those services specified in the interagency agreement required in paragraph (11)(D);

''(ii) improve the achievement of post-school goals of students with disabilities, including improving the achievement through participation (as appropriate when career goals are discussed) in meetings regarding individualized education programs developed under section 614 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1414);

''(iii) provide career guidance, career exploration services, job search skills and strategies, and technical assistance to students with disabilities;

''(iv) support the provision of training and technical assistance to State and local educational agencies and designated State agency personnel responsible for the planning and provision of services to students with disabilities; and

''(v) support outreach activities to students with disabilities who are eligible for, and need, services under this title.''.

SEC. 282. SCOPE OF SERVICES.

Section 103 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 723) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (15) and inserting the following:

''(15) transition services for students with disabilities, that facilitate the achievement of the employment outcome identified in the individualized plan for employment involved, including services described in clauses (i) through (iii) of section 101(a)(26)(B);'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6)(A)(i) Consultation and technical assistance services to assist State and local educational agencies in planning for the transition of students with disabilities from school to post-school activities, including employment.

''(ii) Training and technical assistance described in section 101(a)(26)(B)(iv).

''(B) Services for groups of individuals with disabilities who meet the requirements of clauses (i) and (iii) of section 7(35)(A), including services described in clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (v) of section 101(a)(26)(B), to assist in the transition from school to post-school activities.''; and

(3) in subsection (b), by inserting at the end the following:

''(7) The establishment, development, or improvement of assistive technology demonstration, loan, reutilization, or financing programs in coordination with activities authorized under the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) to promote access to assistive technology for individuals with disabilities and employers.''.

SEC. 283. STANDARDS AND INDICATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 726) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**EVALUATION STANDARDS**'' and inserting ''**PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**'';

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) STANDARDS AND INDICATORS.—The performance standards and indicators for the vocational rehabilitation program carried out under this title—

''(1) shall be subject to paragraphs (2)(A) and (3) of section 136(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871(b)); and

''(2) may, at a State's discretion, include additional indicators identified in the State plan submitted under section 101.''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) on a biannual basis, review the program improvement efforts of the State and, if the State has not improved its performance to acceptable levels, as determined by the Director, direct the State to make revisions to the plan to improve performance; and''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 107 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 727) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a)(1)(B) and (b)(2), by striking ''evaluation standards'' and inserting ''performance standards''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking ''an evaluation standard'' and inserting ''a performance standard''.

SEC. 284. EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS.

Section 108(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 728(a)) is amended by striking ''under part B of title VI, or''.

SEC. 285. COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended by inserting after section 109 (29 U.S.C. 728a) the following:

''SEC. 109A. COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY.

''(a) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'eligible entity' means a for-profit business, alone or in partnership with one or more of the following:

''(1) Community rehabilitation program providers.

''(2) Indian tribes.

''(3) Tribal organizations.

''(b) AUTHORITY.—A State shall use not less than one-half of one percent of the payment the State receives under section 111 for a fiscal year to award grants to eligible entities to pay for the Federal share of the cost of carrying out collaborative programs, to create practical job and career readiness and training programs, and to provide job placements and career advancement.

''(c) AWARDS.—Grants under this section shall—

''(1) be awarded for a period not to exceed 5 years; and

''(2) be awarded competitively.

''(d) APPLICATION.—To receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to a designated State agency at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as such agency shall require. Such application shall include, at a minimum—

''(1) a plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the collaborative program;

''(2) a plan for collecting and reporting the data and information described under subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 101(a)(10), as determined appropriate by the designated State agency; and

''(3) a plan for providing for the non-Federal share of the costs of the program.

''(e) ACTIVITIES.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to carry out a program that provides one or more of the following:

''(1) Job development, job placement, and career advancement services for individuals with disabilities.

''(2) Training in realistic work settings in order to prepare individuals with disabilities for employment and career advancement in the competitive market.

''(3) Providing individuals with disabilities with such support services as may be required in order to maintain the employment and career advancement for which the individuals have received training.

''(f) ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES.—An individual shall be eligible for services provided under a program under this section if the individual is determined under section 102(a)(1) to be eligible for assistance under this title.

''(g) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share for a program under this section shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of the program.''.

SEC. 286. RESERVATION FOR EXPANDED TRANSITION SERVICES.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended by inserting after section 110 (29 U.S.C. 730) the following:

"SEC. 110A. RESERVATION FOR EXPANDED TRANSITION SERVICES.

''Each State shall reserve not less than 10 percent of the funds allotted to the State under section 110(a) to carry out programs or activities under sections 101(a)(26)(B) and 103(b)(6).''.

SEC. 287. CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 112(e)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 732(e)(1)) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) The Secretary shall make grants to the protection and advocacy system serving the American Indian Consortium under the Developmental Disabilities and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15001 et seq.) to provide services in accordance with this section, as determined by the Secretary. The amount of such grants shall be the same as the amount provided to territories under this subsection.''.

SEC. 288. RESEARCH.

Section 204(a)(2)(A) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 764(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''VI,''.

SEC. 289. TITLE III AMENDMENTS.

Title III of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 771 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 301(a) (21 U.S.C. 771(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and'' at the end;

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3);

(2) in section 302 (29 U.S.C. 772)—

(A) in subsection (g)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING''; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking ''section 306'' and inserting ''section 304'';

(3) in section 303 (29 U.S.C. 773)—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''section 306'' and inserting ''section 304''; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by amending subparagraph (A)(ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) to coordinate activities and work closely with the parent training and information centers established pursuant to section 671 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1471), the community parent resource centers established pursuant to section 672 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1472), and the eligible entities receiving awards under section 673 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1473); and''; and

(II) in subparagraph (C), by inserting '', and demonstrate the capacity for serving,'' after ''serve''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) RESERVATION.—From the amount appropriated to carry out this subsection for a fiscal year, 20 percent of such amount or $500,000, whichever is less, shall be reserved to carry out paragraph (6).'';

(4) by striking sections 304 and 305 (29 U.S.C. 774, 775); and

(5) by redesignating section 306 (29 U.S.C. 776) as section 304.

SEC. 290. REPEAL OF TITLE VI.

Title VI of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 795 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 291. TITLE VII GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) PURPOSE.—Section 701(3) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796(3)) is amended by striking ''State programs of supported employment services receiving assistance under part B of title VI,''.

(b) CHAIRPERSON.—Section 705(b)(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796d(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) CHAIRPERSON.—The Council shall select a chairperson from among the voting membership of the Council.''.

SEC. 292. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) is further amended—

(1) in section 100 (29 U.S.C. 720)—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$3,066,192,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking ''2003'' and inserting ''2021'';

(2) in section 110(c) (29 U.S.C. 730(c)), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) The sum referred to in paragraph (1) shall be, as determined by the Secretary, not less than 1 percent and not more than 1.5 percent of the amount referred to in paragraph (1) for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.'';

(3) in section 112(h) (29 U.S.C. 732(h)), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$11,600,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years'';

(4) by amending subsection (a) of section 201 (29 U.S.C. 761(a)) to read as follows: ''(a) There are authorized to be appropriated $103,125,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years to carry out this title.'';

(5) in section 302(i) (29 U.S.C. 772(i)), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$33,657,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years'';

(6) in section 303(e) (29 U.S.C. 773(e)), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$5,046,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years'';

(7) in section 405 (29 U.S.C. 785), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$3,081,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years'';

(8) in section 502(j) (29 U.S.C. 792(j)), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$7,013,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years'';

(9) in section 509(l) (29 U.S.C. 794e(l)), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$17,088,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years'';

(10) in section 714 (29 U.S.C. 796e–3), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$22,137,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years'';

(11) in section 727 (29 U.S.C. 796f–6), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$75,772,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years''; and

(12) in section 753 (29 U.S.C. 7961), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''$32,239,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years''.

SEC. 293. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 1(b) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 109 the following:

''Sec. 109A. Collaboration with industry.'';

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 110 the following:

''Sec. 110A. Reservation for expanded transition services.'';

(3) by striking the item related to section 304 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 304. Measuring of project outcomes and performance.'';

(4) by striking the items related to sections 305 and 306;

(5) by striking the items related to title VI; and

(6) by striking the item related to section 706 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 706. Responsibilities of the Director.''.

Subtitle F—Studies by the Comptroller General

SEC. 296. STUDY BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON EXHAUSTING FEDERAL PELL GRANTS BEFORE ACCESSING WIA FUNDS.

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete and submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of subparagraph (B) of section 134(d)(4) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)(B)) (as such subparagraph was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act), including—

(A) a review of the regulations and guidance issued by the Secretary of Labor to State and local areas on how to comply with such subparagraph;

(B) a review of State policies to determine how local areas are required to comply with such subparagraph;

(C) a review of local area policies to determine how one-stop operators are required to comply with such subparagraph; and

(D) a review of a sampling of individuals receiving training services under section 134(d)(4) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)) to determine if, before receiving such training services, such individuals have exhausted funds received through the Federal Pell Grant program under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

(2) makes appropriate recommendations with respect to the matters evaluated under paragraph (1).

SEC. 297. STUDY BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON ADMINISTRATIVE COST SAVINGS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete and submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that—

(1) determines the amount of administrative costs at the Federal and State levels for the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available for—

(A) each of the programs authorized under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) or repealed under section 401 of this Act, as such programs were in effect for such fiscal year; and

(B) each of the programs described in subparagraph (A) that have been repealed or consolidated on or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) determines the amount of administrative cost savings at the Federal and State levels as a result of repealing and consolidating programs by calculating the differences in the amount of administrative costs between subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1); and

(3) estimates the administrative cost savings at the Federal and State levels for a fiscal year as a result of States consolidating

amounts under section 501(e) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9271(e)) to reduce inefficiencies in the administration of federally-funded State and local employment and training programs.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''administrative costs'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801).

SA 2638. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Reid of NV to the resolution S. Res. 312, urging the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in this case of Robert Levinson, one of the longest held Unites States civilians in our Nation's history; as follows:

In the seventh whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''and providing some initial indications that he was being held somewhere in southwest Asia''.

In the eighth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''further''.

SA 2639. Mr. REID (for Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Reid of NV to the resolution S. Res. 312, 0; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution urging the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in this case of Robert Levinson, one of the longest held United States civilians in our Nation's history.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 9, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''The Situation in Sudan.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 9, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 9, 2014, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kevin Rosenbaum, detailee to the Senate Committee on Finance, and Stephanie Dearie, clerk to the Senate Committee on Finance, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALLING ON IRAN FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE CASE OF ROBERT LEVINSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 271, S. Res. 312.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 312) calling on the government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in this case of Robert Levinson, one of the longest held United States civilians in our Nation's history.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to; the Nelson amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the amendment to the title be agreed to, and the motions 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. 312) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2638) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To make technical corrections in the preamble)

In the seventh whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''and providing some initial indications that he was being held somewhere in southwest Asia''.

In the eighth whereas clause of the preamble, strike ''further''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2639) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution urging the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in this case of Robert Levinson, one of the longest held United States civilians in our Nation's history.''.

The resolution (S. Res. 312), with its preamble, as amended, and its title, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 312

Whereas United States citizen Robert Levinson is a retired agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), a resident of Coral Springs, Florida, the husband of Christine Levinson, and father of their 7 children;

Whereas Robert Levinson traveled from Dubai to Kish Island, Iran, on March 8, 2007;

Whereas after traveling to Kish Island and checking into the Hotel Maryam, Robert Levinson disappeared on March 9, 2007;

Whereas, in December 2007, Robert Levinson's wife, Christine, traveled to Kish Island to retrace Mr. Levinson's steps and met with officials of the Government of Iran who pledged to help in the investigation;

Whereas for more than 6 years, the United States Government has continually pressed the Government of Iran to provide any information on the whereabouts of Robert Levinson and to help ensure his prompt and safe return to his family;

Whereas officials of the Government of Iran promised their continued assistance to the relatives of Robert Levinson during the visit of the family to the Islamic Republic of Iran in December 2007;

Whereas, in November 2010, the Levinson family received a video of Mr. Levinson in captivity, representing the first proof of life since his disappearance;

Whereas, in April 2011, the Levinson family received a series of pictures of Mr. Levinson, which provided indications that he was being held somewhere in southwest Asia;

Whereas Secretary John Kerry stated on August 28, 2013, ''The United States respectfully asks the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to work cooperatively with us in our efforts to help U.S. citizen Robert Levinson.'';

Whereas, on September 28, 2013, during the first direct phone conversation between the leaders of the United States and Iran since 1979, President Barack Obama raised the case of Robert Levinson to President of Iran Hassan Rouhani and urged the President of Iran to help locate Mr. Levinson and reunite him with his family;

Whereas November 26, 2013, marked the 2,455th day since Mr. Levinson's disappearance, making him one of the longest held United States civilians in our Nation's history; and

Whereas the FBI has announced a $1,000,000 reward for information leading to Mr. Levinson's safe return: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that Robert Levinson is one of the longest held United States civilians in our Nation's history;

(2) notes recent pledges by newly appointed officials of the Government of Iran to provide their Government's assistance in the case of Robert Levinson;

(3) urges the Government of Iran, as a humanitarian gesture, to intensify its cooperation on the case of Robert Levinson and to immediately share the results of its investigation into the disappearance of Robert Levinson with the United States Government;

(4) urges the President and the allies of the United States to continue to raise with officials of the Government of Iran the case of Robert Levinson at every opportunity, notwithstanding other serious disagreements the United States Government has had with the Government of Iran on a broad array of issues, including human rights, the nuclear program of Iran, the Middle East peace process, regional stability, and international terrorism; and

(5) expresses sympathy to the family of Robert Levinson for their anguish and expresses hope that their ordeal can be brought to an end in the near future.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—MANDATORY QUORUM CALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived with respect to the two cloture motions filed earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate

completes its business today, it adjourn until Monday, January 13, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time of the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1845, the unemployment insurance extension; that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to S. 1845 be 3 p.m. Monday and the filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to the Reed amendment No. 2631 be 4:30 p.m. on Monday; further, that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Robert Wilkins to be U.S. circuit judge for the DC Circuit, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to a vote on confirmation of the nomination; finally, that following disposition of the Wilkins nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Reed amendment No. 2631.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the next vote will be at 5:30 p.m. Monday, January 13, 2014, on the confirmation of the Wilkins nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:18 p.m., adjourned until Monday, January 13, 2014, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SUZETTE M. KIMBALL, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, VICE MARCIA K. MCNUTT, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEBORAH L. BIRX, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE AND COORDINATOR OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS GLOBALLY.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

MICHAEL W. KEMPNER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2015, VICE MICHAEL LYNTON, RESIGNED.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

HEIDI NEEL BIGGS, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2017, VICE ERIC J. TANENBLATT, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

CHRISTOPHER P. LU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE SETH DAVID HARRIS.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

WESTLEY WATENDE OMARI MOORE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2016, VICE STAN Z. SOLOWAY, TERM EXPIRED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

RANYA F. ABDELSAYED, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW KEKOA ABORDONADO, OF CALIFORNIA
LAURA RENEE ALDRICH, OF VIRGINIA
KAREN A. ANTONYAN, OF NEVADA
DWAIN D. ATKINSON, OF VIRGINIA
AZIZOU ATTE-OUDEYI, OF MASSACHUSETTS
NICOLE R. BADEN, OF MARYLAND
DANIEL F. BAKER, OF MICHIGAN
CEDAR C. BALAZS, OF NORTH DAKOTA
SARAH JEANNE BAUS, OF VIRGINIA
CLAIRE T. BEA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSICA LUCIA BEDOYA HERMANN, OF VIRGINIA
KAREN D. BETTENCOURT, OF CALIFORNIA
CHARLES C. CALVO, OF VIRGINIA
ROSS STEVENSON CAMPBELL, OF VIRGINIA
KATIE CAPARULA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BENJAMIN B. CHAPMAN, OF MARYLAND
HEATHER MICHELLE CHASE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
MEGAN P. CHEN, OF ILLINOIS
JOHN T. CHENG, OF MASSACHUSETTS
GLORIA CHOU, OF CALIFORNIA
GRACE ELLEN CHUNG, OF WASHINGTON
JULLION MATHIAS COOPER, OF MASSACHUSETTS
COLIN MALLOY CRAM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COLLEEN E. DE BERNARDO, OF VIRGINIA
JACQUELINE A. DE OLIVEIRA, OF VIRGINIA
EDUARD DEHELEAN, OF ILLINOIS
BERNARDO A. DIAZ, OF MASSACHUSETTS
BROOKS W. DIEHL, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY CHRISTINE DIGNAN, OF FLORIDA
CHELSI L. DILDINE, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINE M. EICHINGER, OF ILLINOIS
CAROLINA ESCALERA, OF FLORIDA
REBECCA ELIZABETH FARMER, OF WASHINGTON
SORIBEL L. FELIZ, OF NEW YORK
BOLTON XAVIER FORD, OF VIRGINIA
CRAIG M. FRIED, OF VIRGINIA
KYLE PATRICK FRITSCHLE, OF VIRGINIA
BART L. GEWERTZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHRISTOPHER GIDEON GRANGER, OF CONNECTICUT
ERIC W. GROFF, OF WASHINGTON
ALEXANDER CHARLES GUITTARD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JULIAN ANDREACCHI HADAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHARLES NORMAN HALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS
JOSEPH H. HART, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ZACHARY A. HAUGEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AMANDA R. HECKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARIE SUZANNE HEGLUND, OF VIRGINIA
MASON BENJAMIN HOROWITZ, OF ILLINOIS
JENNIFER HOYLE, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN E. HUNEKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GRANT HUNTER, OF MISSISSIPPI
KATE ERIN HUSBAND, OF MICHIGAN
MARK GEORGE JACKSON, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ARIEL ROSE JAHNER, OF CALIFORNIA
ESTHER B-H JOE, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER DAVID JOHNSON, OF NEW YORK
KEVIN PAUL KETCHUM, OF TEXAS
JUSTIN ANDREW KING, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN-MARSHALL KLEIN, OF VIRGINIA
ANNE MARIE ESTROSAS LEE, OF FLORIDA
SU LEE, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE LELLA, OF NEW YORK
ADAM MIGUEL LEVY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
KYLE JOSEPH PATRICK LISTON, OF OHIO
LISA A. LUDKA, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELO MILO MAESTAS, OF WASHINGTON
MARK ROBERT MALONEY, OF VIRGINIA
CARA M. MAQSODI, OF VIRGINIA
ERICA M. MARRERO, OF VIRGINIA
SHIVA ALIM MARVASTI, OF CONNECTICUT
JONATHAN MATZNER, OF VIRGINIA
CATILIN ELIZABETH MAXWELL, OF VIRGINIA
KATHLEEN E. MCDONALD, OF WASHINGTON
TIMOTHY JAMES MCKENZIE, OF VIRGINIA
BRADLEY MEACHAM, OF WASHINGTON
JACOB DANIEL MECUM, OF OREGON
TERESA MILENKOVIC, OF VIRGINIA
RHETT MOBLEY, OF FLORIDA
THERESA MUSACCHIO, OF ILLINOIS
ADMIR MUZUROVIC, OF VIRGINIA
NAUREEN M. NALIA, OF CALIFORNIA
MARY ELIZABETH NAMETH, OF MICHIGAN
ASHKAN NASSABI, OF MICHIGAN
DEBRA NEGRON, OF VIRGINIA
EUGENE NOVIKOV, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CHUKWUDI NWADIBIA, OF CALIFORNIA
JUAN A. ORTIZ MARQUEZ, OF VIRGINIA
CONNOR O'STEEN, OF WASHINGTON
STEPHANIE KATHRYN PARENTI-GIORDANO, OF FLORIDA
ANGELA KERRI PARHAM, OF VIRGINIA
RACHAEL NGUYEN PARRISH, OF MARYLAND
MEAGHAN H. PATRICK, OF VIRGINIA
MALALY PIKAR-VOLPI, OF VIRGINIA
SANDRA VALERIA PIZARRO, OF IDAHO
AARON HURLEY PRATT, OF MINNESOTA
MELISSA FISHER RANN, OF ILLINOIS
ANTHONY MARK READ, OF NEW YORK
ALEKSANDRA RISTOVIC, OF WEST VIRGINIA
JOHN O. ROBERTS, OF MARYLAND
LAUREN ROBERTS, OF VIRGINIA
NICHOLAS ROBERT ROSSMANN, OF VIRGINIA
MEREDITH LEIGH SANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
KATRINA J. SENGER, OF VIRGINIA
MOIRA K. SHANAHAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GRACE A. SHUGRUE, OF VIRGINIA
SAMARA LAKEIDRA ANNESE SIMMONS, OF NEW YORK
ERIC J. SKARPAC, OF MARYLAND
TABITHA JANETTE SNOWBERGER, OF TENNESSEE
ROBERT D. SOLES, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL BRENT STONE, OF VIRGINIA
BRYAN STRAUB, OF OHIO
MIKA STRICKLER, OF LOUISIANA
KEVIN J. SU, OF VIRGINIA
JORDAN DAVID SUN, OF VIRGINIA
JACOB DAWES STARNES SURFACE, OF INDIANA
SARAH A. TERRY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
EMILY TIETZE, OF TEXAS
SAMUEL D. TOOTLE, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL GARRISON TOWNE, OF VERMONT
SEVAK TSATURYAN, OF CALIFORNIA
GEORGE M. TUCKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SARAH MELISSA VAN HORNE, OF CALIFORNIA
SUSAN R. VAN WAES, OF VIRGINIA
DUNCAN T. VARDA, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN VOLKOFF, OF MARYLAND
LILA F. WADE, OF OREGON
IDASHLA KANE WAGNER, OF VIRGINIA
COURTNEY M. WALTON, OF ILLINOIS
MATTHEW A. WARD, OF UTAH
MARC A. WHITAKER, OF CALIFORNIA
JEANELLE L. WICKS, OF ARIZONA
LISA MARIE WOOD, OF NEW JERSEY
ANGIE ZEIDAN, OF VIRGINIA
FIRENO F. ZORA, OF VIRGINIA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL DENNIS J. GALLEGOS
COLONEL DAVID D. HAMLAR, JR.
COLONEL JOHN S. TUOHY

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL PAUL D. JACOBS
COLONEL TIMOTHY P. O'BRIEN
COLONEL ANDREW E. SALAS

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL JON K. KELK
BRIGADIER GENERAL CASSIE A. STROM
BRIGADIER GENERAL KENNETH W. WISIAN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL DARYL L. BOHAC
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT M. BRANYON
BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL B. COMPTON
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES E. DANIEL, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL MATTHEW J. DZIALO
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD N. HARRIS, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL WORTHE S. HOLT, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL GARY W. KEEFE
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID T. KELLY
BRIGADIER GENERAL DONALD A. MCGREGOR
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT L. SHANNON, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT S. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL CHRISTOPHER J. BENCE
BRIGADIER GENERAL JACK L. BRIGGS II
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID J. BUCK
BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS A. BUSSIERE
BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN A. CLARK
BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN T. DENKER
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN L. DOLAN
BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL E. FORTNEY
BRIGADIER GENERAL PETER E. GERSTEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL GINA M. GROSSO
BRIGADIER GENERAL JERRY D. HARRIS, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL DARYL J. HAUCK
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN M. HICKS
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN P. HORNER
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES R. MARRS
BRIGADIER GENERAL LAWRENCE M. MARTIN, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN K. MCMULLEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL BRADFORD J. SHWEDO
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAY B. SILVERIA
BRIGADIER GENERAL LINDA R. URRUTIA–VARHALL
BRIGADIER GENERAL JACQUELINE D. VAN OVOST
BRIGADIER GENERAL MARK W. WESTERGREN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PARTRICK J. DONAHUE II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM B. GARRETT III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DAVID D. HALVERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 3037, AND 3064:

To be brigadier general, judge advocate general's corps

COL. STUART W. RISCH

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KATHRYN L. AASEN
JASON T. BLACKHAM
JEFFERY A. CASEY
CHOL H. CHONG
SHERYL L. KANE
AMAR KOSARAJU
JAMES M. KUTNER
DAVID P. LEE
ZINDELL RICHARDSON
KEVIN J. STANGER
MICHAEL R. SUHLER
RICHARD D. TOWNSEND
JOHN K. WALTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

THERESE A. BOHUSCH
DAVID E. BYER
JAMES M. CANTRELL
VICTOR CARAVELLO
MARIE PAULETTE COLASANTI
CAROL M. COPELAND
MAUREEN O. HARBACK
BRENT A. JOHNSON
JAMES W. LASSWELL
KEVIN J. MCCAL
KRYSTAL L. MURPHY
RICHARD SCHOSKE
RANDOLPH R. SMITH
JAMES A. STEPHENSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAVID M. BERTHE
PAUL N. CONNER
GREGORY S. CULLISON
CHRISTOPHER A. DUN
TIMOTHY A. DYKENS
ALFRED K. FLOWERS, JR.
LINDA M. GUERRERO
JOHN J. MAMMANO
TIMOTHY L. MARTINEZ
RONALD J. MERCHANT
TODD L. OSGOOD
MICHELLE A. PUFALL
SCOTT C. SUCKOW
JEFFREY J. WHITE
PAUL A. WILLINGHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

AMY R. ASTONLASSITER
JENNIFER R. BEIN
MARIE ANTONETTE C. BRANCATO
JOHN A. BREWSTER
JARED W. CARDON
BENJAMIN R. CLARKE
LINDA K. COATES
JAY FEDOROWICZ
GEOFFREY L. GESSEL
SCOTT F. GRUWELL
CURTIS J. HAYES
PAUL B. HILFER
TYETUS T. HOHNSTEIN
NATHAN D. KRIVITZKY
KETU PANCHAL LINCOLN
PATRICK M. MCDONOUGH
DIONTE R. MONCRIEF
IRIS B. ORTIZ GONZALEZ
DANIEL J. PALAZZOLO
CHRISTOPHER K. PARRIS
JAKUB F. PIETROWSKI
CHAD R. RAPER
MATTHEW T. RAPER
JAROM J. RAY
MATTHEW M. ROGERS
DAVID A. ROTHAS
RENE SAENZ
CADE A. SALMON
LESLEY J. SALVAGGIO
BRETT A. SESHUL
KYRA Y. SHEA
CHRISTINA L. SHEETS
ANGELA K. STANTON
AIMEE N. ZAKALUZNY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD T. BARKER
ERIC G. BARNEY
ANGELICA BLACK
CHET K. BRYANT
CANG QUOC BUI
ERIC J. CAMERON
FRANCISCO J. CATALA
HEIDI L. CLARK
MICHAEL J. CUOMO
LINDA LEE CURRIER
JOHN A. DALOMBA
MICHAEL F. DETWEILER
THOMAS J. DOKER
DAVID A. EISENACH
TROY P. FAABORG
KELLY J. GAMBINOSHIRLEY
GREG J. GARRISON
GREGORY S. HENDRICKS
GEORGE A. HESTILOW
VINA E. HOWARTH
WEILUN HSU
TERESA MEAD HUGHES
CHAD A. JOHNSON
BRIAN A. KATEN
EDWARD D. KOSTERMAN III
CHRISTOPHER M. KURINEC
PATRICE L. LYONS
THOMAS N. MAGEE
MICHAEL D. MCCARTHY
ANN D. MCMANIS
MELISSA R. MEISTER
CORY J. MIDDEL
DENIS J. NOLAN
ERIC L. PHILLIPS
JOANNA L. RENTES
LARA L. RILEY
MOCHA LEE ROBINSON
ETHIEL RODRIGUEZ
MATTHEW W. SAKAL
STEFFANIE S. SARGEANT
ERIC J. SAWVEL
MELISSA HERGAN SIMMONS
JOHN E. SIMONS
LEONARDO E. TATO
STACEY S. VAN ORDEN
MICHELLE L. WAITERS
CAROL A. WEST
ROBBIE L. WHEELER
IAN P. WIECHERT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ELIZABETH R. ANDERSONDOZE
MARK A. ANTONACCI
KARYN JESTER AYERS
DEVIN P. BECKSTRAND
LYNN G. BERRY
ALEXANDER B. BLACK
REBECCA SMILEY BLACKWELL
STEPHEN R. BODEN
KURT R. BOLIN
HANS C. BRUNTMYER
DARREN E. CAMPBELL
MATTHEW B. CARROLL
NAILI A. CHEN
NICHOLAS G. CONGER
PATRICK J. DANAHER
EDWIN P. DAVIS, JR.
GERALD R. FORTUNA, JR.
KATHY J. GREEN
MARY L. GUYE
WILLIAM N. HANNAH, JR.
MATTHEW P. HANSON
CHRISTOPHER G. HAYES
CHRYSTAL D. HENDERSON
LAKEISHA RENEE HENRY
DAVID C. IVES
ROBERT A. JESINGER
JON M. JOHNSON
PETER H. KIM
KY M. KOBAYASHI
MICAL J. KUPKE
DONALD J. LANE
HENRY K. K. LAU
TERENCE PATRICK LONERGAN
MIKELLE A. MADDOX
JOHN D. MCARTHUR
LISA C. MITCHELL
STEPHEN W. MITCHELL
MEREDITH L. MOORE
CHARLES D. MOTSINGER
ENEYA H. MULAGHA
GLEN K. NAGASAWA
DAVID M. OLSON
CRAIG R. K. PACK
RACHELLE PAULKAGIRI
DWIGHT E. PEAKE
SCOTT C. PRICE
LYRAD K. RILEY
CHRISTOPHER S. ROHDE
KAREN A. RYAN PHILPOTT
STEPHANIE A. SCHAEFER
DAVID P. SIMON
KRISTEN E. TALECK
DAI A. TRAN
MARK W. TRUE
LAURENCE A. ULISSEY
KEVIN R. VANVALKENBURG
ALLAN E. WARD
CATHERINE T. WITKOP
BRIAN M. YORK
AARON T. YU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JENARA L. ALLEN
ANDREW W. BAKER
MICHAEL E. BINGHAM
BENJAMIN J. BRITTEN
AMY C. BROWN
CODY W. CALAME
KATHRINA T. CARRASCO
CODY L. CHRISTLINE
JEFFREY G. CLAYTON
BRANDON C. CLYBURN
REANN M. CORNELL
JENNIFER E. CREECH
MEGAN SARAH DESROCHES
CYNTHIA L. DOMINESSY
PRESTON S. DUFFIN
ANDREA L. DUFOUR
JOHN A. DUSENBURY, JR.
PETER S. FRANDSEN
CHERIELYNNE A. GABRIEL
JASON R. GARNER
CHRISTIN M. GIACOMINO
DOUGLAS N. GRABOWSKI
ALLEN G. GUNN
WYETH L. HOOPES
KELLEY A. HURSH
JESSICA A. ISENBERG
BENJAMIN W. JOHNSON
DERRIK R. JOHNSON
SHANNAN M. JOHNSON
CHRISTOPHER J. JONES
ROYDEN DERRICK JONES
TANN S. JONES
MATTHEW W. JOOSSE
KATYA B. KANUK
BRYAN R. KATZ
AMANDA R. KELLY
VERA LEE
AUSTYN M. LEHMUTH
MICHAEL S. LUNA
CLAUDIA E. MAIOLO
JOHN R. MALLYA
JOSEPH K. MCCOMBS
JESSICA L. MILBURN
MATTHEW T. MOBERG
MIKHAIL I. MUKHIN
REBECCA S. NEITZKE
MARK R. OLSEN
RHETT K. OLSEN
NICHOLAS L. POLCZYNSKI
DAMON J. POPE
JACOB A. POWELL
CHRISTOPHER J. RAIMONDI
DAVID M. RAPER
JENNIFER L. REDFORD
JAMES M. RIDGEWAY II
APRIL M. ROCKER
JASON A. ROSE
LARA C. SACKHEIM
CHRISTOPHER J. SAYLOR
DAVID K. SCHINDLER
TODD A. SCHULTZ
TYLER J. SCHUURMANS
MELISSA C. SHEETS
KIMBERLY A. SIMMENHIIPAKKA
AARON T. SMITH
JACOB T. SMITH
NICOLE A. SMITH
HELENA M. SWANK
WAH YUNG TSANG
JON P. VANDEWALKER
ABBEY C. VINALL
CRAIG V. VINALL
SCOTT A. WALKER
BRACKEN M. WEBB
SARAH M. WHEELER
WILLIAM A. WRIGHT
DERRICK A. ZECH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ERIN E. ARTZ
TAMMY L. BAKER
VICKI L. BATEMAN
DAVID T. BEUTLER
KATRINA R. BLANCO
PAMELA L. BLUEFORD
SCOTT M. BOYD
SHANNON CHRISTINE BRANLUND
TRACY A. BRANNOCK
SITAO V. BROWNHEIM
RICHARD H. CABALLERO
LANNIE M. CALHOUN
RACHEL E. CASEY
DANIEL G. CASSIDY

STEVEN R. CHASE
PEDRO J. COLON
ELIZABETH F. COPELAND
TISHA T. CORNETT
CHRISTINE RENNIE CREED
BRIAN D. CRUZ
DANNY C. DACEY
JODI L. DANTER
ANTHONY E. DARGUSH
ROBERT T. DAVIS
MARK ANDREW DIXON
KENT H. DO
IZABELA A. DZIEDZIC
CRAIG D. ENGLAND
JON M. B. FARLEY
EMILY A. FLETCHER
JASON R. FLORY
HEATHER M. FORD
JASON W. FORQUER
ADAM J. FRITZ
EMILY A. FUSCO
WILLIAM A. GARLISI, SR.
LUCAS GASCO
JULIE M. GLOVER
KARINA C. GLOVER
JUSTIN J. GRAY
EMILY A. GRIESER
DANIEL B. GROSS
ROBERT T. GUDGEL
STEPHANIE K. HARLEY
ARMEL HASANI
ANDREW G. HELMAN
LAURA P. HENRY
JAYVANITA A. HILL MOORE
MARK R. HILL
ANDREW M. HODGE
STACIANNE M. HOWARD
CHRISTOPHER M. HOWELL
AMANDA E. HUSTON
IRENE R. JACKSON
KASEY M. JACKSON
BARBARA R. JEAN
ERIC W. JORCZAK
FERNINA Y. JUNIEL
SARAH E. KELLY
NEAL J. KENNINGTON
MAUREEN F. KIMSEY
JAMES W. KURZDORFER
LEA L. LAFFOON
ANDREW B. LAMMY
ANTONIO LEONARDICATTOLICA
BRIAN E. LIVINGSTON
KARLO M. MARIANO
CRYSTAL V. MCLEOD
HEIDI A. MCMINN
KIMBRAY N. MCNEAL
MARI M. METZLER
TABITHA D. MULLINS
NGUYEN T. NGUYEN
LAURA A. NICHOLS
JIN U. O
MELISSA M. ODENWELLER
UZOAMAKA ODIMEGWU MBAKWEM
MARK F. OLSON
LAMONT Q. ONG
JOSE A. ORTEGA
JEREMY R. PALLAS
GREGORY H. PALMROSE
GENA C. PARKMAN
TUYEN T. PHAM
SONIA N. PONS
DAVID R. POOLE
JESSICA M. POTHAST
AMY L. QUINLISK
MICHAEL J. RABENER
MICHAEL H. RATH
PATRICE L. REVIERE
JORDAN B. RICHARDSON
GERARDO I. ROBLES MORALES
LAKISHA GADSDEN ROE
ANDREA M. ROPE
JILL M. ROSER
EMILY A. ROUGIER
DAWN M. RUSSELL
JAMES B. RUTLAND
KAREN M. SALYARS
LLOYD C. SCHARFENSTINE
JOHN I. SHOAF
JEFFREY J. SMITH
THOMAS M. SMITH
RABECCA K. STAHL
JIMMY D. STANLEY
BRIAN J. STROH
LAURA L. SWANSON
DAWN APRIL TANNER
JOLYN I. TATUM
NADIA E. TEALE
MICHAEL R. TEMPLE
MATTHEW S. UBEDEI
DANNY J. VILLALOBOS
KATHERINE J. WAGGNER
CATHERINE M. WARE
MICHAEL L. WEBBER
DAVID M. WELLER
TOMAS WIDEMOND
CHAD R. WILLIAMS
DIANNE L. WILLIAMS
JAMES B. WILLIAMS
TODD K. ZUBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

WESLEY M. ABADIE
CHRISTOPHER T. ANDERSON
JAVIER L. ARENAS
JAMES J. ARNOLD
JOANNE M. BALINTONA
MATTHEW F. BARCHIE
DARRELL E. BASKIN
RHODORA J. BECKINGER
KENNETH S. BODE
DANIEL E. BRADY
PRYOR S. BRENNER
NATHAN H. BREWER
ALICE J. BRIONES
LEE JOSHUA BROCK
DANIEL J. BROWN
DOUGLAS W. BYERLY
MATTHEW C. CALDWELL
DALE C. CAPENER
KATHERINE M. CEBE
LAURA P. CEBE
VICTOR C. CHANG
STEVE I. CHEN
DONALD S. CHRISTMAN
KASI M. CHU
CHAD E. CONNOR
TARA E. COOK
JESSICA W. CROWDER
KATIE M. CROWDER
MICHAEL W. CROWDER
BRYAN C. CURTIS
EDDIE D. DAVENPORT
TASLIM A. DAWOOD
KATE B. DEISSEROTH
CHRISTOPHER J. DENNIS
JEFFREY D. DILLON
TUCKER A. DRURY
STEVE L. DUFFY
JAMES T. DUNLAP
MATTHEW D. EBERLY
ANDREW B. EBERT
ELIZABETH A. ERICKSON
AARON M. FIELDS
TERESA L. FINNILA
BRIAN M. FITZGERALD
ANNA M. FLINN
JOSEPH P. FORESTER
MICHAEL R. FRAYSER
AMY E. GAMMILL
MATTHEW C. GILL
SEAN C. GLASGOW
CHRIS K. GOLD
MATTHEW D. GOLDMAN
CRAIG A. GOOLSBY
DAVID K. GORDON II
CLAIRE HOELSCHER GOULD
SCOTT I. HAGEDORN
HEATHER A. HALVORSON
MARIE J. HAN
MATTHEW C. HANN
SHANA LEE HANSEN
BRENT S. HARLAN
KENISHA R. HEATH
CHANCE J. HENDERSON
DANA J. HESS
SVEN M. HOCHHEIMER
BRIAN L. HOLT
MARC D. HOPKINS
ANDREW Y. HSING
BRIAN S. JOHNSTON
COURTNEY A. JUDD
ERIC W. KADERBEK
GREGORY C. KAHL
JOHNSON C. KAY
KIRK A. KEEGAN III
CHRISTOPHER KEIRNS
PATRICK L. KELLER
JASON A. KELLY
RONALD J. KHOURY
MARY ANNE KIEL
JULIANE B. KIM
JEREMY A. KING
MELISSA M. KING
GEORGE H. KOTTI III
LEZLIE R. KUEBKER
CAROLYN S. LACEY
JEFFREY S. LAROCHELLE
GRANT E. LATTIN, JR.
DALILA W. LEWIS
ARNOLD K. LIM
JEN LIANG JACOB LIN
CHRISTOPHER J. LINBERG
HENRY C. LIU
EDWARD M. LOPEZ
JOSEPH E. LOTTERHOS, JR.
BRUCE A. LYNCH
BRYANT R. MARTIN
JASON C. MASSENGILL
PETER E. MATTHEWS
GREGORY THOMAS MCCAIN
SHANNAN E. MCCANN
SHANE N. MCCAULEY
TIMOTHY J. MCDONALD
SHAWN M. MCFARLAND
MICHAEL A. MEEKER
JONATHAN S. MILLER
JAMES D. MITCHELL
ARASH K. MOMENI
DERRICK A. MONTGOMERY
GLENVILLE G. MORTON
BRIAN H. NEESE
ADAM J. NEWELL
JOHN M. OBERLIN
JAMES B. ODONE
DAVID M. OLDHAM
JOSEPH M. OLIVEIRA
WILLIAM L. POMEROY III
JOHN W. POWELL
JESSICA F. POWERS
RONALD J. QUAM
ERIC T. RABENSTEIN
TEMPLE A. RATCLIFFE
DARA DANIELA REGN
CHRISTOPHER A. ROUSE
DILLON J. SAVARD
MICAH D. SCHMIDT
TODD A. SCHWARTZLOW
KATHRYNE L. SENECHAL
ANAND D. SHAH
HEATHER M. SILVERS
KRISTIN L. SILVIA
MARVIN H. SINEATH, JR.
MICHELLE T. SIT
MATTHEW J. SNYDER
ELIZABETH L. SOMSEL
JONATHAN A. SOSNOV
JADE M. SPURGEON
MARK C. STAHL
JENNIFER ANN STANGLE
MEGAN BURGESS STEIGELMAN
SHANE C. STEINER
JACOB T. STEPHENSON
JOSEPH J. STUART
JASON L. TAYLOR
CAMERON M. THURMAN
CARLA E. TORRES
ELIZABETH P. TRAN
SARAH N. VICK
MATTHEW C. WALLACE
GRAHAM I. WARDEN
DERON T. WARREN
CHRISTOPHER J. WILHELM
JASON A. WILLIAMS
ALAN J. WILLIAMSON
MATTHEW J. WOLF
ELY A. WOLIN
ALYN Q. WOODS
JOSHUA Y. YOUNG
SCOTT A. ZAKALUZNY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ADAM L. ACKERMAN
DANIEL J. ADAMS
SABRINA M. AKHTAR
JANELLE M. ALEXANDER
KRISTINE E. ANDREWS
JUSTIN J. ARAMBASICK
MATTHEW A. ARMSTRONG
RYAN D. AYCOCK
SARAH K. AYERS
JUSTIN P. BANDINO
MICHELLE L. BANDINO
MICHAEL A. BARAKAT
DARRICK J. BECKMAN
MELISSA C. BECKMANN
DAVID CARL BELCHER
DAVID E. BEREDA
MARSCHALL B. BERKES
CHRISTOPHER L. BERRY
STUART R. BERTSCH
MELISSA J. BLAKER
DANA M. BLYTH
AARON M. BOGART
PRENTICE L. BOWMAN
ERIN K. BOYLSTON
ERIN N. BRACK
MICHAEL BREWER
WILLIAM E. BROOKS
MICHAEL R. BRUNSON
NATHAN S. BUCK
REBECCA K. BURNS
REBECCA R. BURSON
KATHRYN M. BURTSON
TYLER M. BUSER
MELISSA R. BUSKEN
PAUL E. BUTTS
KIMBERLY B. CALDWELL
ROBERT M. CAMBRIDGE
BRYAN J. CANNON
DIANE M. CARANTA
CHRISTOPHER J. CHIU
MARYROSE D. CHUIDIAN
LETITIA DANIELLE CHUKWUMAH
YOUNGME C. CHUNG
CHRISTOPHER N. CLARKE
JEFFREY A. COLBURN
CHARLIE A. COLLENBORNE
JOSHUA C. COMBS
MATTHEW R. COMPTON
MARK A. COOMES
SCOTT J. CRABTREE, JR.
NICOLE C. CROLEY
JARED A. CROTHERS
TORIJAUN D. DALLAS
CORDELL R. DAVIS
SHYAM K. DAYA
MAURICIO DE CASTRO PRETELT
STEVEN D. DEAS
MELISSA L. DECKER
ERIK SCOTT DESOUCY
KRISTEN L. DEWILDE
SCOTT C. DILLARD
CHRISTINA L. DILLER
BRADLEY R. DOLES
DANIEL A. DOLEWSKI II
STACY A. DONNELLY
GARY W. DORAZIO
JALIEN KATRICE DORRIS
RYAN S. DORSEYSPITZ
JOSHUA R. DUNCAN
KEITH E. EARLEY, JR.
PETER S. EASTER
SHANNON R. EHLERINGER

BASHIR ELKHOURY
EMILY J. ERMIS
SCOTT M. EVERSON
ANGELA M. FAGIANA
JETHER C. FARINO
CHARLES J. FERONTI
PATRICK R. FINKBONE
SARAH BRITT FOLEY
CAELAN M. FORD
HEATHER N. FOSTER
DANA A. FRAZINE
ANTHONY P. GALE
LAURA K. GALLO
HILARY B. GALLOGLY
HECTOR M. GARCIA MARRERO
CHRISTIAN A. GARCIA
NITASHA D. GARCIA
NOEL M. GARCIA
JENNIFER M. GEMMILL
SPENCER M. GEORGE
LAWRENCE MCLEAN GIBBS
SHANNON A. GLADMAN
LINDSEY A. GOETZ
AARON J. GOODRICH
ROSS F. GRAHAM
RICHARD E. GRAY
RYAN L. GRAY
ASHLEY L. GUBBELS
JOSHUA D. GUSTAFSON
ANDREA M. HAGES
JESSICA L. HAINSFURTHER
KIMBERLY A. HAMILTON
DALLAS G. HANSEN
MARK C. HANSEN
CHRISTIANNE M. HARRIS
GABRIEL T. HARRIS
APRIL E. HAURY
TIMOTHY R. HAUSER
BENJAMIN J. HEATON
KELLY D. HEEGARD
ROBERT J. HENLEY
NATASHA C. HERBOLD
CHRISTOPHER W. HEWITT
JUSTIN B. HILL
JOSHUA W. HINSON
BRIAN J. HOOD
JAMES E. HOUGAS III
ANDREW D. HOUSHOLDER
ADAM B. HOWES
KATTIE DANNIELLE HOY
NICOLE M. HSU
JOSEPH C. HUDSON
OMOTAYO A. IDERA ABDULLAH
KATHERINE M. IVEY
CHRISTINE E. JACOBSEN
HAMEED JAFRI
ROCKY P. J. JEDICK
JULIE R. JEYARATNAM
CYNTHIA R. JOHNS
MARY A. JOHNSTON
BRANDON Q. JONES
RYAN W. JONES
JOHN H. KIM
RICHARD BENJAMIN KNIGHT
STEPHANIE I. KNODEL
RYAN M. KRAMPERT
BENJAMIN B. KUMOR
EMILY S. KUO
ANDREW J. KUSCHNERAIT
HANA K. KWAN
RHET R. LANGLEY
JENNIFER L. LAZAROWICZ
AMY M. LEE
RACHEL A. LIEBERMAN
MARK LIU
LIN N. LU
LESLIE LYLES
RAEANN H. MACALMA
JAIMIE L. MAINES
JACOB S. MAJORS
ANDREW M. MALEY
JAMES M. MANLEY
CRYSTAL M. MANOHAR
WILLIAM E. MARTIN
DAVID T. MATTESON
JON R. MAUST
WILLIAM J. MAYLES
BROOKE E. MCCARTHY
TREVOR I. MCCOTTER
MATTHEW S. MCDONOUGH
TIFFANY P. MERRICK
RYAN P. MOLCHAN
SONIA L. MOLCHAN
MICHELLE R. MORA
KRISTY MORALES
ARIAN A. MOSES
DAVID A. MOSS
BARON THAXTON MULLIS
SHANNON M. MURPHY
PATRICIA I. NWAJUAKU
ROBIN M. OBER
TIMOTHY R. ORI
ZACHARIAH A. OVERBY
JUDY K. OWENS
CHARLES Q. PACE
DEMIAN A. PACKETT
JAVIER A. PADIAL
WHITNEY PAFFORD
STEPHEN J. PARK
CORNELIUS R. PETERSON
TREVOR A. PETERSON
DANIEL S. PETTIT
NEIL T. PHIPPEN
JENNIFER L. PIPPIN
KYLA R. PYKO
KRISTEN A. REINEKE
REGINA M. REINSVOLD
RICHARD E. REINSVOLD
JUSTIN C. REIS
JEANMARIE B. REY
ILA S. REYES
WESLEY D. REYNOLDS
DEREK M. RICHARDSON
DAVID L. RIGGS, JR.
AARON M. ROBERTS
CHRISTINA HELEN ROBINSON
JOEL N. ROBINSON
CHRISTINE ROJAS
REBECCA A. ROSE
NATASHA M. ROWE
KAREN A. RUPP
TRAVIS C. RUSSELL
TYLER W. RUST
ELIZABETH E. SABLOTNE
DANE H. SALAZAR
VALERIE G. SAMS
DAVID R. SAYERS
CHRISTOPHER SCHEIBLER
FREDERICK W. SCHIEBEL
MONICA E. SCHMIDT
THOMAS W. SCHMIDT
BROOKE M. SCIUTO
DANIEL J. SCOTT
OWEN J. SCOTT
MICHELE A. SCULLY
BRETT SEARCEY
DAVID J. SHAW
ANDREW J. SHEEAN
MICHAEL R. SHERMAN
ASHLEY M. SHIRAH
MATTHEW P. SHUPE
THOMAS S. SHUTE
TRACY J. SLAGER
JOANNA L. SLOBODNJAK
CASEY C. SMITH
WILLIAM D. SMITH
ANGELA M. ST CLAIR
REBECCA H. STANLEY
DWAYNE C. STEELE
JUSTIN D. STERETT
JONATHAN A. STERING
ANDREW PAUL STEVENS
JOSHUA A. STEVENS
MARK J. STEVENS
CHRISTOPHER J. STRAUCHON
MEGHANN M. STROBACH
MARY F. STUEVER
ANGELA D. SULLIVAN
SABRINA M. SUMNER
ROBERT B. SWANSON
MATTHEW J. SWENSON
CHRISTOPHER F. TANA
KELLY B. THOMPSON
ENRILYN R. THRONSON
JONATHAN D. TIDWELL
MICHAEL K. TIGER
AMANDA M. TIPTON
ROBERT L. TONG
OANH N. TRAN
JOHN F. TRENTINI III
GREGORY TRIFILO
RICHARD E. TROWBRIDGE
DANIEL T. TRUSCOTT
DANIEL J. URSCHEL
MARY ROSE B. VALINA
MICHAEL R. VAN DUSEN
ALLISON A. VAN HAASTERT
JOHN E. VICKMAN
DAVID M. VON CLEF
BETTINA C. WATKINS
LUISA Y. WATTS
MICHAEL A. WATTS
JOY E. WHEAT
BRANDON M. WHITE
DERRIC ALLAN WHITESIDE
MATTHEW C. WILSON
PRESTON J. WILSON
REBEKAH L. WOLAK
SKY J. WOLF
PRISCILLA H. WONG
MEREDITH L. WRIGHT
ZACHARY E. WRIGHT, JR.
ABBY L. YOUNG
KRISTEN P. ZELIGS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JOSEPH A. ANDERSON
ERICA K. BARKEI
JACOB L. BARNOSKI
SHAWN C. BASINGER
COLT W. BAXTER
MICHAEL BELLIN
DESIREE R. BROACH
AMY M. CARLSON
AMANDA J. CHAMBERLIN
ROSS A. CONIGLIO
JASON R. CRAWFORD
JOHN M. CRAWFORD
TERRA L. DAWES
FRANK A. DECECCO
TACIA E. DESPO
MATTHEW T. FRENCH
ANGELINA C. GERARDO
JAROD M. HANSON
DIANA A. HOFFMAN
RHONDA L. HOLT
STEPHANIE M. KENNEDY
MARC G. KNOBBE
MIRIAM A. LOVELL
BRANDEN M. MAXWELL
TAYLOR K. OPEL
AMOS K. PETERSON
SANTOS K. J. RAPP
CAITLIN A. RIZZO
D011695

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

VICTOR M. ANDA
TODD D. ANDERSON
TIMOTHY M. BENEDICT
TROY P. BETTENCOURT
DAVID M. BOLAND
EDWARD J. BOOTH
TISHA L. BRIDGE
CHARLES P. BRILL
JASON R. COLLINS
CHRISTOPHER B. CORDOVA
BRADLEY P. COUGHLIN
ROBIN E. CUSHING
KAREN A. DAIGLE
CINDY J. DEAN
MARIA G. DUGGAN
EMMANUEL EASTERLING
DAVID E. ELLIOTT
LINDSEY K. FAUDREE
BRIAN M. FECTEAU
ANDREW D. FISHER
ISMAEL FLECHA
ANDREW D. FORTENBERRY
DARRON FRITZ
JAMISON E. GADDY
BRETT C. GENDRON
CRYSTAL L. GIESEL
JASON D. GONZALEZ
BRIAN E. GRAY
BRIAN T. GREGG
STEPHEN HANSON
DARREN W. HEARN
JULIE A. HESS
MICHAEL D. HOLLOWAY
SCOTT R. JOLMAN
JOETTA M. KHAN
JUSTIN KOCHER
TINA M. KOILE
KRISTOPHER B. LEWIS
KELLY J. MARCOUX
TODD L. MCNIESH
CHRISTOPHER G. METCALF
JOHN A. MILLER
MICHAEL D. MORRISON, JR.
ANTONIO ORTIZGARCIA
TAMARA E. OSGOOD
DUSTIN T. OVERHOLT
JASON F. PACE
DAVID M. POLSTON
OSCAR POMALES
FRANK RAMOS
CHRISTOPHER W. REMILLARD
JESSE P. REYNOLDS
BRADLEY M. RITLAND
CANDI C. ROBERTS
CHRISTOPHER J. RUGGIERO
DAWN M. RYAN
MELISSA J. SHELTON
BRIAN S. SIMONS
CRAIG J. STACHEWICZ
SUSAN STANKORB
MARTIN L. STEWART
RACHELLE THOMAS
VALERIE M. WATKINS
DREW M. WEBB
JEFFREY A. WEISS
WELTON W. WILSON
JOSHUA A. WORLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

TRACY K. ABENOJA
SAMANTHA L. T. AGEE
BRIAN P. ALEXANDER
MICHELLE F. AMBERSLEY
IQUO N. ANDREWS
DANIELA A. ARGENTINO
DANGELO M. AUSTIN
KENNETH M. AYTES
BRIDGETTE S. BAILEY
JIYOON J. BARHAM
STEVEN A. BARR
FELISA K. BATSON
SAMANTHA E. BAZAN
DAWN M. BLANCHARD
CAMISHA Q. BOATWRIGHT
REUBEN BONDURANT
PHANTHAVONG BOON
WILLIAM BOSOMPEM
COLLAZO G. A. BRACETE
WILLIE C. BRANCH
GORDON T. BRISCOE
ELIZABETH R. BROWN
ROBIN R. BROWN
TRENA A. BUGGS
MICHELE L. BURATTI
SEAN W. CALDER
BROOK T. CARERROS
LORETTA K. CLARKTORREIRA

VERONICA D. COLLINS
YASHIKA R. COOK
RICHARD E. CROCKER
JEREMY K. CROUCH
RICHARD A. CURRY
WILLIAMS L. M. DANIELS
NICOLLE E. DEATON
CELIA DIAL
JAMES J. DIAL
ELISABETH DILLON
MEGAN D. DONALD
NAKEIMA E. DORR
NICOLE R. DRAKE
JULIE R. DUFFY
JOHN C. ECKHOLM
MICHAEL A. ELIE
MATTHEW J. EULER
ANNIE M. FANT
NATALIE A. FARLEY
ANGELO V. FIORE
ANGELIA M. FISHER
ELIZABETH A. FLEGE
KYLEE J. FOY
JACOB R. FROEHLE
MARC A. FURMANSKI
JULIE K. GAHL
JEFFREY M. GAINOK
MANUEL A. GALAVIZ
BRIAN P. GALLAHAN
BETHANY D. GARDNER
BELINDA I. GIBBS
JENNIFER Y. GIVENS
MICHAEL GRAY
KELLY N. GREEN
BRIAN A. GREENE
CYNTHIA D. GROENDES
JOSE G. GUTIERREZHERNANDEZ
TIMOTHY L. HARRINGTON
HERMAN L. HENKES
GENO M. HERRON
PATRICIA A. HODSON
SETH A. HOLLOWAY
TORRY B. HOOK
CHRISTY G. HOYT
FELECIA E. HUDSON
JENNIFER L. HUYCK
CATHERINE T. JENNINGS
GEORGE H. JOHNSON
COREY W. JONES
KEVIN P. JONES
STEPHEN D. JONES
NANCY N. KANE
JAYME L. KAPFENSTEIN
SUZANNE T. KEITH
LAQUINCYIA R. KEY
ANDREW S. KRAUSE
PATRICK M. KRUM
NICKIE A. LACER
JOANN J. LEDOUX
NORRIS L. LEVY
JOSEPH M. LISTER
STEPHENIE R. LISTER
DEBRA LOVE
JULIANA A. LUCIANO
NICCOLE M. MALDONADO
CANISHA A. MARTIN
ATIA C. MBAH
SANDRA B. MCKENZIE
KELLY C. MEISTER
FELIX MERCADOTORRES
AMANDA M. MERRITT
JUSTIN L. MILLER
BARON B. MOEHLENBROCK
KRISTINA E. MOFFETT
JOHN M. MOZER
ERIC S. MUTCHIE
AMANDA B. NAPOLET
NATHANIAL NARAYANA
CYNTHIA L. NATION
NICOLE M. NELSON
MICHAEL G. NEUFELD
MARTHA M. ONER
NICKOLAS C. PACELLA
FIGUEROA O. PEREZ
GREGORY R. PHILLIPS
ISABELLA PINA
LOUIE S. PINEDA
MELODY POLANEC
KENNETH O. PORTER
LISA A. POST
TRACEY E. POWELL
MARITA J. PRINCE
DERRAL W. PROWANT
HEIDI R. RADMER
RYAN K. RANSOM
NICOLE L. RAU
RANDY J. RAU
KELLY A. RENEHAN
NORVEE R. REYES
NSENGA RIBEIROANDERSON
TANESHA D. RICHARDSON
SCOTT A. RIVERS
LUDRENA C. RODRIGUEZ
KIMBERLY A. ROSENBAUM
BROOKE H. SCHRUM
KESHIA A. SEYDEL
ANNE J. SHEAHAN
STEPHEN J. SHOWALTER
JANET J. SIMS
ASHLEY D. SMITH
CURTIS B. SMITH
ADAM J. SOKOLOWSKI
KIMBERLY M. SOLARI
EDRIS L. STAPLES
CHERYL L. THOMAS
TERESA TIMMS
LEIGH B. TRAYLOR
BRENT B. TUMA
MARY A. TURBIAK
SANDRA L. TURNER
RACHEL G. TYLER
JOANN C. WARD
KELLEY A. WATTS
NANCY J. WEAVER
KAREN A. WHITE
ERIN E. WHORRALL
ANDREW J. WIEHER
TINA M. WILLIAMS
RACHEAL L. WOOD
KATHLEEN M. YOUNG
DANIEL J. YOURK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

HARRIS A. ABBASI
MICHAEL L. ACE
JOCELYN M. ADVIENTO
BRENT E. ANDERSON
DAVID L. ARMESON
MICHAEL G. BACKLUND
CHASKA L. BARKSDALE
ANTIONE D. BARNETT
DOUGLAS D. BARRICKMAN
ANTIONE D. BARRY
JONATHAN S. BARTLETT
MEGAN L. BATES
CARLA A. BERGER
CATHERINE A. BESSLER
TIFFANY R. BILDERBACK
DARIN R. BINGHAM
CHRISTOPHER M. BLACKNALL
ALEJANDRO BONILLA
ISAAC M. BONNEY
DOMINICA D. BOWDEN
MELISSA M. BOYD
LINDSAY M. BRADEN
ROBERT D. BRODNICK
ALISSA L. BYRNE
ASMAR S. CALVERY
CORETTA F. CAMPBELL
SPENCER B. CASH
EDWIN G. CAUDELL
JOSHUA D. CHASE
JESS M. CHRISTENSEN
ALSHONTA CLEMONS
LAUREL K. COFELL
THOMAS C. COLLETTE
SEAN N. COLLEY
NATALIE D. COLLINS
BRENT A. CREER
JONATHAN A. DAMBROZIO
ANDY D. DAO
NEAL A. DAVIS
KIMBERLY L. DECKER
SAMANDRA T. DEMONS
IAN C. DEWS
BRENDAN S. DONOVAN
REUBEN G. DOORNINK
CHRISTINE P. DOWNS
MICHAEL N. DRETSCH
PATRICK DULIN
PHILIP J. DURANDO
EDWARD N. EDENS
CESAR I. EGUSQUIZA
MICHELLE L. ELLIOTT
MATTHEW R. EWENS
STEVEN E. FLANNIGAN
JASON A. FOGARTY
MICHAEL P. FORSLUND
MATTHEW D. FRANCIS
CHAD M. GAGNON
ARMANDO M. GENEROSO
CORY L. GEROULD
KASSANDRA T. GESSE
DANA Y. GRAY
GEORGEANA L. GREEN
MICHELL L. GRIFFITH
JUAN E. GUZMAN
JASON G. HALBERT
NAKIA C. HALL
KATHLEEN E. HAMILTON
PATRICIA J. HAMMOND
CHAD R. HANDLEY
JUSTIN W. HANSEN
CHARLES L. HAYES
ZACHARY J. HEINRICH
PAUL C. HENNING
JESSICA HIGA
GREGORY B. HILL
STUART S. HOBBS
JESSICA R. HULL
RACHEL N. HUSSAIN
NYKEBA L. A. JACKSON
MARVIN J. JENNINGS
ANTHONY R. JONES
STEVEN G. JONES
JAMES T. JUNE
ERICA L. KANE
DANE A. KAPPLER
RICHARD M. KELLEY
JASON S. KIM
KATHERINE M. KINDER
BRADLEY K. KISTLER
DAVID S. KLAJIC
LISA R. KLEIN
SANJAY KRISHNASWAMY
RYAN S. LABIO
CLAYTON C. LANGDON
DAYAMI LIEBENGUTH
RODNEY L. LINCH
KATHRYN C. LOFRANCO
ISAAC LOPEZ
IAN J. LYNCH
JAMES B. MACDONALD
TRISTAN C. MANNING
PEDRO L. MARREROGUZMAN
SCOTT A. MARTIN
KATIE M. MARTINEZ
BRIAN A. MASON
TARA N. H. MCADOO
PATRICK W. MCCARDLE
BRANDON D. MCCARTER
LANCE E. MCINTIRE
CASEY MCKENNA
LEE A. MCMOOAIN, JR.
JENNIFER N. MEADOWS
TY A. MEDLER
BRIAN A. MILLER
MICHELLE L. MILLER
DANELLE M. MIYAMOTO
ALEX C. MONTGOMERY
TERRANCE MONTGOMERY
MEGAN E. MORGAN
MICHAEL S. MOSER
KRISTIAN D. MROCZKO
MICHAEL J. MURPHY
ERIC J. NEELANS
GABRIELA L. NIESS
PRINCESS P. PALACIOS
HOWARD W. PALMER
MATTHEW PARTYKA
NATHANIEL J. PASCHAL
LES S. PATTERSON
DENNIS J. PENACERRADA
MARCUS D. PERKINS
WADE H. PETERSEN
RACHEL S. PETWAL
SHANTAY R. PHILLIPS
BRYAN C. PICKERAL
ROBERT R. PLOTTS
ALEXANDER RAGAN
CAMILLO N. RAMIREZ
MELISSA G. REGISTER
MARSHA D. REVEAL
ERIN E. RICHARDS
CHRISTOPHER W. RICHELDERFER
KELLY M. RIVERA
VIRGIL A. RIVERA
JOHN F. ROBICHAUX
JORGE F. RODRIGUEZ
DENNIS M. RUFOLO
DIEU T. T. RUSHBROOK
RAUSHAN A. SALAAM
LATRICIA N. SANDERS
ADAM N. SCHAFFER
ROBERT N. SCHLAU
SHAMECCA M. SCOTT
GRANT SEVERSON
ROXANNA E. SHEAFFER
CLARK SIMON
JON J. SKIDMORE
AARON M. SMITH
JASON P. SMITH
JESSE E. SMITH
STEPHANIE D. SMITH
VICTOR F. SORANO
GWYNETH R. SOTO
JAMIE L. SOUTHERLAND
NICHOLAS R. SPANGLER
WILLIAM D. SPRUILL
JOHN C. STEHULAK
RANDALL J. SWEENEY
MELISSA M. THOMAS
MATTHEW L. TILLMAN
THOMAS F. TORCHIA
HA T. TRAN
CYNTHIA L. TUCKER
ROSALYNDA M. UY
CHRISTINE M. VANDEVEIRE
CRISTA M. WAGNER
LYNN M. WAGNER
MELINDA A. WALLACE
FRANK B. WANAT
TERRANCE L. WILLIAMS
MATTHEW C. WINGATE
CHRISTOPHER S. WOODSON
JULIE K. YOUNG
JOSHUA D. ZELDIN
DAVID M. ZUPANCIC

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM B. ALLEN IV
BRETT A. ALLISON
JOSE E. ALMAZAN
BRADLEY W. ANDERSON
JOSHUA D. ANDERSON
SETH E. ANDERSON
ROBERT G. ANTOLINO
DAVID W. BAAS
THOMAS N. BALL
JAMES T. BARDO
JEFFREY D. BAUER
JEREMY W. BEAVEN
PIERRE R. BERTRAND
JAMES S. BIRGL
JOHN W. BLACK
JASON A. BOROVIES
MARK D. BORTNEM
JOHN C. BOWES
TIMOTHY S. BRADY, JR.
CHRISTOPHER M. BRANNEN

LEONEL O. BRITO, JR.
MARK J. BROEKHUIZEN
JEFFREY D. BROWN
MARK C. BROWN
MATTHEW A. BROWN
THOMAS A. BROWNE, JR.
JEFFREY H. BUFFA
ANTHONY W. BURGOS
DAMON K. BURROWS
ROBERT L. BURTON
MICHAEL D. BUTLER
DUSTIN J. BYRUM
MICHAEL T. CABLE
ANDRES H. CACERESSOLARI
AMY S. CAHOON
JOHN O. CALDWELL
JADE CAMPBELL
STEPHEN T. CAMPBELL
MATTHEW P. CAPODANNO
ROBERT E. CARLSON, JR.
WALTER G. CARR
SIU K. CHENG
BRIAN G. CILLESSEN
THOMAS J. CLEAVER
LOUIS COLTER III
CRAIG C. CONNELL II
WARREN C. COOK, JR.
TIMOTHY J. COOPER
FRED G. COURTNEY III
CLAYTON A. CRAIG
JOSEPH W. CRANDALL
DEREK M. CROUSORE
URBANO CRUZ
JONATHAN E. CURTIS
JEREMY G. DEVEAU
SHAUN W. DOHENEY
JASON E. DONOVAN
JAMES S. DORLON
HAROLD E. DOWLING
JARED R. DUFF
SEAN P. DYNAN
JAMES W. EAGAN III
LAUREN S. EDWARDS
THOMAS E. ELDERS
SEAN M. ELWARD
DAVID C. EMMEL
JACOB O. EVANS
MICHAEL C. EVANS
ROY H. EZELL III
EDWARD R. FERGUS
DAIL T. FIELDS
ROBERT E. FLANNERY
CHRISTOPHER M. FLOOM
STEVEN J. FREESE
ANTHONY D. FROST
KELLY FRUSHOUR
STUART J. FUGLER
MICHAEL G. GAFFNEY, JR.
GERARDO D. GAJE, JR.
JOHNNY G. GARZA
TODD C. GATES
JAMES R. GIBSON
ERNEST GOVEA
LAWRENCE B. GREEN II
ROBERT B. GREEN
BRIAN D. GREENE
LEO S. GREGORY
JENNIFER L. GRIEVES
SHAWN P. GRZYBOWSKI
CHRISTOPHER M. HAAR
DONALD W. HARLOW
FRANCIS G. HARRIS
RYAN J. HART
BRIAN M. HARVEY
DOUGLAS C. HATCH
JAMES F. HICKEY, JR.
CHARLES W. HILL
EDMUND B. HIPP
JAMES T. HOFFMANN
JONATHAN C. HOLDER
TODD C. HOLLAND
PETER D. HOUTZ
CARRIE M. HOWE
STUART H. HOWELL
JEFFREY A. HUBLEY
MATTHEW G. HUMPHREY
BRIAN E. HUTCHERSON
IVAN F. INGRAHAM
KHIEEM JACKSON
JOHN J. JAMES
HEATH B. JAMESON
ADAM B. JENKINS
GREG R. JOHNSON
ROBERT D. JOHNSON
JOHNNIE D. JONES, JR.
QUINTIN D. JONES
RANDALL K. JONES
ALLEN A. KAGEN
DENNIS J. KASKOVICH, JR.
HENRY H. KAYSER
MATTHEW J. KESSLER
JAMES A. KIDD
TRAVIS M. KING
CHRISTOPHER R. KOTLINSKI
NATHAN S. KRICK
ANTHONY G. KROCKEL
DIONNE V. KU
KEVIN K. KUGINSKIE
MICHAEL F. KUTSOR
WACO LANE
ADAM LEVINE
MARTIN R. LEWIS
KEVIN A. LIPSKI
JOHN R. MACFARLANE IV
TODD E. MAHAR
DAVID L. MANKA
MELANIE J. MANN
PATRICK G. MANSON
NOAH G. MARQUARDT
MERIDITH L. MARSHALL
RICHARD C. MARTIN, JR.
NATHAN S. MARVEL
MICHAEL F. MASTRIA
ROGER E. MATTIOLI
MATTHEW M. MAZ
MARK D. MCCARROLL
REGINALD J. MCCLAM
STEPHEN N. MCCLUNE
ERIN K. MCHALE
MICHAEL T. MCMAHAN
ANTHONY F. MCNAIR
CHRISTOPHER M. MESSINEO
BRIAN S. MIDDLETON
KATHRYN I. MILLER
WILLIAM B. MILLETT III
ANTHONY R. MITCHELL II
JASON A. MITZEL
JOHN A. MODER
SUNNY M. MONTAS
GREGORY D. MORRISON
GEORGE S. MURPHY
MICHAEL P. MURPHY
PATRICK NELSON
MICHAEL C. NESBITT
JAMES M. NIXON
JOHN K. NORRIS, JR.
RONALD E. NORRIS, JR.
JOSEPH C. NOVARIO
OWEN J. NUCCI
KEITH G. NUNN
TIMOTHY N. NUTTER
MICHAEL E. OGDEN
JONATHAN M. OGORMAN
WILLIAM C. PACATTE
GREGORY B. PACE
DAVID L. PADILLA
ADAM M. PASTOR
EARL H. PATTERSON V
DAVID N. PAYNE
CHRISTOPHER W. PEHRSON
KENNETH W. PHELPS III
KYLE G. PHILLIPS
JOSHUA M. PIECZONKA
ADAM W. PITNEY
RYAN T. PRINCE
JAMES S. PRYOR
ERIC D. PURCELL
ANDREW J. PUSHART
BERT RAKDHAM
GARRETT V. RANDEL III
JOHN G. RANDOLPH
CHARLES C. READINGER
SCOTT M. REED
GREGORY J. RIVALDI
KEVIN R. ROOT
RICHARD M. RUSNOK
SHEREL L. RYAN
JONATHAN Y. SABADO
CRAIG E. SCHAFFNER
JONATHAN L. SCHNEIDER
DAVID A. SCHREINER
RYAN E. SCOTT
DOUGLAS A. SEICH
RYAN E. SHADLE
SHANNON M. SHEA
JUDE C. SHELL
SCOTT M. SHUSTER
JEREMY W. SIEGEL
CHRISTOPHER D. SILER
EDWARD J. SILVA
SCOTT P. SILVIA
JONATHAN N. SIMS
JESSE L. SJOBERG
JOHN P. SKUTCH
DANIEL T. SMITH
ERIK J. SMITH
JASON R. SMITH
JONATHAN R. SMITH
MICHAEL S. SMITH
THOMAS D. SMOLENSKI
DEREK M. SNELL
DANIEL H. SNYDER
CHRISTOPHER T. STEELE
IAN D. STEVENS
MATTHEW J. STEWART
JAMES R. STOVER
BRIAN L. STRACK
NATHANIEL B. STUSSE
GREGORY J. SUMMA
STEVEN M. SUTEY
JAMES S. TANIS
JAMES R. TAYLOR
PAUL C. TEACHEY
HARRY F. THOMAS, JR.
ROBERT B. THOMAS
GARY D. THOMPSON
SUZAN F. THOMPSON
DOUGLAS M. THUMM
JAYSON M. TIGER
JONATHAN H. VAUGHN
GILES D. WALGER
CURTIS L. WALKER, JR.
DAVID W. WALKER
BRADLEY W. WARD
ROBERT J. WEINGART
OLGIERD J. WEISS III
LAWRENCE H. WENTZELL
MICHAEL S. WILBUR
WALTER A. WILKIE
MARLIN D. WILLIAMS
SHAWN E. WILLIAMS
PRESCOTT N. WILSON
SEAN M. WILSON
JEREMY S. WINTERS
CRAIG A. WOLFENBARGER
BARIAN A. WOODWARD
MELISSA L. WRIGHT
FLOY A. YATES, JR.
LEE A. YORK
ROYCE D. ZANT III
JAMES L. ZEPKO

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MS. AUDREY WRIGHT DAY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Over eighteen years ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Healthcare Profession as a Registered Nurse; and

Whereas, Ms. Audrey Wright began her career providing health and wellness service to citizens from all walks of life; She has educated and mentored through the Saint Joseph's Mercy Care Services Recuperative Care Program and today retires as a Registered Nurse after years of dedicated service to our community; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents, giving the citizens of our District a friend to help those in need, a fearless leader and a servant to all who want to ensure that the system works for everyone; and

Whereas, Ms. Audrey Wright is a cornerstone in our community who has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Audrey Wright on her retirement and to wish her well in her new endeavors; Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim November 30, 2013 as Ms. Audrey Wright Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 30th day of November, 2013.

HONORING CAMMIE EARL HUTCHERSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Entrepreneur, Mr. Cammie Earl Hutcherson.

Cammie Hutcherson is a life-long resident of Jefferson County, Mississippi. He has developed the pride of helping his community in any way that he can. As a young adult, his first business was the H & H Farm, which is located on Fountain Road in Fayette. He basically raised cattle and horses. The farm is still operational at this time.

Later, Mr. Hutcherson went into business as Cammie's Wrecker Service, a venture he has worked diligently in for the past 20 years. This business has grown and is operational with four vehicles. His business is known for offering affordable, reliable and courteous services to residents in Jefferson County and surrounding counties.

In 2007, Mr. Hutcherson opened a mini storage facility which has been an asset to many residents in Jefferson County. The storage has 90 rental units.

Presently, Mr. Hutcherson is working to open a restaurant/grill in Jefferson County. It will be named, "Mur's Kitchen." The name is in memory of his late mother, Mrs. Willie Lee Hutcherson.

Mr. Hutcherson appreciates the success he has received from patrons in Jefferson County and hopes that the relationship will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an aggressive entrepreneur, Mr. Cammie Earl Hutcherson, for his dedication to serving the surrounding area of Jefferson County, Mississippi.

COMMENDING THE WINGS OF FREEDOM TOUR ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year, the Wings of Freedom Tour celebrates 25 years of service to World War II veterans.

In 1984, Mr. Bob Collings acquired two iconic U.S. World War II airframes, a B–17 and B–24. After five years of investment and restoration, the world's only flying B–24J Liberator took flight at the 50th Anniversary of the B–24.

The Wings of Freedom Tour began in 1989 and has made nearly 3,000 stops. The Freedom Tour is dedicated to education and to honoring those who served through recreating World War II history. Their motto encapsulates that philosophy: "Read about WWII history and you might remember. Experience WWII history and you'll never forget."

It is my pleasure to commend the Wings of Freedom Tour on their 25th anniversary, and I join the Wings of Freedom Tour in expressing appreciation for our veterans and those currently serving in the United States military.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 2014

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my good friend and fellow Representative from Pennsylvania, LOU BARLETTA, for introducing this legislation that is so vital to the safety of millions of people across our state and our country.

Merriam-Webster defines a volunteer as "a person who does work without getting paid to do it." It defines an employee as "a person who works for another person or company for wages or salary." Yet the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), defying these clear definitions and common sense, considers volunteer firefighters to be employees and has not clarified whether or not they are subject to the employer mandate under President Obama's health care law.

In Butler Township, back home in Western Pennsylvania, more than 17,000 people rely on approximately 130 volunteer firefighters to keep that community safe. Ed Kirkwood, the manager of Butler Township, has stated that by his calculations, taxes in Butler Township would have to be more than doubled to comply with the federal mandate and maintain all of Butler's volunteer firefighters.

I've spoken time and again about how the unintended consequences of the president's health care law will hurt Americans. In this particular instance, it threatens to bankrupt communities and endanger the public all because the IRS doesn't know the meaning of what it is to be a volunteer firefighter. This is unacceptable. It must be changed, and Mr. BARLETTA's bill, H.R. 3685—the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act—will do just that. I give my emphatic support to this bill and ask that the IRS correct its definition of volunteerism before Pennsylvania communities which rely on these heroes have to pay for its lack of common sense.

BROWNS MILL CIVIC AND ATHLETIC BOOSTER ASSOCIATION DAY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, since its founding, the Browns Mill Civic & Athletic Booster Association has been and continues to be a worthy instrument for good; and

Whereas, the Browns Mill Recreation Center Booster Club Inaugural Blue & Gold Gala is being held to celebrate community service and to assist our youth that desire to participate in recreational activities, sports, summer programs and afterschool educational programs; and

Whereas, the Browns Mill Civic & Athletic Booster Association has always promoted the concept of One Community-One Goal by working with and for individuals of all walks of life to make DeKalb County a place where openness is seen as well as heard; and

Whereas, its members give of themselves tirelessly and unconditionally to serve our community through projects to enhance our youth through sports, health, mentorships and scholarships; and

Whereas, the lives of many in our district are touched by the leadership and service

given by the members of the Browns Mill Civic & Athletic Booster Association, our nation and the world is a better place due to their commitment to excellence in all of their endeavors; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize their outstanding service to our District; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim November 2, 2013 as Browns Mill Civic & Athletic Booster Association Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 2nd day of November, 2013.

HONORING CLINTON DEMETRUS WILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Entrepreneur, Mr. Clinton D. Williams, who is a resident Cleveland, Mississippi.

Mr. Williams was born November 23, 1972 to Clifton L. Williams, Sr. and Dorothy L. Williams of Shaw, Mississippi. He attended and graduated from McEvans Elementary and Shaw High School. Because of his interest in the arts, Clinton enrolled in the Fine Arts Program at Mississippi Valley State University in Itta Bena, Mississippi, where he majored in Fine Arts with emphasis in Graphic Designs and Print Making. He graduated from in 1997 with a Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree.

Clinton decided to remain in the Mississippi Delta to assist with the family screen printing business. In 1999, Clinton decided to start his own business, Williams Designs with the determination to take the family business along with his own business to the next level, he and his father worked hard to make sure that they provided quality work with reasonable prices with a fast turnaround time. It was of great importance that their customers understood that they were greatly appreciated by the Williams' family.

In 2005 the reigns to the family business were handed over to Clinton. With the responsibility to make sure the family business continued.

With over 25 years of experience, Triple C T-Shirts & Williams Designs are continuing to provide great customer service. Today, Clinton oversees all operations from cleaning up to doing artwork, making deliveries, printing, running errands, picking up lunch for his staff and even offering words of encouragement.

He is married to Shonda C. Williams and they have one daughter, Justice B. Williams.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing entrepreneur, Mr. Clinton Williams, for his dedication to entrepreneurialship.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT STRAIN

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bob Strain on the high honor of being named Veteran of the Year by the Greater Sierra Vista United Veterans Council.

A retired colonel, Bob served our country with distinction for thirty years in the United States Air Force. After retiring from the military, Bob served his community of Sierra Vista, Arizona for over twenty years with the same level of integrity and dedication through civic engagement and elected office.

The city of Sierra Vista and Fort Huachuca grew stronger under Bob's leadership both as a member of the City Council and as mayor. By increasing and reinforcing water conservation in the city and surrounding region, Bob helped ensure the future growth and sustainability of the city and the Army Garrison.

As an active member of numerous community associations and organizations, Bob has been a strong and articulate advocate for the many veterans who call Southern Arizona home. In 2012, he was inducted into the Arizona Veteran's Hall of Fame. This well-deserved recognition by the Greater Sierra Vista United Veterans Council is another testament to his hard work and dedication on behalf of veterans.

I am proud to call Bob Strain a friend and join with a grateful community in congratulating him on this well-deserved honor.

HONORING LOU TERRELL

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 2014, San Diego lost a true fixture of our community. Lou Terrell was a devoted educator, a loving family man, and a tireless advocate for the people of his city.

In the 1980's, Lou Terrell served as mayor and councilmember for Del Mar, California. Since then, he served as a leader in local chapters of Planned Parenthood and the American Civil Liberties Union, where he continued to work to make his city a better and fairer place.

Lou was also a former professor at San Diego State University, and served as chair of the school's Department of Political Science. A scholarship was established in his name to help students of political science pursuing their own careers in public service.

Lou Terrell established and served as the president of the Del Mar Foundation, a nonprofit that organizes cultural events for local children and families and works to keep Del Mar's beaches and parks clean and safe. Today, the Del Mar Foundation remains a symbol of Lou's love for his community.

Those who knew and worked with Lou knew him as a kind hearted and generous man who loved his wife and children, and his dogs. Above all, all of us who had the pleasure of knowing Lou remember his positive attitude in the face of anything. It was contagious.

Lou Terrell was a dedicated public servant and a beloved husband and father. His passing is a terrible loss for our region, and for everyone who was lucky enough to get to know Lou. He will be greatly missed.

MR. KEITH "KEECHO" RAWLS, U.S. CITIZEN OF DISTINCTION

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Whereas, our lives have been touched in a most positive and uplifting way by, Keith "Keecho" Rawls who has given so much of himself through sharing his gift of music and love of life; and

Whereas, at Clark College in Atlanta, Georgia he majored in music and began his professional career as an extraordinarily gifted composer, arranger and accomplished pianist who was instrumental in enhancing the sounds of recording artists such as Peabo Bryson and distinguishing himself as the first Musical Director of the Universoul Circus; and

Whereas, he gave of himself, his time and talent to uplift his fellowman, he inspired others through his gift of music, his wit and conversation; and

Whereas, he was a son, a brother, a father, a grandfather, a nephew and a friend to many and will be greatly missed by all; and

Whereas, he led by doing both behind the scenes and on the front lines, being an ambassador of good will who remained true to the uplifting of our community throughout this life; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Keith Rawls as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that he is deemed worthy and deserving of this Congressional Honor by declaringMr. Keith "Keecho" Rawls, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 16th day of November, 2013.

HONORING MR. HERBERT ALLEN, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a long standing black farmer, Mr. Herbert Allen, Sr. of "Allen Farm". He and his family are residents of Silver City in Humphreys County, MS, where generations of Allen's have been farming since the 1940s which gives them over 70 years.

The story of the Allen family as black farmers includes major setbacks, but they are still in operation today. Grandpa Nathan Allen started with 40 acres of land in an effort to provide a decent living for himself, his wife, and 6 children. After he died, his son Herbert

Allen, Sr. began operating the 40-acre farm and grew it into 323 acres.

Herbert and his wife, Nomie, raised 9 children on that small and hard-to-come-by income because again the challenges of the black families were real. In fact they raised most of the food they used to feed their family.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the odds have been great and many: Depression, rainy and dry crop years with little to sometimes no government compensation, floods, bad loans, too little loans, and other unfortunate things but again, through it all they survived.

Herbert Allen, Sr. operated the farm for over 50 years until his death in 2006, then Herbert, Jr. and his brother, Freddie, took over the operation. Although the two brothers managed the daily affairs, it was still a family affair involving all the siblings. There are several spin-off businesses that have been developed: Allen Recycling (Canton and Yazoo City, MS) Allen Heating and Air (Gulfport, MS), and Allen Cattle Ranch (Silver City, MS).

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring, Mr. Herbert Allen, Sr., a black farmer from the Mississippi's Second Congressional District.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT J. DREWEL

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Bob Drewel on the occasion of his retirement as the Executive Director of the Puget Sound Regional Council. Throughout his service in this capacity for most of the last decade, as well as his long tenure as Snohomish County Executive, Mr. Drewel demonstrated time and again his dedication to the continued development and success of the Puget Sound region. His civic service, by even the strictest of standards, is second to none. During his tenure as Executive Director, Mr. Drewel built effective partnerships among business, labor, government, and civic interests. Most notably, he spearheaded creation of the Prosperity Partnership, a broad coalition devoted to the advancement of long-term economic prosperity in the central Puget Sound region, and VISION 2040, the region's integrated growth, economic development, and transportation strategy. It is my privilege to thank him for his years of public service and for his unwavering commitment to the prudent growth of our region.

Mr. Drewel's many contributions to the Puget Sound region also include leadership to assure assembly of the Boeing 787 jet airliner in Everett, and subsequent efforts to secure development of a new Air Force Tanker and the Boeing 737 MAX family of aircraft in Renton. In addition, Mr. Drewel was the first President of the Aerospace Futures Alliance, and he is the founder and President of the Washington Aerospace Partnership. He also is a past President of the Executive Board of the Puget Sound Regional Council and the former Chairman of the Sound Transit Board that led the successful attempt to win voter approval of the Sound Transit system in 1996. A man of seemingly endless energy (and forbearance), Bob also was Chairman of the Highway 520 Tolling Implementation Committee to fund replacement of the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge, an absolutely crucial transportation link in the region. Finally, Bob served as Co-Chair of the Transportation Partnership of 2008 that advocated Washington state's largest-ever transportation improvement package, which ultimately was approved by the voters.

Bob Drewel exhibited remarkable conviction and resolute commitment to the central Puget Sound region through the many roles and positions he held during his three decades of civic service to King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. On behalf of the people of the City of Seattle and the State of Washington, I extend our gratitude and our deep appreciation to Robert J. Drewel for his extraordinary leadership and deep commitment to our region. We wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING LEVELLE GUINN DAVIS AS HE CELEBRATES HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Levelle Guinn Davis, who celebrated his 100th birthday on January 3, 2014.

Mr. Levelle Guinn Davis was born in Corralitos, Santa Cruz County, California to Jay Ammon and Mel Agusta (Guinn) Davis. He was the 2nd of 6 children. Levelle's father was a native of Plymouth, California in Amador County. Levelle was raised in several areas: preschool in San Jose, early school years in Gilroy, grade school years from Crows Landing and Mountain View Road then Faith Home Elementary in Ceres where Walter White was the Principal. As a junior at Modesto High School, he decided to go to work full time against the advice of his counselor, Grace M. Davis. He became friends with the pioneer Hackett family boys and in 1935, married their little sister, Ruth Etta Hackett in the Bethel Church at 15th and G Streets, Modesto, California.

Levelle and Ruth started their family and had two sons, Leonard Aaron and Daniel Arlen while employed at the Spreckels sugar mill near Salinas, California. He was a drive belt maintenance specialist and moved to Tuolumne County in 1943 to be closer to his parents and siblings. In 1952, the family moved to Stockton to allow Lenard and Daniel better education opportunities. Both sons attended Stockton Junior College and served in the California Army National Guard in Stockton.

After their sons were married, Levelle and Ruth moved back to Modesto in 1965 to be near the families of his sister and Ruth's brothers.

Mr. Davis retired after 10 years as a tomato paste cook with the Tri Valley Growers Cannery. Between seasons, he would drive eight row corn combine harvesters; he was a member of the Local #12 Teamsters Cannery Workers Union.

He enjoyed having a large garden with a variety of fruit trees. Ruth canned and froze everything that they grew.

Mr. Davis was a member of the Calvary Temple Church when Pastor Joe Wright was serving there. During that time, he would lead a large group of Senior RVers to numerous camp outings to places like Frank Rains Park in Del Puerto Canyon and Oakdale Reservoir. He enjoys all kinds of table games with friends at Modesto Verde.

Mr. Levelle Guinn Davis has enjoyed traveling to all 50 states, including Hawaii and several trips to Alaska. He has a clock and watch collection as well as ''button'' accordions, harmonicas and has enjoyed various types of photography: 8mm movies, VHS videos, Sawyers 3–D and 35mm slides to name a few.

Levelle and Ruth were married 70 years and have three grandchildren; Laura Giovanetti, Danial Aaron Davis and Renee Crabtree and seven great-grand children: Nick, Alex, Heidi, Kaitlyn, Mitchell, Ashley and Jake.

Levelle has been blessed with good health: he reads without glasses, drinks pure water, takes health supplements and has never consumed alcohol nor smoked cigarettes. He has always been health conscience and wanted to set a good example for his sons. He takes a walk to the clubhouse several days a week and exercises on the trampoline. He even wins at dominoes and other games he plays regularly.

Mr. Davis is a current member of the Modesto Parlor Number 11 of the Native Sons of the Golden West. He still has a good sense of humor and likes to tell jokes. He tells everyone that, like the California Governor, he also has a Highway Patrolman as his driver; his oldest son Leonard, who is a retired CHP pilot.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating Mr. Levelle Guinn Davis as he celebrates his 100th birthday.

MS. THERESA WALKER, U.S. CITIZEN OF DISTINCTION

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one woman, Ms. Theresa Walker, who gave of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, her dedicated service is present in DeKalb County, Georgia for all to see, where she was an unwavering advocate for youth, the elderly, the poor and small businesses; and

Whereas, this remarkable, positive woman with the beautiful smile gave of herself, her time and her talent; never asking for fame or fortune but only to uplift those in need; and

Whereas, she led by example from behind the scenes, as well as front and center for the state of Georgia, DeKalb County, the Georgia Black Chamber of Commerce, Paragon Productions, Inc., the Lou Walker Senior Citizens Center, her beloved church, Saint Phillip A.M.E and her beloved Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.; and

Whereas, this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a mother, a wife, a daughter, a friend a warrior, a matriarch, and a woman of great integrity; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Ms. Theresa Walker for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that Ms. Theresa Walker of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor", Ms. Theresa Walker, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of October, 2013.

HONORING JACKIE'S BEAUTY BOUTIQUE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a well respected rural town minority owned business, Jackie's Beauty Boutique.

Jackie Bailey, originally from Edwards, Mississippi, became inspired to enter the profession of barber/stylist through her early interactions with Ms. Doris Green. Ms. Green was a well-known stylist in the Bolton community who performed a number of services, mainly hot comb presses. Ms. Bailey distinctly remembers watching Ms. Green hot comb press a number of young girls hair and noticing the ease and serenity in which Ms. Green styled hair.

Driven by her inspiration, Ms. Bailey enrolled at Utica Junior College in Utica, Mississippi in 1983 in the Barber/Stylist program. After obtaining her degree in 1984, she acquired a job with Apollo Hair Design in 1985, which was located in Jackson, Mississippi. She later resigned in 1986 to take a year hiatus to recover from a car accident. In 1988, an opportunity to co-own her own business presented itself, so she and her cousin, Madge Sherry, opened a beauty salon in Bolton, Mississippi.

Her primary clientele were residents of Bolton and neighboring towns. Men, women, and children were serviced in various manners, such as haircuts, shaves, relaxers, and general hair washing. With the presentation of another business opportunity, Ms. Bailey and her cousin separated business ties, allowing for Ms. Bailey to be one of the longest standing Black-owned salons in town. Her professionalism and expertise in barbering and styling has allowed her business to thrive in this rural area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Jackie Bailey and Jackie's Beauty Boutique for its remarkable contribution and undying commitment to provide professional barbering and stylist services to the citizens of Bolton and neighboring rural communities.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE FOR BOB BOLEN, FORMER MAYOR OF FORT WORTH, TEXAS

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bob Bolen, the beloved former mayor of Fort Worth, Texas. Mayor Bolen passed away in the early morning hours of January 6th, 2014 at the age of 87 at his home in Fort Worth.

Robert Eugene Bolen was born on April 10, 1926 to Milford and Bee Bolen in Chicago, Illinois. While he and his family moved more than a dozen times during his youth, Texas is where he would ultimately call home.

Bob Bolen gravitated to public service at a young age. He chose Texas A&M University in College Station for his undergraduate degree in the 1940s. However, he soon left College Station to serve in the U.S. Navy as a gunnery officer on the USS *Iowa* during the waning days of combat in the Pacific Ocean during World War II. Following his military service, he returned to College Station where he graduated with a degree in Business Administration in 1948.

Upon graduation from Texas A&M University, he began his career as a management trainee with McCrory's, a chain of five and dime stores. While his career led him to locations like Syracuse, New York, he would later be transferred to McCrory's Fort Worth store and he never moved again.

Bob Bolen was first elected to public office in 1979 as the District 6 representative on the Fort Worth City Council. After just one term on the city council, he ran in the special election for mayor. He won and served until 1991, cementing his legacy as the longest serving mayor in Fort Worth history.

He was a dedicated public servant throughout his time as the mayor of the "Panther City". Bob Bolen's efforts were carefully watched by other cities. What the city is today is a direct result of much of the work he accomplished while leading the city as mayor.

During his tenure, Bob Bolen's Fort Worth experienced a rebirth and revitalization of the downtown area. Companies like Burlington Northern expanded and public-private partnerships helped to cultivate the growing community. Alliance airport was developed within the city limits and Fort Worth became home to the only printing location outside of Washington, DC for the Federal Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The Bureau continues to print money there today.

He was a renowned leader and in the process he helped so many people. He had a particular affection for helping young people as well. He would go out of his way to encourage them and steer them either toward public service or toward appreciating it.

Bob Bolen left an indelible mark on the city of Fort Worth and the transformation that he oversaw helped create the distinguished city that it is today.

Bob Bolen loved Fort Worth and Fort Worth loves Bob Bolen. He gave the city far more than it was ever able to give him and that's a legacy worth remembering.

RECOGNIZING THREE MAINERS FOR EXCELLENCE IN MATH AND SCIENCE

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize three constituents in my District who have recently been selected to receive Presidential Awards for excellence in math and science.

Teachers Karen Jagolinzer of Frank H. Harrison Middle School in Yarmouth and Elizabeth Heidemann of Cushing Community School in Cushing will receive 2012 Presidential Awards for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching. By being chosen for this prestigious award, Karen and Elizabeth distinguish themselves as some of the top teachers in the country.

I am proud of both Karen and Elizabeth for what they are doing to give our students solid skills in math and science, along with a greater sense of where those lessons can take them in life. Karen has taught for 18 years, creating classrooms where students can learn mathematics in a safe and supportive environment. Elizabeth is a kindergarten teacher who challenges her young students to apply lessons in their community and natural surroundings.

In addition, Daniela Oliveira, an Assistant Professor at Bowdoin College, will receive the 2012 Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers. This honor recognizes promising scientists and engineers who are beginning their careers with important research and community service. Daniela is conducting groundbreaking work on using innovative technology to make our computers more secure.

Mr. Speaker, advancing math and science is critical to keeping the United States competitive in a global marketplace, driving innovation, and discovering more about our world. My deep appreciation goes to Karen, Elizabeth, and Daniela for their commitment to these goals, as well as my sincere congratulations for receiving these awards.

STRONGHOLD CHRISTIAN CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Stronghold Christian Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our district for the past twenty years; and

Whereas, Pastors Benjamin and Sherry Gaither and the members of the Stronghold Christian Church family today continues to uplift and inspire those in our district; and

Whereas, the Stronghold Christian Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past twenty (20) years; and

Whereas, this Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with DeKalb County their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Stronghold Christian Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 20th Anniversary of their founding; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim November 10, 2013 as Stronghold Christian Church Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 10th day of November, 2013.

HONORING MACK H. SHORTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a hardworking and self motivated man, Mr. Mack H. Shorter.

Mr. Shorter, a native of Issaquena County, has always called the Delta his home. He has been a farmer since 1976.

Mr. Shorter retired from the U.S. Corps of Engineers as a construction supervisor in 2008 and began farming full time. Farming has been his favorite past time for the last 37 years. During this time he has grown cotton, corn and soybeans. ''I just love to make things grow,'' stated Mr. Shorter. Since retirement he farms about 160 acres of soybeans and raises about 75 to 80 cattle.

Mr. Shorter has six children. He and his wife, Hazel, reside in Fitler, Mississippi in Issaquena County and are active members of Mt. Zion Baptist Church in Cary, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Mack H. Shorter.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MIKE BANKS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a great Georgian, Mike Banks.

Earlier this week, Mike lost his earthly battle with pulmonary fibrosis.

Mike's absence leaves a void in several Northeast Georgia circles, ranging from banking and broadcasting to community service organizations and his home church.

Mike's commitment to community service was inspired by Matthew 25:36-40, ''whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.''

Among his many outlets of civic involvement, Mike was a founder of the John Jarrard Foundation.

Under the leadership of Mike and the rest of the Executive Committee, the John Jarrard Foundation grew from an annual concert to a regionally-recognized organization supporting songwriters and a number of great causes.

The Foundation supports a number of wonderful music programs, including a songwriting education program for Georgia students. In addition, the Foundation sponsors songwriting concerts throughout the Southeast.

My prayers and thoughts go out to Mike's family as they mourn a loss that will be felt by many in Northeast Georgia.

HONORING CHARLES E. HANRAHAN RETIRING FROM CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Charles E. Hanrahan, Senior Specialist in Agricultural Policy in the Resources, Science, and Industry Division of the Congressional Research Service (CRS). After a distinguished career of 47 years of federal service, including more than 29 years of service to Congress on agricultural trade and international food aid issues at CRS, Charles will be retiring on January 31, 2014.

Charles Hanrahan's work on international food aid issues has been of enormous value to the Members and staff of the House Hunger Caucus, which I co-chair. He was famous for his ''International Food Aid 101'' briefings that helped every congressional office understand the importance of our global food assistance programs, how they worked, the challenges they face, and how they might be strengthened and improved. My staff and I relied on his insights and we will miss not being able to pick up the phone or send him an email seeking information and advice.

During his tenure at CRS, Charles has achieved a remarkable record of accomplishment providing invaluable support to the authorizing and appropriations committees and Members of Congress on agricultural trade, global food security, and international agricultural development. Over his illustrious career, he has worked on 10 omnibus farm bills, 3 multilateral trade negotiations, and numerous bilateral and regional free trade agreements, and has been indispensable in congressional consideration of these measures. His unparalleled institutional knowledge on these issues will be greatly missed by Congress.

Charles began his federal career working part-time in the offices of his representative and senator from his native Kentucky and operating an elevator here in the U.S. Capitol while earning his Bachelor of Science at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. After graduation, he volunteered for the Peace Corps and served over 2 years in Guinea, West Africa where he taught agricultural economics and farm management. When he returned stateside, he earned his Ph.D. in 1972 at the University of Kentucky. Before coming to CRS in 1984, Charles worked at USDA's Economic Research Service where he rose to deputy director in international economics, and earlier served at the U.S. Agency for International Development as a senior economist in the Africa Bureau, and as a staff economist at the National Academy of Sciences.

With this wealth of experience, Charles quickly established himself as a leading expert on agricultural trade and international food aid issues at CRS when he arrived in 1984. During his CRS career, he has written more than 200 reports and confidential memoranda and conducted hundreds of briefings for Members and staff, all of which were completed with authoritative and objective analysis and the skills of a masterful teacher. Just over a year after his arrival at CRS, his comprehensive knowledge of world hunger issues were tapped by the Select Committee on Hunger as Charles testified at a public hearing on food supplies in drought ravaged sub-Saharan Africa. His expert testimony at this hearing and his accomplished work in the nearly three decades following have gone a long way in keeping Congress informed on the important humanitarian issues of international food aid and agricultural development.

In addition to his many years of excellent direct support to Congress, Charles has served in acting supervisory and mentoring roles within CRS, including most recently as acting deputy assistant director in his division and as division reviewer of the reports and memoranda of CRS analysts. In these roles, he has earned the great respect of his CRS colleagues for his deep knowledge, fairness in evaluating their work, and his ability to manage challenging administrative problems.

In retirement, Charles plans to pursue his favorite extracurricular pursuits of travel, reading, cooking, dining out and spending time with his beloved family. We wish him the very best in his retirement and thank him for his dedicated and stellar record of service to Congress, the American people, and vulnerable people around the world.

TURNER MONUMENTAL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH DAY

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation.

Whereas, Turner Monumental African Methodist Episcopal Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our district for the past one hundred fourteen years; and

Whereas, Pastor Jai S. Haithco, Sr., and the members of the Turner Monumental African Methodist Episcopal Church family today continues to uplift and inspire those in our district; and

Whereas, the Turner Monumental African Methodist Episcopal Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past one hundred fourteen (114) years; and

Whereas, this Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who

have shared not only with their Church, but with DeKalb County their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Turner Monumental African Methodist Episcopal Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 114th Anniversary of their founding; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim October 13, 2013 as Turner Monumental African Methodist Episcopal Church Day In the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 13th day of October, 2013.

HONORING MAGNOLIA WINDSHIELD REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a unique and well established minority owned business, Magnolia Windshield Repair and Replacement.

Magnolia Windshield Repair and Replacement began operation November 1, 2002 in Bolton, Mississippi. There was no office, fax, or landline phone. There was no specific parking lot or driveway to drive a vehicle in for servicing. This dream was birthed with a mobile operation in mind.

Mr. Pelvia Robinson, owner and operator since its establishment, created a business that was completely mobile, allowing for him to complete a windshield repair wherever needed.

Mr. Robinson realized there was no adequate space within the city limits of Bolton, nor any of the other rural surrounding areas, without having to drive at least 20 miles to Jackson for windshield repair. Because Mr. Robinson was born and raised in Bolton, he felt that this type of business would not only benefit the people of the town and the surrounding rural areas, but it also presented a unique business opportunity for himself as an up and coming entrepreneur.

Since its inception, Magnolia Windshield Repair and Replacement has grown from just having private customers to servicing commercial customers, while also acquiring several major contracts. Magnolia Windshield employs one other person to assist in its day to day operation. Even after being in business for nearly 11 years, Magnolia Windshield is still mobile, but its official address and location is 207 Bolton-Brownsville Road, Bolton, Mississippi, at which often times cars are repaired for those customers wanting to bring their vehicles in for immediate repair.

In addition to a location, it also has an office, a fax, and a landline telephone. Mr. Robinson accredits his success as being owner of Magnolia Windshield Replacement and Repair first to God, second to his parents, Henry and Ruth Robinson, and thirdly a strong family support.

Mr. Pelvia Robinson was born January 11, 1964. He is the last child of 9 siblings. His formal education included elementary education in Bolton, MS and secondary and college education at Hinds Agricultural High School and Hinds Community College, respectively. He is the father of Pelvius Robinson, and grandfather of Pelvius Robinson, Jr. He is married to Paulette Robinson.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Pelvia Robinson and Magnolia Windshield Repair and Replacement for his dedication and service as a minority business owner to the citizens of Bolton and surrounding rural communities.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF JUDGE CHARLES B. MIKELL

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the late Charlie Mikell. Many years ago I was in a Bible study group with a few friends. We met weekly to discuss spiritual matters, the Gospel, and our personal lives. One of the members was a young lawyer named Charles B. Mikell. Although as a group we were at various stages of our lives, Charlie had already served as an Army Intelligence Officer in Vietnam and was with one of the leading law firms in Savannah. One day he made a surprising comment. He said that there had been times in his life when he felt that he should have been doing more for others. As the years went by, I realized exactly what he meant.

Eventually Charlie gave up his very lucrative career in law and was appointed to the State Court of Chatham County. He served as Chief Judge of that court for two years and as President of the Georgia Council of State Court Judges. Later, he was elected Judge of the Superior Court of the Eastern Judicial Circuit in 1992 and was reelected in 1996. In 2000 he was appointed to the Georgia Court of Appeals. He served as Chief Judge of the Georgia Court of Appeals from 2011 until his retirement in August of 2012. Through these activities he realized his potential and ability in serving others and emerged as one of the most respected judges in Georgia. He had a reputation for fairness, clarity, and mercy.

In addition to his outstanding public service, Charlie was also involved in a number of charities and foundations, including the United Way, the Arthritis Foundation, the Boy Scouts, the Devereaux Foundation, the Museum of African History and Culture, the King-Tisdell Cottage Foundation, the Neighbor-to-Neighbor Justice Center, and the National Foundation for Troubled Youth. He was also a member of the vestry at Christ Church, taught Sunday School, and coached basketball at the Victor B. Jenkins Memorial Boys Club. In each of his endeavors, he transcended political and socioeconomic differences. He truly had no enemies and was respected by all.

Charlie passed away on November 4, 2013 after a courageous battle with multiple myeloma. He leaves behind his loving wife of thirty-three years, Dr. Julia L. Mikell, his son Chuck and his wife Isadora, his son John, his wife Jane, and their two sons John, Jr. and James, and his son Sam. I had the privilege of attending church with the Mikell family, and I taught both Chuck and John in Sunday School. I also worked with Sam during his time in Washington. All three kids are brilliant, polite, and, like their parents, have channeled their remarkable talents into both the pursuit of their careers and to helping others.

America is full of good people, and it's people like Julia and Charlie Mikell who have made America great by handing down wonderful values to their children. They will continue to bless us, and their memory will carry on. I feel honored to recognize the memory of Charlie Mikell, and I was proud to call him a friend. He will be truly missed.

CONGRATULATING CHIEF MASTER SGT. TAMARA PHILLIPS ON HER RETIREMENT FROM THE OHIO NATIONAL GUARD

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chief Master Sgt. Tamara Phillips on her retirement from the Ohio National Guard.

Phillips most recently served as the State Command Chief Master Sgt. for the Ohio National Guard where she worked directly for the Ohio Adjutant General. She also served as the Superintendent of the 178th Force Support Squadron, 178th Fighter Wing, Springfield Air National Guard Base, Ohio where she was responsible for four flights dealing in a wide range of products and services. She also was in charge of mentorship and professional development of all assigned enlisted members.

Chief Phillips first enlisted in the 168th Air Refueling Wing, Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska in March 1987 as an Administrative Specialist. She transferred to the 445th Airlift Wing, at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, for 18 months and then enlisted in the Ohio Air National Guard, Springfield Ohio.

She was then a full-time technician with the 162nd Fighter Squadron orderly room and shortly thereafter moved into the Wing Commander's executive administrative position. She also served as the Wing Staff and Operations Group First Sergeant. In 2002, she was selected as the 178th Mission Support Flight Superintendent, and later served the men and women of the 178th Services Flight as well when the two units merged to form the new Force Support Squadron.

Throughout her life Phillips has been unwavering in her service to our great nation and the people of Ohio. I would like to thank her for her dedication.

PASTOR JASPER WILLIAMS, JR. DAY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, one of those individuals, Pastor Jasper Williams, Jr., has given of himself to lead Salem Bible Church for fifty years; and

Whereas, under the guidance of God he has pioneered and sustained Salem Bible Church as an instrument in our community that betters the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has shared his time and talents for the betterment of our community by preaching the gospel, singing the gospel and living the gospel; and

Whereas, Pastor Jasper Williams is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a man of great courage, a fearless leader and above all a visionary who has shared not only with his church, but with our District and the world a passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Pastor Jasper Williams for his leadership and service for our District as he celebrates his 50th Pastoral anniversary; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim November 10, 2013 as Pastor Jasper Williams, Jr. Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 10th day of November, 2013.

HONORING MR. MILTON LEWIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man whose life's work is centered around cultivating and harvesting the land, Mr. Milton Lewis.

Mr. Lewis is considered a masterful farmer by many in the small rural town of Bolton, MS. Dating back to as early as the 1960s, Mr. Lewis farmed approximately 10–15 acres of land alongside his mother, Mrs. Ruthie Bell Lewis, as sharecroppers.

Mr. Lewis cultivated a number of crops, such as potatoes, peanuts, sugar cane, and cotton. To fulfill his families sharecropping responsibilities, Mr. Lewis relinquished a portion of his family's harvest to the Gaddis & McLauren Seed and Feed Store, which is located in Bolton, MS.

Ultimately, Mr. Lewis diligently farmed his land for approximately 30 years. Today, Mr. Lewis continues to farm a small portion of land near his home, primarily for his enjoyment and close family members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Milton Lewis for his impeccable cultivator talent.

THE PASSING OF LOU TERRELL

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 2014, San Diego lost a true fixture of our community. Lou Terrell was a devoted educator, a loving family man, and a tireless advocate for the people of his city.

In the 1980's, Lou Terrell served as mayor and councilmember for Del Mar, California. Since then, he served as a leader in local chapters of Planned Parenthood and the American Civil Liberties Union, where he continued to work to make his city a better and fairer place.

Lou was also a former professor at San Diego State University, and served as chair of the school's Department of Political Science. A scholarship was established in his name to help students of political science pursuing their own careers in public service.

Lou Terrell established and served as the president of the Del Mar Foundation, a nonprofit that organizes cultural events for local children and families and works to keep Del Mar's beaches and parks clean and safe. Today, the Del Mar Foundation remains a symbol of Lou's love for his community.

Those who knew and worked with Lou knew him as a kindhearted and generous man who loved his wife and children, and his dogs. Above all, all of us who had the pleasure of knowing Lou remember his positive attitude in the face of anything. It was contagious.

Lou Terrell was a dedicated public servant and a beloved husband and father. His passing is a terrible loss for our region, and for everyone who was lucky enough to get to know Lou. He will be greatly missed.

CONGRATULATING LAURA PARN

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Laura Pam for receiving the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching (PAEMST). It is an honor to have such a fine educator in my district teaching this nation's next generation of leaders.

This award is administered by the National Science Foundation on behalf of the Office of Science and Technology Policy. It is given annually to teachers across the country who demonstrate outstanding achievements in teaching science and math to students in kindergarten through 12th grade. Not only do these educators represent the very best in their field and have a true passion for math and sciences, but they instill that passion into their students.

Laura is one of 102 teachers to receive this award in 2013. She is the Assistant Principal at Green Tree Elementary School in Lake St. Louis, Missouri and has acted as an adjunct professor for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Primarily Math program. With funding from the National Science Foundation, she co-created and co-taught two graduate level mathematics content courses for primary teachers. These classes have become staples of the program. She also serves on the 2013 Louisville Regional Conference Committee for the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

I am encouraged that the students of Missouri have educators such as Laura who can help them excel in the important fields of math and science at such a young age. The guidance and instruction of teachers like Laura are vital in producing the world's next leaders of innovative science, and I hope that this Chamber will continue to support the development of exceptional teachers in these fields.

TRIBUTE TO MR. BOB THIELE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, over thirteen years ago, Mr. Bob Thiele accepted a calling to serve others by becoming a consultant with the University of Georgia Small Business Development Center (SBDC); and

Whereas, he has served small business clients with great care, concern and professionalism, by inspiring, educating and motivating; giving a much needed boost to the economic backbone of America; and

Whereas, he has shared his time and talents, giving the citizens of our District a friend, a community leader and an inspiring servant, ensuring that economic opportunity is available to all; and

Whereas, Mr. Thiele is a cornerstone in our community enhancing the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and our Nation; and

Whereas, on his retirement from the University of Georgia SBDC, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mr. Bob Thiele and to wish him well in his new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim November 21, 2013 as Bob Thiele Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 21st day of November, 2013.

HONORING MR. PRIMUS WHEELER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a long standing black farmer, Mr. Primus Wheeler. He and his family are residents of Tallahatchie County where generations of Wheeler's have been farming since 1936.

The story of the Wheeler family farming does not start with Primus, it started with his Father, Jim Wheeler. Jim started out farming a 40 acre unit rented from the Buford Plantation then later, rented 300 more acres until one day he was financially sound enough to purchase more than 1000 acres of his own. In order to secure his investment, Jim Wheeler invested his life lessons in his sons by teaching them the farming business, what it means to be a black farmer, the importance of having your own money, and family sticking together and staying together.

Primus began learning the family farming business as a farm hand, day supervisor, and even bookkeeper until 1948. These skills he held on to, seeing how his father was able to provide a sustainable and prideful life for the family.

In 1948 when he decided to marry, Georgia, his current wife of 65 years, he knew he too had to provide for his family. So, Primus along-side his wife, Georgia, began farming their first 40 acres of rented land. They grew

cotton, corn, soybeans, livestock, and vegetables. His livestock consisted of 30 to 40 cows and 50–100 hogs. In 1957 they purchased their first piece of land and moved away from the family owned land and farm, ''Wheeler Farm.''

Primus along-side his wife grew their farm to 100 acres, which is still located in the Sharkey Road community between Glendora and Tippo, MS. He remembers his first crop in 1957 as his worst but just as he was taught and had seen by working with his father on the family farm, ''you take the good with the bad and learn from it but keep going to break through. You just have to make more good crops than bad crops in order to survive.''

He was dealing with bad weather and insects. Over time Primus got better being on his own even increasing the farm from the initial 100 acres to 238 acres at one point then up to 800 acres by renting from local retired farmers. He was able to supplement his income by harvesting cotton and soybeans for other farmers.

Primus Wheeler, like so many black farmers had challenges that would test the soul and belief of any man.

Over the years he dealt with challenges like bad seasons in terms of weather, insects, and certainly government financing for black farmers. For example, he said, more times than not, that he had to lean on hope and prayer that FSA would approve his applications for financing, which often times came in late July or early August. These were emotional and unpredictable times; especially seeing the other farmers planting while he was faces the pitfall of FSA. You see, he relied on this money to purchase seeds and fertilizers. But nevertheless, he withstood them all relying on his father's teachings.

So, through it all, Primus and his wife was able to educate 9 children on their small delta farm and unlike him, not one of his children had to skip or quit school to stay home and help work the farm. Primus retired and turned the farm over to his son, Michael, who ran it until the late 1990s. Afterwards, Primus, Jr. gained control of the farm and still runs it today. However, in all cases, Primus himself is still involved in the decision making of the farm advising and mentoring his son and future generations. Hat's off to Mr. Primus Wheeler for hanging in there and maintaining his farm.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring, Mr. Primus Wheeler, a black farmer from the Mississippi Second Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 7, I was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather. Had I been here for the quorum call (rollcall No. 1), I would have voted ''present.''

RETIREMENT OF CHARLES TRAUGHBER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennesee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to honor one of Tennessee's hardest working and most thoughtful public servants on the occasion of his retirement.

Charles Traughber stepped down recently after a 30-year career as Chairman of the Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole.

Before assuming that role, he spent 10 years working with offenders as a prison counselor and as a charter member of the parole board.

During his 40-year career, Chairman Traughber served the people of Tennessee with great honor and distinction and always approached each case with the gravity and seriousness it deserved.

I was a criminal court judge in Knoxville for seven-and-a-half years, and during that time I issued thousands of criminal sentences.

There may be no tougher job—with greater potential consequence—than evaluating whether or not a prisoner is ready to re-enter society, and I cannot think of a better person to have had in this role than Chairman Traughber.

During his remarkable career, Chairman Traughber reviewed and voted on more than 145,000 cases.

The most infamous person to come before his board was James Earl Ray, who assassinated the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. Chairman Traughber said Ray was denied parole because of the ''seriousness of the offense.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to join me in celebrating the exceptional career of a very patriotic American, Charles Traughber. Our Nation is a better place because of his service.

TRIBUTE TO EDNA LOUISE FLINT HOUSE

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, one hundred years ago a virtuous woman of God, Edna Louise Flint House was born in Decatur, Georgia on December 7, 1913 to John and Louise Flint; and

Whereas, she was raised up in DeKalb County, Georgia and married Mr. Jesse House and their union has blessed our district and nation ever since; and

Whereas, this phenomenal Proverbs 31 woman has shared her time and talents as a wife, mother and motivator, becoming a Georgia citizen of great worth, a fearless leader and a servant to all by always advancing the lives of others; and

Whereas, Mrs. House has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; she serves as a Mother at New Beginning Full Gospel Baptist Church in Decatur, Georgia; and

Whereas, Mrs. House along with her pastor, Bishop James H. Morton, her family and friends are celebrating a remarkable milestone, her 100th Birthday, we pause to acknowledge a woman who is a cornerstone in Decatur, DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. House on her birthday and to wish her well and recognize her for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all; Now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim December 7, 2013 as Mrs. Edna Louise Flint House Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 7th day of December, 2013.

HONORING THE SMOKEHOUSE GRILL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a budding Minority Business in the Mississippi Delta, The Smokehouse Grill in Marks, MS.

On January 19, 1971, L.C. and Velma Pride welcomed a bouncing baby boy they named Paul Andrew. Paul was the youngest of the eight Pride children. Paul attended Quitman County School District where he received his high school diploma in 1989.

Paul furthered his education at Northwest Community College in 1990 majoring in Computer Programming. He became employed at Sunflower Grocery Store in Senatobia, MS for his first job. He worked there for two years where he learned to become an independent man he is today. He later moved on to a better opportunity at Mood Automotive for eight years where he gained a lot of friends, experience, and skills to be an example for others to follow.

Paul purchased his first home in Marks, MS at the age of 21. It was a huge accomplishment that he was extremely proud of. He later began driving trucks for Ozark Motor Lines where he worked two years. During this time, his daughter, the most beautiful girl, was born on April 14, 2002 and he named her, Japarian Marie Pride. Japarian is now an intelligent, outgoing 11 years old who attends South Panola Schools.

Driving through Marks, MS in March of 2002, Paul had a taste for barbeque rib tips, but there was no ''Rib Shack'' in Marks. Paul came up with the idea to open a rib shack. ''I asked God to show me the way,'' stated Paul and two months later, the doors of Paul Pride's Smokehouse were opened. Smokehouse, as it is commonly called, has been selling rib tips, chopped barbeque, ribs, wings, and fish ever since.

Smokehouse is located at 1075 Martin Luther King Dr. in Marks, MS. Paul stated, ''We have a great location here and we are located in an industrial area on Main St. Since opening, Smokehouse has saturated Quitman, Panola, Coahoma, and Tallahatchie counties.'' Being from Marks, Paul is no stranger to the area. His father was a part of the Marks Police Department for 40 years. Paul's roots run

deep in the city of Marks. Eleven years later, he is still on the grill and Smokehouse is still going strong.

Paul is now engaged to Stacy Frost who helps him run Smokehouse. Paul is destined to continue running his business and serving great food to those who eat at and support The Smokehouse Grill. Paul has a bright future that is continuing to blossom on a path to greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing The Smokehouse Grill for serving our great community.

IN RECOGNITION OF BUSTER JOHNSON

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, Today I congratulate Mohave County Supervisor Buster Johnson on becoming president of the Arizona Association of Counties (AACO). Mr. Johnson is the first elected official from Mohave County to serve as the AACO's president. He has already proven his dedication to the people of Mohave County as a leading Mohave County Supervisor, and I have no doubt that his leadership will serve the AACO and all people of Arizona well.

The AACO is an important organization in Arizona. As the only organization that represents all of Arizona's 15 counties and their officials, its purpose is to promote issues important to our counties on the state and federal levels.

Congratulations to Mr. Johnson and the AACO. I wish them much success in serving Arizona.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO ALLOW AGENCIES TO FIGHT FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE IN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce two technical corrections to the Affordable Care Act. These two bills provide minor technical corrections to avoid confusion and to ensure that regulators can effectively do their work in combatting fraud, waste, and abuse in the Medicare program. We need to extend the solvency of the Medicare program and to do so, we must ensure that the regulatory agencies are empowered to fully enforce provision to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse in the Medicare program.

The first bill would allow certain physician extenders, including physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists, to document that the face-to-face encounter required by the Affordable Care Act has occurred. The Affordable Care Act currently requires that a physician document that a face-to-face encounter has occurred, even though the law allows the face-to-face encounter to be performed by a physician extender. The face-to-face encounter is an important tool to combat fraud and abuse in the durable medical equipment context, and it is important to recognize the role that physician extenders play in many instances.

The second bill would correct an error in the ACA that was carried over from an underlying law, which prevents regulators from stopping waste, fraud, and abuse. A provision in the Affordable Care Act intended to allow regulators additional discretion to impose a surety bond on home health agencies based on the volume of payments they received from the Medicare program. However, due to a drafting error in the underlying law that was inadvertently perpetuated in the Affordable Care Act, the bond that regulators can require from home health agencies is essentially capped at $50,000. For large providers, this amount is too low a sum to have a meaningful impact and directly contradicts Congress' intention to require a higher bond from home health agencies that receive substantial Medicare payments.

We must continue our efforts to extend the solvency of the Medicare program. Fighting fraud is a nonpartisan issue. I urge my colleagues to support these technical correction provisions.

WREN'S NEST HOUSE MUSEUM

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georiga. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, the Wren's Nest House Museum, a community institution and National Historic Landmark is one of Atlanta's most engaging historic sites, bringing education and joy to untold numbers of visitors including many from the 4th Congressional District of Georgia; and

Whereas, the Wren's Nest is open to the public year-round sharing the African American storytelling tradition and educating visitors about the life and work of Joel Chandler Harris, one of Georgia's most celebrated journalists and literary figures; and

Whereas, the Wren's Nest is filled with many original artifacts and furnishings that belonged to the Harris family and as a museum is one of the finest examples of 19th century Victorian-era middle class lifestyles in the United States; and

Whereas, in recent years the museum has completed several accurate historic restorations of the property with an eye toward authenticity; and

Whereas, the Wren's Nest was the boyhood home of Julian, a Harris son and Pulitzer Prize winning journalist who in the 1920's courageously fought the Ku Klux Klan in the editorial pages of his newspaper; and

Whereas, the museum has extended its community outreach by encouraging young writers through the Wren's Nest Scribes Program which mentors 5th, 6th and 7th graders to hone their writing skills and become published authors; and

Whereas, the dedicated board, staff and volunteers of the Wren's Nest are today welcoming the community to A Victorian Christmas Open House & Celebration of the 168th Birthday of Joel Chandler Harris by featuring the incredible Wren's Nest Ramblers Akbar Imhotep, Curtis Richardson, Josie Bailey and Mama Kofu who interpret and present the more than 180 African folktales preserved by Joel Chandler Harris; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to join in the celebration and recognize this outstanding museum and community institution that is uniquely Georgia; Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim December 8, 2013 as Wren's Nest House Museum Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 8th day of December, 2013.

HONORING MR. WILLIAM "KINGFISH" BYRD

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this month is August and all this month I rise to honor black farmers. So today, I rise to honor the late Mr. William Byrd of Sunflower County, MS, five miles east of Shaw on Highway 442. He earned the name of Kingfish not because people thought he was a joke but because he became a well-known, respected and honest black business man with money—time frame 1920s to his death.

Mr. Byrd did not get a chance to go to school and get a full first through twelfth grade education, no, in fact, he acquired his education by the means of hands-on hard work, life experiences, and the "Blue Back Webster." Like many laboring migrant black families he moved with his father, mother, and siblings around until finally settling in the Mississippi Delta. The many moves with his family was because his dad, Mr. Shep Byrd, was strong willed on not settling his life as a sharecropper but, rather self-employed and own land.

So, this transmission of self-employment was passed on to Mr. William Byrd, who in turn passed it on to his children, Lonnie "LC" Byrd, Melvin "Jimbo" Whiting, Velma "Red" Whiting, Thelma "Black" Whiting, and Thomas "TL" W. Byrd. His son, Thomas recalls his dad, often saying, "I'll even buy swamp land and make something out of it, if I just get the chance to buy it."

Little by little Mr. William Byrd would work and save his money never forgetting his dream to buy land. He even found a piece of land he wanted to buy and yes, it was under water and thought to be useless. A useless piece of land back then was called "deadening" land because it was swap area and not considered fertile for anything. He would often go there and gaze and dream, and cut down trees wisely clearing the land but telling all those who asked him, "What are you doing. . .?" he would say, "I'm cutting wood for burning."

Many times, the white men would threaten his life and run him home but he kept going back into the "deadening" until eventually he had saved enough money to buy the first of approximately 700 acres of land he would own over the course of his entire life.

The journey of this Black Farmer is that by 1940 he was well established with 20 houses or more on his land for all his workers,

both black and white, although once word got out that white folks were willing to work for him the other whites would run them off.

You see, Mr. Byrd believed in treating people the way he wanted to be treated, regardless of color. By 1955, he had earned enough money and respect as a black business man that he was able to purchase at least ten homes and two restaurants in Shaw, often paying cash each time he made a purchase. By this time, ''money was no problem'' as his son remembered his Dad saying. In fact, the first house he purchased was a big beautiful brick house which was the home of Mr. Thomas McEvans.

Mr. McEvans was another rich man in Shaw; he owned a clothing store, tailoring shop, and he took the lead in building the 1st colored school in Shaw, and a member of the Board of Trustees among other influences he held in Shaw. In 1959, part of his dream to build a community for blacks began to materialize. Mr. Byrd purchased a building ten miles west of Shaw on Highway 448 and had it moved to its current location of Hwy 442, five miles east of Shaw. That building became a focal point of Byrd's community. He remolded the building turning it into ''Byrd Grocery,'' and later he added on to the building a restaurant and gas station, changing the name to ''Byrd Grocery and Service Station.'' Byrd's community also had two baseball fields.

When Black farmers were losing their farms in the 1960s for various reasons, Mr. Byrd was never affected or worried because he knew he had planned wisely. Long before automation really took over, he was already using tractors to do the work on the farm, getting away from the mule. But when automation fully came into use, his son, Thomas recalls the day his Dad went to the John Deere place and purchased a brand new top of the line, ''John Deere'' cotton picker. And because he was able to pay $25,000 cash for the John Deere, the white salesman surely sold it to him because of the money but after that he refused to have anything else to do with him because it was unheard of and certainly shocking that Mr. Byrd, a black man, was in possession of that amount of cash and no one really knew. You see, his success rested in his belief to ''never spend more than you make, keep folks out of your business, and don't be extravagant because a fool and his money will soon part,'' said, his son, Thomas Lee.

In 1975, Mr. Byrd due to health problems turned the family farm over to his oldest son, Lonnie ''LC'' Byrd, who died December 17, 1999. Mr. William ''Kingfish'' Byrd died in July 1980 and is buried in the Strangers Home Cemetery in Shaw, MS beside his wife, Daisy Byrd, who died in August 1981. Thomas Lee recalls his father's last words to him, ''Son, I told LC and I'm telling you never sell the farm. I built this for all my children.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring, Mr. William ''Kingfish'' Byrd, a black farmer from the Mississippi Second Congressional District.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE ACADEMY NOMINEES FROM THE 7TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the young men and women from the 7th Congressional District of Pennsylvania who have been nominated to attend a service academy. These men and women will honor a commitment to serve in the military for a minimum of five years upon graduation. They have been nominated because they have displayed character traits such as leadership, service and dedication both inside and outside the classroom. I am confident that their parents and teachers have prepared them well for this world-class educational opportunity and extraordinary service to their nation.

The following individuals have been nominated for academy appointment:

Evan Allen, Valley Forge Military Academy, United States Naval Academy; Zachary Assenmacher, Haverford High School, United States Naval Academy; Bret Beebe, Twin Valley High School, United States Naval Academy; Troy Bergwall, Bayard Rustin High School, United States Naval Academy; Nicholas Bologa, Pequea Valley High School, United States Merchant Marine Academy; Matthew Brecht, LaSalle College High School, United States Military Academy; Steven Bushold, LaSalle College High School, United States Military Academy; Julia Clements, Downingtown High School, United States Naval Academy; Cole Drahus, Twin Valley High School, United States Naval Academy; Jonas Fiant, Governor Mifflin High School, United States Air Force Academy; Daniel Geibler, Ridley High School, United States Military Academy; Chasan Hall, Coatesville Senior High School, United States Air Force Academy; William Higgins, Penncrest High School, United States Merchant Marine Academy; Phillip Ianozi, Springfield Township High School, United States Merchant Marine Academy; Matthew Jones, Malvern Preparatory School, United States Naval Academy; George Keating, North Penn High School, United States Naval Academy; Ethan Klabunde, Unionville High School, United States Naval Academy; Heather Laudermilch, Westtown School, United States Air Force Academy; Justin Lee, Upper Dublin High School, United States Military Academy; Kiersten Martin, Cardinal O'Hara High School, United States Naval Academy; Catherine McCarthy, Upper Darby High School, United States Naval Academy; Jacob McCubbins, Methacton High School, United States Air Force Academy; James McWilliams, Haverford Senior High School, United States Military Academy; Ross Obenschein, Twin Valley High School, United States Air Force Academy; Christopher Paolantonio, St. Joseph's Preparatory School, United States Naval Academy; Matthew Prestia, Plymouth Whitemarsh High School, United States Naval Academy; Charles Rossino, Haverford High School, United States Naval Academy; Thaddeus Schlamb, Downingtown West High School, United States Naval Academy; Andrew Schutta, LaSalle College High School, United States Naval Academy; Zachary Smith, Cardinal O'Hara High School, United States Naval Academy; Olivia Tierney, Villa Maria Academy, United States Naval Academy; George Ulrich, LaSalle College High School, United States Naval Academy; Madeleine Wawrzyniak, Hatboro-Horsham Senior High School, United States Air Force Academy; Kyle Werner, Kennett High School, United States Military Academy; Dalton Wolfe, Oxford Area High School, United States Naval Academy

Again, Mr. Speaker, congratulations to all of these outstanding nominees. I wish them nothing but the best in all their endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT CHRIS BOHLER

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Sergeant Chris Bohler of Willow Spring, North Carolina, who gave his life while defending our Nation on December 17, 2013, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Sergeant Bohler was one of six U.S. servicemembers killed when a helicopter crashed in Zabul Province, Afghanistan. He shall be remembered by all those whose lives he touched as the finest example of altruism, integrity, and patriotism. His life and his sacrifice merit our utmost respect and gratitude.

Chris came from a long line of soldiers. His great-grandfather served in Europe during World War I. One of his grandfathers enlisted in the Army during World War II, and a great-uncle enlisted in the Air Force during the Korean War. His father also served in the Army.

Chris graduated from South Johnston High School in Four Oaks in 2003 and went on to attend Johnston Community College, where he was admired as a man with high aspirations and the tenacity to achieve his goals. Eager to protect his country, he joined the Army in 2007, and was assigned to B Company, 3rd Battalion, 1st Aviation Regiment, 1st Infantry Division in Fort Riley, Kansas. Chris was a humble hero that lived his life the best way he knew how—by serving others.

Chris was serving our country dutifully when his life was taken. He will be missed by his family and friends. He was the son of Deborah and Pete Bohler and the oldest of three children. Although he is now gone, his courage will continue to be an inspiration to us all. He shall be remembered as the finest example of bravery, honor, and public service. May God comfort his family, and may we always remember the life of Sergeant Chris Bohler.

WELCOME BABY VALENTINA LUCILLE DAY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate my Chief of Staff, Jonathan Day, and his wife Muffy, who serves as Chief of Staff for Congressman

JOHN CAMPBELL, upon the birth of their beautiful daughter. Valentina Lucille Day arrived into the world at 7:12 p.m. on Wednesday, Christmas Day, December 25, 2013, at George Washington University Hospital in Washington, DC. Weighing 6 pounds and measuring 19 inches long, Valentina is the first child for the happy couple. I look forward to watching her grow and have no doubt that her talented parents will be dedicated to her well-being and bright future.

I would also like to congratulate Valentina's grandparents, Wallace and Miriam Lewis of Miami, Florida, and Edward and Margaret Day of Conklin, New York. Congratulations to the entire Day and Lewis families as they welcome their newest edition of pure pride and joy!

MOURNING THE PASSING OF CONGRESSMAN VICENTE ''BEN'' GARRIDO BLAZ

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I learned today of the passing of former Congressman Vicente 'Ben' Garrido Blaz. Elected to the U.S. Congress in 1984 to represent the Territory of Guam, Congressman Blaz was an exceptional leader for his people. He was also an example of statesmanship to the greater Pacific region, including American Samoa. He will truly be missed.

As a genuine patriot, Blaz first served his country as a Marine and served three tours in Osaka, Okinawa, and Vietnam. He was the first general officer from Guam to serve in any branch of the U.S. Armed Forces. In 1977, he became the first Chamorro ever to be promoted to the rank of Brigadier General.

Congressman Blaz served Guam for eight years in the U.S. Congress from 1985–1993 (99th Congress—102nd Congress). As a freshman member and respected leader among his peers, he was also elected as President of his freshman class. I will remember him also as a dear friend who welcomed me as a fellow islander and brother after I was elected to serve American Samoa in 1988.

Congressman Blaz will be remembered for his dedicated service and pioneering spirit. He will also be remembered as a family man: a loving husband to his late wife, Ann Evers Blaz, a devoted father and grandfather. I count myself as one of many who was blessed to share a friendship with this great man and I will hold close to my heart his example of leadership, passion for his Chamorro culture, and immense love for his people.

The people of American Samoa join together to honor our Chamorro brother. We give our deepest condolences to his family, especially his sons, Mike and Tom, and their families, and to the people of Guam as they mourn his passing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of a great man who represented Indianapolis in Congress for twenty years. After a life of dedicated service to his city and country, former Congressman Andrew Jacobs, Jr. passed away on December 28, 2013.

I was privileged to know Congressman Jacobs from a very young age and considered him family. He served as an invaluable mentor and dear friend to my grandmother, Julia Carson, who he hired to work in his Indianapolis congressional office in 1965. It was Andy's faith and encouragement that inspired my grandmother to run for state representative in 1972, and his support of her never wavered.

At an early age, Andy took an interest in me as well and imparted wisdom while serving as a role model. He continued as a valued mentor, even long after he left office. With Andy's passing, our nation lost a man who was resolutely courageous, both in his service as a Marine in Korea, and in public life.

People will likely recall that he helped strengthen Social Security, fought for civil rights, and was unrelentingly frugal with taxpayer dollars. But his true legacy is that of a man who took the path less traveled, one of principle, no matter what advantages he sacrificed to do so.

While in Congress, Andy never took a donation from a political action committee, he never attacked an opponent, and he never put his name on his office door in Washington, D.C., explaining that ''the seat belonged to the people I serve, not to me.'' He was a selfless public servant, who never cared about station or the trappings of office.

Andy was a man of rapier wit. And though he used it often to hilarious effect in disarming the infrequent angry constituent or political foe, he was never caustic or maligning. He upheld the dignity of all. This is undoubtedly why he forged enduring friendships with, and held the respect of, many across the aisle.

For some time now, Andy has penned a weekly ''Thought Bite'' for Nuvo, a local Indianapolis newspaper. On December 18, it read: ''If there's one thing I hate, its hate.'' I cannot think of a better self-assessment for a man whose heart had unlimited capacity to see the goodness in everyone.

In sum, Andy was a model of decency, compassion, servant-leadership, thoughtfulness, and civility. I pray that God rests his soul and gives peace and comfort to his wife, Kim, his sons Andy and Steven, and to the countless others for whom Andy is ''family.''

RECOGNIZING JOE COTCHETT

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an extraordinary man, and a true humanitarian, who is celebrating his 75th birthday and his 50th anniversary practicing law in pursuit of justice for all Americans. Joe Cotchett is a Burlingame attorney known for his intellectual honesty, his booming declaration of indignation over the lack of justice for his clients, and an enormous heart that pumps love out to all, especially those in urgent need.

A few examples of his work over the years demonstrate his dedication to the rule of law. This chamber may never have heard of Joe Cotchett, but many have heard of Charles Keating, the former CEO of Lincoln Savings and Loan. Joe pursued Keating through the years until senior citizens who were bilked had received some measure of recompense. He took the case when others considered it a hopeless cause. Not to Joe. Justice is never hopeless in the law offices of Joe Cotchett.

In fact, white collar criminals know the name of Joe Cotchett well, as he pursued them in the interests of swindled investors in companies such as Technical Equities. When banks and securities firms sold Enron's bonds and assured investors that the bonds were sound, they defrauded buyers. Joe Cotchett held the sellers accountable. More recently, the County of San Mateo is likely to receive tens of millions of dollars through a suit filed against Lehman Brothers and the personal assets of its former CEO, Richard Fuld. Public agencies and the human needs that they serve will recover from wrongdoers, thanks to Joe Cotchett.

In the eyes of many in modern day America, civil justice is a rich man's right and a stale leftover due any poor man with the temerity to plead at the doors of a courtroom. In the eyes of Joe Cotchett, justice is an everyday pursuit on behalf of any American who has been wronged and who deserves redress.

Mr. Speaker, there are probably many persons who are alive today who unknowingly owe their economic well-being and peace of mind to Joe Cotchett. In 2000, Consumers Union was hit with a product disparagement and defamation suit. An automaker claimed that Consumers Union had hurt its reputation. Indeed, when the magazine pointed out that vehicles made by the company were prone to rollovers, sales fell. Joe Cotchett successfully defended Consumers Union and the right of investigative, consumer-oriented journalism to spell out the truth to buyers. Lives then and now are saved because this lawsuit and another in 2004 were not successful. The truth about dangerous products will continue to be published.

Most recently, he recovered $1.5 billion for California counties which had sued lead paint manufacturers for the damage done to children by lead-tainted products. The settlement will go towards removing lead from the homes of low income children throughout California.

He once defended the justices of the California Supreme Court who were sued by various Wall Street interests. Wall Street was a bit unhappy with the court's rules regarding arbitration. The Wall Streeters were unsuccessful, thanks to Joe, and now it is demonstrable that there is justice even for justices but, most importantly, for the public interest that these justices serve.

Joe's work is not merely on behalf of those who can pay. Amerasian children in the Philippines were left in villages after Subic Bay Naval Base closed. Joe mounted a suit on their behalf that resulted in a settlement giving

direct U.S. aid to the children fathered by U.S. servicemembers. Locally, Joe and his law firm are routinely at the top of the list of donors to nonprofits helping the disabled, mentally ill, homeless and many others. It would be difficult to overstate the generosity of Joe towards his many communities, including $5 million to create an endowment at California State Polytechnic University to promote the teaching of mathematics and science. Joe Cotchett has been ''paying it forward'' for decades, all with the knowledge that the meaningful legacies of any man's life are not memorialized in stone but rather demonstrated by the conscientious, continuous replacement of despair and anguish with hope and well-being.

Of course, over 50 years of practice it would be expected that an accomplished advocate would receive many honors and serve in many positions. Joe's honors and places of service are so numerous that they defy enumeration. Let me name just a few: Service on the board of the San Mateo County Heart Association, the San Mateo Boys and Girls Club, the Peninsula Association of Retarded Children and Adults, the Bay Meadows Foundation, Disability Rights Advocates, Public Citizen, and Earth Justice. He has lectured at the law schools of Harvard, Stanford, the University of Southern California, Georgetown, and U.C. Hastings College of the Law. Among his many honors have been those bestowed by the Anti-Defamation League, trial lawyer associations both state and national, and the State Bar of California. He has been published seven times and is a member of eight professional organizations, including the State Bar of California, and the bar associations of New York and the District of Columbia. He is also admitted to the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Joe Cotchett received his B.S. in Engineering from California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo in June 1960, being named an outstanding graduate, and his J.D. from Hastings College of the Law at the University of California in June 1964. He received an Honorary Doctor of Laws from Cal Poly and Honorary Doctor of Letters degrees from Notre Dame de Namur University and the University of San Francisco. He is the author of ''The Ethics Gap'', ''California Continuing Education of the Bar'' and many others. His honors include being named Top 100 Lawyers in California by California Daily Journal in 2011 and the Lawdragon 500 Leading Lawyers in America list for 2011.

Do you see the theme here, my fellow members? Starving children. Children being poisoned by lead. Trusting consumers. The Earth in all her glory? Investors who legitimately trusted in free and fair markets? These are the clients of an honest, thoughtful advocate. An honest man is sometimes described as being made of the salt of the Earth. In fact, Joe is a bit salty. He can sometimes be crusty. But he is definitely of this Earth. Joe Cotchett deserves a happy 75th birthday and a warm round of applause for 50 years of service in the interest of justice. America is always strengthened by citizen advocates who see the public's interest and who defend it unstintingly. This nation should hope that there are many more years in the life and service of Joseph W. Cotchett, an historic defender of American democracy.

HONORING DAN BILBREY

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of Mr. Dan Bilbrey, a Vietnam War veteran who served in the Air Force and an outstanding leader in the community of Tracy, California.

Dan Bilbrey moved to Tracy, California in 1968 where he eventually served as the Mayor for 12 years, from 1994 to 2006 after a term on the City Council from 1990 to 1994.

At age 68, Mr. Bilbrey died in his home in the early morning on Wednesday, November 20, 2013, after suffering an illness for 7 months.

As mayor, Mr. Bilbrey played critical roles in many key community projects including: the Tracy Outlets, the West Valley Mall, construction of the Grand Theatre Center for the Arts, the Civic Center, renovation of the fire administration building at Ninth Street and Central Avenue, completion of the South County Water Surface Project, and establishment of a city parks system.

The city of Tracy honored Mr. Bilbrey's long career of service to the community on February 5th by dedicating the plaza at City Hall, 333 Civic Center Drive, in his name.

Dan was a man of strong faith and conviction. He was a loyal, patient man that his family and community have always been proud and blessed to have in their lives. He was of the highest integrity, a man of wisdom and courage, strength and honor, who respected, and was respected by all. He was always there to help, whether it was a boy scout, a teenager, or any other individual.

Mr. Bilbrey gave 100% into all projects; big or small, they were all of equal importance. He was a man of many hats: Mayor, Councilman, Foundation Director, reserve policeman, medic, husband, father, brother, uncle, grandfather, and recently a great grandfather. He was born to Quitman and Lena Bilbrey and had one sibling, Ann Lamb; all have now passed. He has two children, John and Jennifer, three grandchildren, Savannah, Toli Jr. and Rylee, and one great granddaughter, Danni, who was named after him. His sister, Ann, married Spencer Lamb; they have three children, Terry, Sherry, and Elizabeth, who were very close to him. There are many great nieces and nephews, all of whom Dan's love and life touched.

When Dan had free time, he enjoyed spending it in his garden with his, ''sweetie,'' Josie and his Boston Terrier. They made many trips to Oregon to visit grandchildren. They have also visited Europe, specifically: Portugal, Ireland, and England. Dan took after-Christmas trips to Hawaii with close friends to bring in the New Year. He took several cruises to the Panama Canal, Central America and Alaska. Dan made friends everywhere he went and influenced many with his wisdom and kindness. He will be greatly missed by all. His contributions to our lives and community will always be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Dan Bilbrey for his life and great contributions to his family, community and country.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 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 $17,306,977,954,400.15. We've added $6,680,100,905,487.07 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO DR. GERALD L. BECK

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Gerald L. Beck for more than 38 years of service to educating Idahoans and on the occasion of his retirement from his current position as President of the College of Southern Idaho (CSI).

During his time at CSI, Dr. Beck has been a strong advocate for promoting academic excellence in Southeastern Idaho as well as supporting economic development in the local community. Through Dr. Beck's work prior to joining CSI—which included starting a small business and working two regional managerial positions—Dr. Beck gained the experience necessary to begin a long and successful career educating those who now contribute to the economic development of Idaho

Perhaps the most meaningful impact Dr. Beck has made is his role as an educator and administrator. Dr. Beck started his career at CSI as a technical instructor and went on to hold positions as the Coordinator of the Trade and Industrial Division, the Dean of Continuing Education/Summer School, and the Executive Vice President/Chief Academic Officer. In his time at CSI Dr. Beck was able to integrate the higher education curriculum to support economic growth in southeast Idaho which created a mutually successful relationship between the college and local community.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank Dr. Beck for his service and commitment to higher education in Idaho I wish him well in the next chapter of his life alongside his wife Barbara, children, and grandchildren.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S189–S265

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1899–1912. **Page S223**

Measures Passed:

Assisting United States Civilian Robert Levinson: Senate agreed to S. Res. 312, urging the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in this case of Robert Levinson, one of the longest held United States civilians in our Nation's history, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S259**

Reid (for Nelson) Amendment No. 2638, to amend the preamble. **Page S259**

Reid (for Nelson) Amendment No. 2639, to amend the title. **Page S259**

Measures Considered:

Unemployment Benefits Extension—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S203–09**

Pending:

Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631, relating to extension and modification of emergency unemployment compensation program. **Page S204**

Reid Amendment No. 2632 (to Amendment No. 2631), to change the enactment date. **Page S204**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631(listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, January 9, 2014, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. **Pages S259–60**

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2633, to change the enactment date. **Page S204**

Reid Amendment No. 2634 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2633), of a perfecting nature. **Page S204**

Reid Amendment No. 2635 (to Amendment No. 2634), of a perfecting nature. **Page S204**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, 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 Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631. **Page S204**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 42 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 3), Senate failed to table Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2633, to change the enactment date. **Page S209**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 2 p.m., on Monday, January 13, 2014, Senate resume consideration of the bill; that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to the bill be 3 p.m., on Monday, January 13, 2014, and the filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631 (listed above) be 4:30 p.m., on Monday, January 13, 2014; and that following disposition of the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631. **Pages S259–60**

Wilkins Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. **Pages S209–11**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 4), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination. **Page S209**

By 54 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 5), Senate agreed to the motion to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination. **Page S209**

By 55 yeas to 38 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. 6), Senate upon reconsideration agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Page S210

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Monday, January 13, 2014, Senate resume consideration of the nomination with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form, prior to a vote on confirmation of the nomination. **Pages S259–60**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Suzette M. Kimball, of West Virginia, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey.

Deborah L. Birx, of Maryland, to be Ambassador at Large and Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally.

Michael W. Kempner, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

Heidi Neel Biggs, of Oregon, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2017.

Christopher P. Lu, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor.

Westley Watende Omari Moore, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2016.

43 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

4 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, and Marine Corps. **Pages S260–65**

Messages from the House: **Page S221**

Measures Referred: **Page S221**

Executive Communications: **Pages S222–23**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S223**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S223–24**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S224–27**

Additional Statements: **Pages S220–21**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S227–59**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S259**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S259**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—6) **Pages S209–10**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:18 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, January 13, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S260.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Jessica Garfola Wright, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Jo Ann Rooney, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, and Jamie Michael Morin, of Michigan, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, all of the Department of Defense, and Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Security.

SITUATION IN SOUTH SUDAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the situation in South Sudan, after receiving testimony from Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; Nancy E. Lindborg, Assistant Administrator for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Princeton N. Lyman, U.S. Institute of Peace, John Prendergast, Enough Project, and Kate Almquist Knopf, Africa Center for Strategic Studies, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Gary Blankinship, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Texas, Robert L. Hobbs, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Texas, Amos Rojas, Jr., to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida, Peter C. Tobin, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Ohio, Kevin W. Techau, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Iowa, and Andrew Mark Luger, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota, all of the Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 3824–3840; and 2 resolutions, 105; H. Con. Res. 73 were introduced. **Pages H134–35**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H135–36**

Report Filed: A report was filed on January 2, 2014 as follows:

Annual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Ethics for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, First Session (H. Rept. 113–323).

A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 2952, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security tecnologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–324). **Page H133**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Messer to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H75**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:22 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H83**

Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 2279, to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, by a recorded vote of 225 ayes to 188 noes, Roll No. 10. **Pages H87–H112**

Rejected the Peters (CA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No. 9. **Pages H109–11**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–30 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. **Page H104**

Rejected:

Sinema amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–322) that sought to strike language that would expand eligibility for the National Priorities List (NPL) in Section 204, which is overseen by the Environmental Protection Agency. Would reinstate language that directs listing of the "highest priority facilities" for cleanup (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 7) and **Pages H106–07, H108–09**

Tonko amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 113–322) that sought to block implementation of the bill if any provision would increase litigation, reduce funds available for cleaning up contaminated sites, or that would delay clean up of contaminated sites (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 8). **Pages H107–08, H109**

H. Res. 455, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2279), (H.R. 3362), and (H.R. 3811), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 6, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 5. **Pages H94–96**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in memory of Ben Garrido Blaz, former Member of Congress. **Page H112**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H87.

Senate Referral: S. 1171 was referred to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary. **Page H87**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H95–96, H96, H108, H109, H110–11 and H111–12. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXTENDERS POLICIES: WHAT ARE THEY AND HOW SHOULD THEY CONTINUE UNDER A PERMANENT SGR REPEAL LANDSCAPE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "The Extenders Policies: What Are They and How Should They Continue Under a Permanent SGR Repeal Landscape?". Testimony was heard from Glenn M. Hackbarth, Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; Diane Rowland, Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission; Michael Lu, Associate Administrator Maternal and Child Health Bureau Health Resources and Services Administration; Naomi Goldstein, Director Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families.

INTERNATIONAL IMPACTS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S QUANTITATIVE EASING PROGRAM

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled "International Impacts of the Federal Reserve's

Quantitative Easing Program''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AFRICAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''Will there be an African Economic Community?''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice held a hearing on H.R. 7, the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S WAR ON COAL: THE RECENT REPORT BY THE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Obama Administration's War on Coal: The Recent Report by the Office of the Inspector General''. Testimony was heard from Robert A. Knox, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Interior.

WASTE IN GOVERNMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Waste in Government: What's Being Done?''. Testimony was heard from Senators Carper and Coburn; and public witnesses.

PRIVATE SECTOR PROGRAMS THAT ENGAGE STUDENTS IN STEM

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Private Sector Programs that Engage Students in STEM''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D11)*

H.R. 3304, to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor. Signed on December 26, 2013. (Public Law 113–66)

H.J. Res. 59, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014. Signed on December 26, 2013. (Public Law 113–67)

H.R. 623, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium. Signed on December 26, 2013. (Public Law 113–68)

H.R. 767, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project. Signed on December 26, 2013. (Public Law 113–69)

H.R. 2319, to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994. Signed on December 26, 2013. (Public Law 113–70)

H.R. 3343, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to clarify the rules regarding the determination of the compensation of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia. Signed on December 26, 2013. (Public Law 113–71)

H.R. 3487, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to extend through 2018 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission, to expand such authority to certain other violations. Signed on December 26, 2013. (Public Law 113–72)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled ''The Science Behind Discovery: Seismic Exploration and the Future of the Atlantic OCS'', 9:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine the employment situation for December 2013, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, January 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 1845, Unemployment Benefits Extension. The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the bill is 3 p.m., and the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631 to the bill, is 4:30 p.m.

At 5 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631 to S. 1845, Unemployment Benefits Extension.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, January 10

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 3362—Exchange Information Disclosure Act (Subject to a Rule) and H.R. 3811—Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barber, Ron, Ariz., E30
Carson, André, Ind., E39
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E40
Collins, Doug, Ga., E33
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E30, E35
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E31, E40
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E36
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E39
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E37
Granger, Kay, Tex., E32
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E29, E30, E31, E32, E33, E34, E35, E36, E37
Kelly, Mike, Pa., E29
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E34
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E35
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E31, E37
McGovern, James P., Mass., E33
McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E38
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E38
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E32
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E40
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E39
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E34
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E29, E30, E30, E32, E33, E34, E35, E35, E36, E37
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E36
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E29
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E38

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.